Annex 1
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

Application Downloaded On: 13 Oct 2015

String: islam

Application ID: 1-2130-23450

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

2. Address of the principal place of business
   No.11, 4th Floor, Block D, Metrocity Shopping Mall, Kirgulu St., Buyukdere Ave., 34394, Levent, Istanbul, TR

3. Phone number
   +90 212 319 38 87

4. Fax number
   +90 212 319 38 02

5. If applicable, website or URL
   http://www.agitsys.com
Primary Contact

6(a). Name
Mehdi Abbasnia

6(b). Title
Managing Director & Member of the Board

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
Contact Information Redacted

6(f). Email Address
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Tolga Kaprol

7(b). Title
The Head of Technical Dept.

7(c). Address

7(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

7(e). Fax Number
Contact Information Redacted
Proof of Legal Establishment

8(a). Legal form of the Applicant
Limited Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Trade Registration Office (Ticaret Sicili Memurlugundan)

8(c). Attach evidence of the applicant’s establishment.
Attachments are not displayed on this form.

9(a). If applying company is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.

9(c). If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.

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>Ali Zarinbakhsh</td>
<td>Member of the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Name(s) and position(s) of all officers and partners
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>Ali Zarinbakhsh</td>
<td>Member of the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(d). For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders: Name(s) and position(s) of all individuals having legal or executive responsibility

**Applied-for gTLD string**

13. Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If an IDN, provide the U-label.

`islam`

14A. If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with "xn--").

14B. 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.

14C1. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (in English).

14C2. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (as referenced by ISO-639-1).
14D1. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (in English).

14D2. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (as referenced by ISO 15924).

14E. If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.

15A. 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.

15B. Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and sources used.

15C. List any variants to the applied-for gTLD string according to the relevant IDN tables.

16. Describe the applicant’s efforts to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string. If such issues are known, describe steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in software and other applications.

The team behind Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has been involved in the development of
various IDN scripts for over ten years. Through this work, we have become aware of some issues that may cause rendering problems for certain new gTLDs. We have reviewed the string that will be used with this application and based upon our expertise, we see no issues with operational or rendering problems concerning the applied for gTLD string.

17. OPTIONAL.
Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/).

18A. Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. They are a group whose origins are found some 1400 years in the past, their ethnicity often inextricably linked with their faith. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this.

Islam is the monotheistic religion articulated by the Qur’an, a text considered by its adherents to be the verbatim word of God (Arabic: Allāh), and by the teachings and normative example (called the Sunnah and composed of Hadith) of Muhammad, considered by them to be the last prophet of God. An adherent of Islam is called a Muslim. Islam is a verbal noun originating from the trilateral root s-l-m which forms a large class of words mostly relating to concepts of wholeness, completion and bonding-joining. In a religious context it means "voluntary submission to God". Muslim, the word for an adherent of Islam, is the active participle of the same verb of which Islām is the infinitive.

Muslims believe that God is one and incomparable and the purpose of existence is to love and serve God. Muslims also believe that Islam is the complete and universal version of a primordial faith that was revealed at many times and places before, including through Abraham, Moses and Jesus, whom they consider prophets. They maintain that previous messages and revelations have been partially changed or corrupted over time, but consider the Qur’an to be both the unaltered and the final revelation of God. Religious concepts and practices include the five pillars of Islam, which are basic concepts and obligatory acts of worship, and following Islamic law, which touches on virtually every aspect of life and society, providing guidance on multifarious topics from banking and welfare, to warfare and the environment.

The majority of Muslims are Sunni, being 75–90% of all Muslims. The second largest sect, Shia, makes up 10–20%. About 13% of Muslims live in Indonesia, the largest Muslim country, 25% in South Asia, 20% in the Middle East, 2% in Central Asia, 4% in the remaining South East Asian countries, and 15% in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sizable communities are also found in China, Russia, and parts of Europe. With over 1.5 billion followers or over 22% of earth’s population, Islam is the second-largest and one of the fastest-growing religions in the world.

A robust gTLD has the power to bring together Muslims across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. There is not a .COM or .ORG equivalent of .ISLAM—a domain that has universal appeal across a common religion. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) was founded in, andas is headquartered in, Turkey (an Islamic nation that straddles Europe and the Middle East) by Muslims with great devotion to their religion, which manifests itself in both pride and honor. Because of this, and their devotion to creating a quality online space for the Muslim faithful amongst others, AGITSys’ founders have gathered together a highly experienced team with a variety of Internet-based expertise, a daunting but critical task. The team behind AGITSys has taken a leading role in working toward dedicated Muslim domain names for more than 8 years. No entity is better
suited to manage the .ISLAM gTLD, nor more dedicated to providing new online tools and services to facilitate the unification of the .ISLAM community online. The .ISLAM gTLD will increasingly open up the vast resources of the Internet and the interconnectedness it brings to the Muslims community, while stimulating the introduction of more information and resources among Muslims online. The .ISLAM gTLD is designed to accommodate a global community, and AGITSys’ team’s work with ICANN has always looked not just to serving Muslim people but all users of the internet – thus serving Muslims and those interested in the Muslim faith all around the world – whilst simultaneously achieving ICANN’s goal of creating greater competition in the gTLD space.

18B. How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?

The benefits of the .ISLAM gTLD will be manifold, not just to registrants but also to tens of millions of Muslim internet users, as well as many others with an interest in or curiosity regarding Islam. The presence of a Muslim-specific gTLD will increase the volume of online Islamic resources, as the emergence of .ISLAM second-level domains sees a network effect kick in. This network effect will create an additional incentive for the digitization of existing Islamic materials, so as to facilitate their posting online as the demand for such material grows. Consequently, the new .ISLAM gTLD will also increase access to online resources as the tens of millions of people that read Islamic and Islam-related materials are able, for the first time, to find the material they seek within the sites operating under the .ISLAM gTLD. Existing website registrants will be able to extend their presence to that audience with new .ISLAM sites, while new registrants will emerge from those Muslim populations brought together by the .ISLAM gTLD, adding to the value of the Internet in ways not currently possible.

As the global population expands, more people become willing Internet users and seek out second-level domains. The .ISLAM gTLD is flexible, and is thus capable of being used for sites focused on ecommerce, information dissemination, charitable endeavors and many more functions among Muslims. A transformation in competition is anticipated for web sites within .ISLAM, allowing them to depart from conventional methods of attracting new customers in this expanding market. This is because it will encourage competitors, targeting the extensive and diverse collection of global Islamic Internet users. This incentive doesn't currently exist in an online space devoid of the .ISLAM gTLD, where competition amongst the already saturated existing TLDs is stagnant.

In terms of goals in the areas of specialty, service levels, and reputation for the proposed .ISLAM gTLD, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) is committed to offering choice in top level domain extensions among the Islamic community. AGITSys recognizes many new gTLDs will naturally have a relatively narrow appeal and audience. The .ISLAM gTLD is different, as it not only targets a distinct online community, but one that spans the globe. AGITSys is prepared to utilize its home market of Turkey as a leading source of registrants and sites, while incorporating the power of the web to connect with myriad other registrants and Internet users beyond Turkey. Further, we intend to adopt and follow the highest standards in registry operations exceeding service levels and expectations thus producing a consistent reputation.

AGITSys has been at the forefront of the ICANN community effort in working to bring the Global Muslim community together through a dedicated gTLD, as well as bringing Muslims in to the larger online community. No organization has a greater understanding both of the opportunities a .ISLAM gTLD will afford as well as the challenges that its adoption and spread will bring. AGITSys is prepared to ensure the success of .ISLAM, such that it is a shining example of ICANN’s wisdom in granting the gTLD.

The company is committed to bringing top-level domain registration services to registrants. To this end, AGITSys has contracted CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited (“CoCCA”) to provide hosted Registry Services for the .ISLAM gTLD. CoCCA has over nine years experience authoring open source registry software systems and providing TLD registry support services. CoCCA was originally incorporated in Australia in 2003 as CoCCA Registry Services Limited, in January 2009 CoCCA re-located to New Zealand and trades as CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited. CoCCA is a
privately held NZ company.
CoCCA’s clients are managers of county code top level domains (ccTLDs) as of 31 March 2012, 33 national country code top level domains (“ccTLDs”) have selected CoCCA’s SRS technology or services to manage their critical infrastructure. Several other ccTLDs have committed to migration to CoCCA’s “pamoja” EPP Shared Registry System (“SRS”) in 2012 pending the outcome of re-delegations.
CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. CoCCA’s SRS is a mature product that has grown organically over the past decade as new standards have been developed and published. It is doubtful any other Registry Services provider has accumulated CoCCA’s level of experience operating multiple small to medium sized TLDs efficiently and securely.

AGITSys’ team is also well-known in the ICANN community as a selfless champion of the interests of Muslims around the world, including communities tied to the Islamic heritage. We also have a long history of advising the Turkish internet industry. Our reputation is solid, and we have every incentive to maintain that reputation as we roll out the .ISLAM gTLD.

Under the shepherding of AGITSys, the .ISLAM gTLD will increase competition, provide more online differentiation for customers and consumers, while driving digital innovation. The addition of the .ISLAM gTLD will create new competition for names within the domain name space. Not only will the offering of .ISLAM domains create competition within content providers for users of Islamic content, but it is expected that competition will be enhanced among the varying service providers that users require to deploy said content.

As it is rolled out, the .ISLAM gTLD will rapidly develop as the gTLD of choice among Muslims in all countries. The demand for Islamic content from this group isn’t and won’t be satisfied by .COM or .ORG offerings within the current gTLDs and in fact they have hampered collaboration and innovation. The Islamic people demand content that is tailored to their own unique needs and wants, under the umbrella of a dedicated gTLD. As stated in 18(a) above, as Islamic-content sites increasingly seek to differentiate themselves to consumers, and registrants seek to differentiate themselves to acquirers of second-level domains, the power to differentiate will come from innovative approaches to customer service and the creation of a trusted online environment.

It is AGITSys’ mission that competition and differentiation of the .ISLAM gTLD will be coupled with a user experience online that is reliable and predictable. To make this as likely as possible, AGITSys will work both with existing registrars seeking to reach new audiences, as well as new registrars that may emerge from within the global Muslim community, thereby supporting ICANN’s mission to create more capacity in developing countries. AGITSys feels it can foster more competition at the registrar level by offering assistance and encouragement to new registrars in this way. We also believe that this should and will be coupled with a positive experience for Internet users. Indeed, this is critical to the success of the .ISLAM gTLD. By working with the right registrars (who maintain the right, stringent standards for adoption and use by their own customers, AGITSys can reach its goal of having the .ISLAM gTLD become synonymous with a safe and trusted online experience.

As a part of this, since the .ISLAM gTLD is community based and designed to serve those of Muslim faith, as well as to protect its good name, AGITSys intends to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith, or those with a clear interest in serving the Muslim community and faith beneficially. Such a designation is almost impossible to police, because faith is a highly personal thing requiring no proof beyond belief, and to restrict, for example, registrations to those geographically located in predominantly Muslim nations would alienate the myriad Muslims in other nations. Thus, these limitations will mostly be self-imposed, with registrars agreeing themselves that they are of Muslim faith. Equally, AGITSys will not tolerate radical content, nor will it tolerate content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promoting either, and a blacklist will be created in an attempt to pre-empt any such attempts. Once content is registered, the community will be to an extent self-policing, with facilities to report abusive, irrelevant or anti-Muslim registrations available on the Registry website.

Because of its dedication to the Muslim community and the .ISLAM gTLD which is intended to serve it, AGITSys will implement protection measures for registrations to ensure an abuse free environment whilst maintaining choice. This will be accomplished with Registration safeguards, wildcard alerts, name selection policies, all governed by an
Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections via Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy and Uniform Rapid Suspension. More details on these policies can be found in answer to Questions 28 and 29. The privacy offered will be total, within the rules and procedures provided by ICANN. These policies will be transparent and rigorous, modeled after successful policies implemented by currently delegated TLDs and accompanied by vigilant processes and technologies to prevent unauthorized access to information. This is a manifestation of the larger goal of the .ISLAM gTLD, that of a trusted source of safe online transactions, as stipulated in 18(a).

Privacy and security will be key elements of our Acceptable Use Policy (AUP). The AUP will govern how a registrant may use its registered name, with a specific focus on protecting Internet users. AUP language would specifically address privacy by prohibiting a registrant from using a domain for any activity that violates the privacy or publicity rights of another person or entity, or breaches any duty of confidentiality owed to any other person or entity. The AUP also would prohibit spam or other unsolicited bulk email, or computer or network hacking or cracking, as well as the installation of any viruses, worms, bugs, Trojan horses or other code, files or programs designed to, or capable of, disrupting, damaging or limiting the functionality of any software or hardware. We would maintain complete enforcement rights over the use of the domain name. Should a registrant find itself in breach of the AUP, we would reserve the right to revoke, suspend, terminate, cancel or otherwise modify their rights to the domain name.

In terms of community outreach by the .ISLAM gTLD, it is expected that the momentum around .ISLAM will build quickly, given the pent-up demand that has been building for years within the ranks of the Muslim faithful and associated community. AGITSys, as their champion in gTLD discussions, knows full well how popular this service will be.

The growth of the .ISLAM gTLD will be driven by what economists refer to as the network effect. A network effect occurs when a service becomes more popular as more individuals adopt it. A significant portion of the service’s value stems directly from the increased adoption and usage of the service. Historically the network effect is most powerful in tools of interconnection. The telegraph and telephone were technologies that grew exponentially due to the network effect. The Internet itself is an example of that phenomenon, as seen by the rapid upward growth curve of Internet penetration, broadband speeds, and web site creation. ICANN’s data on the growth of .COM is an example of the network effect, and now it is seen in social-media platforms atop the Internet, such as Facebook and Twitter.

As more sites offer information, services, and opportunities for interconnection to the .ISLAM community as a whole, more members of the community will navigate to those sites. Many of those will provide their own content, and their activity there will spark further growth of second-level .ISLAM domains. At some point, Islamic information and service providers currently not offering sites, will see the demand for .ISLAM-related content and will migrate their offerings to .ISLAM sites as well, furthering the offerings to the community and further driving community members to .ISLAM sites. The future benefits of interlinking this diverse and global community are incalculable but immense. Augmenting this, AGITSys is also active in the business community within Turkey and Middle Eastern countries and interconnected across the spectrum of the Muslim community due to its promotional efforts with ICANN and elsewhere. It will leverage that network to spread the word of the .ISLAM gTLD in order to promote adoption. The best steps AGITSys can take to ensure the gTLD’s adoption and growth, however, are to ensure a system encouraging robust, safe and dynamic second-level domain sites. At that point, the word will spread through the network effect.

18C. 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?

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) will endeavor to the utmost in order to minimize the social costs to registrants of a .ISLAM second-level domain, not least because AGITSys has every incentive to encourage the adoption and growth of the .ISLAM domain. AGITSys has chosen to adopt CoCCA’s tested acceptable use based policy matrix, recommendations for minimizing harm in TLDs, and subject the TLD to the CoCCA Complaint
The CoCCA Best practice policy matrix has been developed over a decade and has currently been adopted by 16 TLDs. It was developed for (and by) ccTLDs managers that desired to operate an efficient standards–based SRS system complemented by a policy environment that addressed a registrants use of a string as well as the more traditional gTLD emphasis rights to string.

A key element of CoCCA’s policy matrix is that it provides for registry-level suspensions where there is evidence of AUP violations. The TLD will join other TLDs that utilize the CoCCA’s single-desk CRS. The CRS provides a framework for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to swiftly address concerns regarding the use of domains, and the COCCA network. The AUP can be used to address concerns regarding a domain or any other resource record that appears in the zone.

The CRS procedure provides an effective alternative to the court system while allowing for Complaints against domains to be handled in a way treats each complaint in a fair and equal manor and allows for all affected parties to present evidence and arguments in a constructive forum.

AGITSys is also currently developing procedures for competition resolution regarding multiple registrations for the same second-level domain in addition to offering the required Sunrise offerings through general availability. AGITSys will model these procedures after the techniques and approaches that have succeeded best to date. The history of .COM will be of interest here, because .ISLAM should grow quickly and face demand as high among the Muslim community as .COM has in the English-language online community.

In terms of cost, benefits, and incentives offered to registrants from the Islamic community, AGITSys will offer fair and competitive pricing campaigns for tens of millions of people, introducing them to the wonders of the Internet and the Muslim faith therein. Competitive pricing and/or discounts will be used and adjusted accordingly to ensure the right incentive matches the phase of operation and business goals. AGITSys’ business plan increases our confidence in offerings that will encourage growing adoption of the .ISLAM gTLD.

Each year, AGITSys will review its financial goals versus actual performance of registry operations. Output from the analysis will include the consideration of pricing versus demand for registrations. As with any for-profit entity, adequate cash flow and predictable revenue streams are essential to successful operations. As such, AGITSys may adjust pricing of domain registrations to align with evolving business goals. Adjustments can include not only price increases, but perhaps price decreases, but only current market analysis will dictate change. Therefore, AGITSys will document in the Registrant Agreement domain price change procedures and how they can be expect to learn about changes through our communications platform. In the end, serving the Islamic community through Internet technologies remains our first priority.

19. Is the application for a community-based TLD?

Yes

20A. 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.

Islam is the monotheistic religion articulated by the Qur’an (a text considered by its adherents to be the verbatim
Islam is a verbal noun originating from the triliteral root s-l-m which forms a large class of words mostly relating to concepts of wholeness, completion and bonding/joining. In a religious context it means “voluntary submission to God”.

Muslim, the word for an adherent of Islam, is the active participle of the same verb of which Islām is the infinitive. Believers demonstrate submission to God by serving God and following his commands, and rejecting polytheism. The word sometimes has distinct connotations in its various occurrences in the Qur’an. In some verses (ayat), there is stress on the quality of Islam as an internal conviction: “Whomsoever God desires to guide, He expands his breast to Islam.” Other verses connect islām and din (usually translated as “religion”): “Today, I have perfected your religion (din) for you; I have completed My blessing upon you; I have approved Islam for your religion.” Still others describe Islam as an action of returning to God—more than just a verbal affirmation of faith. Another technical meaning in Islamic thought is as one part of a triad of islām, imān (faith), and ihsān (excellence) where it represents acts of service (‘ibādah) and Islamic law (sharia). Regardless of personal interpretation of the word, one thread remains continually true; Islam is a word that commands an unparalleled sense of devotion—and level of affinity—amongst Muslims. It denotes not only a religion, but an enormously proud community—and members within that community strongly associate who they are with word Islam.

A Muslim, also spelled Moslem, is an adherent of Islam. Muslims believe that God is eternal, transcendent, absolutely one (the doctrine of tawhid, or strict or simple monotheism), and incomparable; that he is self-sustaining, who begets not nor was begotten. Muslim beliefs regarding God are summed up in chapter 112 of the Qur’an, al-Ikhlas, “the chapter of purity”. Muslims also believe that Islam is the complete and universal version of a primordial faith that was revealed at many times and places before, including through the prophets Abraham, Moses and Jesus. Muslims maintain that previous messages and revelations have been partially changed or corrupted over time, but consider the Qur’an to be both unaltered and the final revelation from God—his Final Testament.

Most Muslims will accept anyone who has publicly pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God”, as a Muslim. Their basic religious practices are enumerated in the Five Pillars of Islam, which are basic concepts and obligatory acts of worship, and following Islamic law, which touches on virtually every aspect of life and society, providing guidance on multifarious topics from banking and welfare, to warfare and the environment. These include daily prayers (salat), fasting during Ramadan (sawm), almsgiving (zakat), and the pilgrimage to Mecca (hajj) at least once in a lifetime.

Muslims believe that God is one and incomparable and the purpose of their existence is to love and serve God. Muslims also believe that Islam is the complete and universal version of a primordial faith that was revealed at many times and places before, including through Abraham, Moses and Jesus, whom they consider prophets.

A comprehensive demographic study undertaken in 2009, which examined 232 countries and territories, reported that 23% of the global population, or 1.57 billion people at that time, considered themselves to be Muslims. This number is inevitably larger today. Of those, it is estimated over 75–90% belong to the Sunni sect, 10–20% to the Shia sect, with a small minority belonging to other sects. According to the study, there are approximately 50 countries worldwide where the majority of citizens are Muslim. It also found that Arabs account for around 20% of all Muslims worldwide. Between 1900 and 1970 the global Muslim community grew from 200 million to 551 million; between 1970 and 2009 Muslim population increased more than threefold, to 1.57 billion.

The study established that the majority of Muslims live in Asia and Africa. Approximately 62% of the world’s Muslims live in Asia, with over 683 million adherents in Indonesia, Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh. In the Middle East, non-Arab countries such as Turkey and Iran are the largest Muslim-majority countries; in Africa, Egypt and Nigeria have the most populous Muslim communities. About 13% of Muslims live in Indonesia, the largest Muslim country, 25% in South Asia, 20% in the Middle East, 2% in Central Asia, 4% in the remaining South East Asian countries, and 15% in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sizable communities are also found in Russia and parts of Europe.

Most estimates indicate that the People’s Republic of China has approximately 20 to 30 million Muslims (1.5% to 2% of
the population). However, data provided by the San Diego State University’s International Population Center to U.S. News & World Report suggests that China has 65.3 million Muslims. Islam is the second largest religion after Christianity in many European countries, and is slowly catching up to that status in the Americas, with reportedly somewhere between 2,454,000 (according to Pew Forum) and approximately 7 million Muslims, according to the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), in the United States. The .ISLAM gTLD will allow these disparate but related peoples--connected through their religion, beliefs and strong pride in being a Muslim--to unite online as a full and robust community, enjoying the connection and exchange of information empowered by faith, and community in beliefs.

20B. Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified in 20(a).

AGITSYS is founded, owned and managed by Muslim people. AGITSys utilizes the technical expertise of highly-qualified Muslims, and it is incorporated in Turkey, a Muslim-majority country where 98% of the population follows Islam.

AGITSys’ team is entirely comprised of Middle Eastern citizens, a region where Islam is the major religion, and the heart of Islam. Additionally, Turkey’s geographical and political location aids enormously in this endeavor, as it literally and figuratively sits in-between the East and West. The .ISLAM gTLD is designed to accommodate a global community, and AGITSys’ team’s work with ICANN has always looked toward serving Muslims globally. A location sitting between the East and West facilitates this process.

• Relations to the community and its constituent parts/groups.

As stated above, AGITSYS and its constituent team members hail from the heart of the Muslim community, both in terms of geography and the nationality of the team members. Their links to the community therein are thus irrefutably strong, as they themselves are passionate members of it.

AGITSys therefore not only has sufficient technical knowledge and expertise to run the .ISLAM gTLD, but is also supported by important well-known figures within the Islamic world. Going forward, the trust and support from the Muslim community this will ensure will be fundamental to the successful operation of a thriving community under the .ISLAM gTLD.

• Accountability mechanisms of applicant to the community.

AGITSYS will oversee the formation of a .ISLAM Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) populated by members of the Islamic community. AGITSYS intends that the PAC be representative of the entire broad spectrum of the Muslim community. It therefore intends to engage religious figures, academics, public figures and a broad range of community leaders and other interested parties as a part of this committee. Anyone with a desire to do so will be able to apply to become a member of the PAC, and AGITSYS will not discriminate against any applicants; if their application is strong then the simplest farmer has as much chance of joining the board as a distinguished academic. The PAC would serve as a conduit for the community to weigh in on any policy matters that impact the operation of the gTLD. These can range from abuse prevention and mitigation to registration policies and the maintenance and structure of the .ISLAM community. The PAC will also be critical for our continued outreach across the community as we spread the word about the .ISLAM gTLD. It will serve as a key channel of communication with, and anchor to, the community which this effort hopes to serve. As discussed later in this response, the PAC will be responsible for developing a list of reserved names
that will ensure that any domains registered in this TLD do not infringe upon or in any other way impugn key words to the community.

20C. Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

• Intended registrants in the TLD.

The .Islam gTLD is intended for Muslim faithful who wish to promote, participate or learn about Islam and its various facets, its affect on the daily life of the people around the world, its history, its law and jurisprudence and the rich and diverse culture that surrounds it. Thus, any well-intentioned Muslim who wants to supply such content, or do business based around it, will be able to operate a domain under the .ISLAM gTLD.

• Intended end-users of the TLD.

For a fifth of the world’s population, Islam is both a religion and a complete way of life. Muslims follow a religion of peace, mercy, and forgiveness - and the majority have nothing to do with the extremely grave events which have come to be associated with their faith. Every Muslim, and indeed a great many non-Muslims, in the world can benefit from .ISLAM websites and the wealth of information and services that it is anticipated will offered by them. The diversity of the .ISLAM gTLD’s offering would be wide enough to cover almost all audiences and their Islam-related needs, considering that all .ISLAM websites will be promoting Islam in some form.

Within all of these populations, the specific intended end users of the .ISLAM gTLD are manifold, and include:

People with ties to Islamic heritage: This includes a significant percentage of both the population of Muslim countries and also with other nations.
Individual Muslims: As demonstrated above, this includes hundreds of millions of individuals around the world.
Students: Those learning about different aspects of Islam, its concepts, its laws, its culture and heritage and its many other facets would benefit from increased resources online that would help them to learn and develop.
Islamic businesses: as in every community, Muslims undertake a great deal of business both within their community and also with external groups. The ability to link their business to the word Islam will therefore be of significant importance to Muslim businesses, both to denote a Muslim-based business and also as a source of pride in being known as such. Indeed, the word Islam is already exceptionally popular within online business – and the word alone yields more than 500 million hits when searched.
All sects: As described above, the main two sects of the Muslim community are Sunnis and Shias – both of whom will be welcome to operate under the .ISLAM gTLD, alongside all other Muslim sects.

It is hoped that not only will these intended users derive individual benefit from the existence of a .ISLAM community, but that they will also contribute in turn. This should create a group benefit, which will in turn feed back in to individual benefits – establishing a beneficial cycle.

• Related activities the applicant has carried out or intends to carry out in service of this purpose.

Anticipating the diversification of TLDs now being realized, and the consequent introduction of an Islamic-specific
online space, AGITSys has been working with a wide variety of related parties for several years in preparation, and will continue to do so going forward. A key element for the success of the .ISLAM gTLD is a strong and interactive community, which Muslims around the world are proud to associate with and keen to contribute to. To ensure this, AGITSys will sponsor community outreach and marketing, in order to raise awareness of the forthcoming possibilities. These possibilities are also highly appealing for Islamic businesses, and as such AGITSys will engage in dialogue with those businesses, and industry chiefs, regarding their ideas for how the .ISLAM gTLD will take shape, and what they intend to subsequently give back to it.

Quality content will also be fundamental to a thriving .ISLAM community, especially because AGITSys is committed to ensuring that .ISLAM is populated by quality second-level domain offerings. With this in mind, AGITSys will be talking with those most likely to contribute quality content, from news and media agencies to academics and libraries (who will be able to digitize Islamic materials and then distribute them online comprehensively for the first time) about how they can and will contribute, and what AGITSys can do to facilitate this process.

Ultimately, however, religion will always be the most important element for a successful .ISLAM community online. The entire gTLD concept is designed as a place of online respect; almost worship, for those of Islamic faith. As such, the involvement, blessing and feedback of the Islamic religious community is fundamentally important. Aware of this, AGITSys has been in prolonged and continued contact with important religious figures – asking them what they want to see and how they would like to see it done, whilst also encouraging them to spread the word and prepare themselves. This should mean that when the .ISLAM gTLD comes online, there will be a large swathe of information posted almost immediately – therefore instantly creating a rewarding user experience.

- Explanation of how the purpose is of a lasting nature.

The community that will be served by .ISLAM--growing as it has out of the Muslims community--has thrived and grown for more than a millennium. Remarkably, it has done so largely without the level of connection online found within Western cultures. This existing community interconnection speaks to the cultural staying power of the Islamic community and the many ways it enriches world culture.

With the adoption of a .ISLAM community, this robust group will be further empowered to interconnect and grow, allowing it to take its equal place on the Internet stage. The community thrives now, but will reach new heights through the .ISLAM gTLD.

The growth of the .ISLAM gTLD will be driven by what economists refer to as the network effect. A network effect occurs when a service becomes more popular as more individuals adopt it. A significant portion of the service’s value stems directly from the increased adoption and usage of the service. Historically the network effect is most powerful in tools of interconnection. The telegraph and telephone were technologies that grew exponentially due to the network effect. The Internet itself is an example of that phenomenon, as seen by the rapid upward growth curve of Internet penetration, broadband speeds, and web site creation. ICANN’s data on the growth of .COM is an example of the network effect, and now it is seen in social-media platforms atop the Internet, such as Facebook and Twitter.

As more sites offer information, services, and opportunities for interconnection to the .ISLAM community as a whole, more members of the community will navigate to those sites. Many of those will provide their own content, and their activity there will spark further growth of second-level .ISLAM domains. At some point, information and service providers currently not offering sites will see the demand for .ISLAM-related content and will migrate their offerings to .ISLAM sites as well, furthering the offerings to the community and further driving community members to .ISLAM sites. The future benefits of interlinking this diverse and global community are incalculable but immense.
20D. Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a).

• relationship to the established name, if any, of the community.

Islam is the name of the religion of Muslim community. The .ISLAM community (synonymous with the Muslim community) is well known globally, and thus it is not expected that AGITSys will have to undertake any awareness campaigns as to the nature of the community. Every Muslim around the world, notwithstanding the sect they belong to or their nationality, knows Islam as their religion, and tries to respect ISLAM’s rules. There will be instant understanding amongst anyone in the Muslim community as to the meaning of .ISLAM, and the fact that any second-level domain with the .ISLAM gTLD will be a site providing them with information and access critical to them as a community member. Equally, Islam as a culture religion is extremely recognizable to members of other cultures and religions – meaning broader awareness of the significance of the .ISLAM gTLD beyond the Muslim community will be high.

• relationship to the identification of community members.

As stated above, community members will feel an affinity and self-identification with the .ISLAM TLD. As adoption of .ISLAM grows, use of domains using this community gTLD will grow exponentially, helping to cement the obvious connection between the string and the community. For the purpose of limiting registrants within the gTLD to Muslims, a key identifier for community members is that they must have publicly pronounced the Shahadah, as described in section A above and further elaborated below.

• any connotations the string may have beyond the community.

AGITSYS knows of no other connotations the .ISLAM string might have outside of this community.

20E. 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.

• Eligibility: who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined.

As mentioned above, the primary goal of the .ISLAM gTLD is the protection and promulgation of the Islamic culture, beliefs, heritage, laws and rules. To this end, In order to register a .ISLAM Domain Name, you declare that you are part of the Islamic Religious and Cultural Community. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God.” Our policies may permit registrations within .ISLAM gTLD from the following groups: Universities, schools, research institutions and other academic entities performing Islamic academic activities or which teach-promote aspects of Islamic culture. Public or private entities whose aim is promoting different aspects of Islam. Publishing companies that publish works about Islamic culture, in Islamic script or relating to the Islam.
Individuals, groups, businesses, organizations, entities or initiatives, however constituted, carrying online communications specifically among Muslims
Individuals, groups, businesses, organizations, entities or initiatives affirming their belonging to the Muslim Community
Registrations within the .ISLAM gTLD are intended for members of the Muslim community who wish to promote, participate or learn about ISLAM and its many facets, its affect on the daily life of the people around the word, its history, Law and jurisprudence and its rich and diverse culture.
As part of the renewal of the domain name, each registrant must certify their compliance with the Acceptable Use Policy as well as pronounce the Shahadah via electronic means.

• Name selection: what types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD.

AGITSys will follow ICANN guidelines regarding potential restrictions of second-level domains. The names selected to be registered under .ISLAM gTLD must not present any conflict with the cultural, traditional and historical values of the Muslim community. This restriction will be controlled by creating a ‘black list’ of prohibited names managed by the .ISLAM Policy Advisory Committee described above.

• Content/Use: what restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name.

AGITSys will have an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and registration policies that will govern how a registrant may use its registered name. We will ask all members to honor Islamic Culture, Heritage and rules. We will also require registrants to ensure that websites hosted within the .ISLAM gTLD do not violate the sensitivities of the Muslim Community. These requirements will be enforced through the AUP and other contracts registrants must sign with their registrars prior to the registration of a domain name.
Specifically, use being deemed “Acceptable” begins with certifications in the registration and renewal process. Certification constitutes a series of acknowledgements that the Registrant is either of Muslim faith, or has a clear interest in ameliorating the community. Acceptable Use Certification contains the following:
1. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God.”
2. Registrants must accept and abide by the following:
a. No denegation of The Prophet Mohammad will be propagated within any site content of the .ISLAM gTLD
b. Messaging about Islam or the Quran will not criticize the Muslim faith
c. Registrants and Users will refrain from activities that run contrary to Islamic principles
d. Not to use the .ISLAM gTLD or site content as a communications and coordination vehicle of radical or terrorist activities
e. Registrants will not establish third level DNS management of second level .ISLAM domains.

• 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?

As part of the AUP and registration polices, AGITSys will have complete enforcement rights over registrants’ use of .ISLAM domain names. AGITSys will randomly audit domain names registered in the .ISLAM gTLD to ensure compliance with all eligibility and use criteria. If a violation is discovered, an investigation will begin immediately to rectify said violation. Penalties for violation range from suspension of a domain, to removal of the domain name from the TLD and blacklisting of the registrant, preventing them from being able to register any other names in the .ISLAM TLD. From time to time the .ISLAM PAC may need to be engaged to consult on potential enforcement activities.
20F. 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.

21A. Is the application for a geographic name?

No

22. 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.

Protection of Geographic Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has chosen CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited (CoCCA) as their registry services provider. CoCCA has over 12 years of experience in authoring registry software and providing registry support services. With 35 national TLDs relying on CoCCA’s technology to manage critical infrastructure, the CoCCA EPP Shared Registry System (SRS) is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. In many respects new niche market gTLDs are predicted to more closely resemble existing ccTLD name spaces than the current gTLD ones. CoCCA’s commercial model and technology enables TLD Sponsoring Organizations to focus on operating the front end portion of the registry including sales, marketing and community relations while leaving the operational aspects to the proven team at CoCCA.

In addition to technology CoCCA has a considered and tested set of leading – practice policies designed to address security, stability, rights protection, abuse mitigation, privacy and other issues, CoCCA is a trusted partner for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to operate the .islam in a manner that is fully compliant with all ICANN rules and regulations.

CoCCA, on behalf of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., intends to implement the following measures to protect geographical names at the second and at all other levels within the TLD:

Reservation Measures for Geographical Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adhere to Specification 5 of the proposed Registry Agreement, “Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries” section 5 titled “Country and Territory Names.” The geographic names listed in the following internationally approved documents will be reserved at the second level within the TLD and at all other levels where registrations occur:

(1.i.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

(1.i.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

Potential Release of Geographical Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is committed to working with governments and other stakeholders that may have a concern regarding the registration of names with national or geographic significance at the second level. If Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. decides to release reserved geographical names, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will abide by the process outlined in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement by seeking agreement from the applicable government(s). Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. understands that any release of the geographical names may be subject to Governmental Advisory Committee review and approval by ICANN.

Review, Audit, and Updates to Policies
Policy management is dynamic in nature requiring continual management. The Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. in conjunction with CoCCA’s assistance will be engaged in policy development efforts in general and with respect to protections of geographical domain names. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will review and consider suggestions or concerns from government, public authorities or IGO’s regarding this policy. And as with all required policies, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will perform openly and transparently regarding the process or the creation of new policy be required. Further, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s internal process continually and manages its reserve lists as one part of the abuse prevention mechanisms described in greater detail within question 28, “Abuse Prevention and Mitigation.”

23. 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:

A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers.
B. Dissemination of TLD zone files.
C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois service).
D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered.
E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC). The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Additional proposed registry services that are unique to the registry must also be described.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has contracted CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited ("CoCCA") to provide hosted Registry Services for the .isla TLD. The .isla TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing production Shared Registry System (“SRS”). CoCCA will ensure redundant geographically diverse DNS resolution through propagation of the .isla zones on the Internet Software Consortium (“ISC”), Packet Clearing House (“PCH”) anycast networks - and on CoCCA unicast servers.

CoCCA authors the internet’s most widely used SRS registry system (which has been branded “pamoja” for gTLD name spaces). ISC authors BIND and pioneered anycast technology, PCH has one of the internet’s largest and longest running anycast networks. DNSSEC key storage and and signature will take place on the PCH DNSSEC platform, a platform
developed for ccTLD’s that mirrors the security and processes used by ICANN to secure the root.

The .islam TLD SRS data will be escrowed with both NCC Group and CoCCA subsidiary CoCCA Data Escrow Services (NZ) Limited.

23.1 About CoCCA

CoCCA has over nine years experience authoring open source registry software systems and providing TLD registry support services. CoCCA was originally incorporated in Australia in 2003 as CoCCA Registry Services Limited, in January 2009 CoCCA re-located to New Zealand and trades as CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited. CoCCA is a privately held NZ company.

CoCCA’s existing clients are governments and other managers of county code top level domains (ccTLDs). As of 31 March 2012, 33 national ccTLDs have selected CoCCA’s SRS technology and/or services to help them manage their critical infrastructure. Several additional ccTLDs have committed to migrate to CoCCA’s “pamoja” SRS in 2012 (pending the outcome of re-delegations). As many as 40 ccTLDs are thought to be using the pamoja SRS application, while CoCCA has formal relationships and support contracts with 33 TLDs, the exact number of users is hard to determine as the pamoja software is freely available for download from the internet. CoCCA’s offers ccTLDs a perpetual royalty-free license to use and deploy the SRS software.

CoCCA’s commercial model is based on delivering significant economies of scale to TLD managers, CoCCA’s dominant market position in the ccTLD ecosystem - where the TLD string is generally considered critical infrastructure, ensures CoCCA’s commercial viability and ongoing funding of R&D regardless of the success of a particular gTLD string (or group of gTLD strings) that select CoCCA as the Registry Services provider. CoCCA’s technology is mature, field tested and their commercial model is solid and not dependent on new gTLD’s.

The pamoja SRS can be used several ways, the application can be downloaded and installed locally by a TLD Sponsoring Organization (”SO”), or the SO can contract CoCCA to host either the primary or failover SRS at the CoCCA Network Operations Centre (”NOC”).

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is a freely available gTLD-compliant TLD database application based on the ”CoCCA Tools” open source ccTLD EPP registry system. The SRS licensing simplifies failover and transition planning as the source, data, and daily virtual machine images are to be placed into escrow enabling them to be migrated or re-deployed by a different entity without any SRS licensing issues. CoCCA’s SRS is a ‘shrink-wrapped” application that can be installed on a single server in minutes or deployed in a High Availability (HA) configuration.

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. CoCCA’s SRS is a mature product that has grown organically over the past decade as new standards have been developed and published. It is doubtful any other Registry Services provider has accumulated CoCCA’s level of experience operating multiple small to medium sized TLDs efficiently and securely.

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is currently used to run three (3) Arabic (IDN) TLDs and was selected by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority in Egypt to launch the Internet’s first IDN TLD (.masr) in 2010. The flexible package supports ASCII and IDN - including variants and folding where required.

23.2 Current pamoja SRS deployments


<p>| .af | Afghanistan | Ministry of Communications and IT | [P] [F] [E] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Centre National de l’Informatique</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Botswana Telecoms Authority</td>
<td>[S] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon Telecommunications (CAMTEL)</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Is.</td>
<td>Christmas Island Internet Administration Limited</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>NIC.EC (NICEC) S.A.</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian Universities Network (EUN)</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt IDN</td>
<td>National Telecommunication Regulatory Authority</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>Island Networks Ltd.</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>TELE Greenland A-S</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Georgia</td>
<td>Government of South Georgia</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>University of Guyana</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Consortium FDS-RDDH</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Red de Desarrollo Sostenible Honduras*</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Communications Media Commission*</td>
<td>[S] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>Island Networks (Jersey) Ltd.</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Ministry of Communications</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya Network Information Center (KeNIC)</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>NIC-MG (Network Information Center Madagascar)</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Internet Direct Ltd</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>MNI Networks Ltd</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Centro de Informatica de Universidade</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Namibian Network Information Center</td>
<td>[F] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria Internet Registration Association</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Is.</td>
<td>Norfolk Island Data Services</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Red Cientifica Peruana</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Is.</td>
<td>Solomon Telekom Company Limited</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>National Agency for Network Services</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria IDN</td>
<td>National Agency for Network Services</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Ministry of Infrastructure</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Ministry Of Telecommunications</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine IDN</td>
<td>Ministry Of Telecommunications</td>
<td>[S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>ZAMNET Communication Systems Ltd.</td>
<td>[F] [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Currently in the process of migrating away from Neustar (.iq) and Afflias (.hn)

23.3 CoCCA’s Hosted SRS
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has confirmed with CoCCA their production experience and the availability of the Registry Services described briefly in sections 23.4-23.18 below - and in greater detail in the responses to questions 24-43. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and CoCCA understand elements of ICANN’s TLD requirements will most likely be modified in the future. CoCCA’s Registry Services will comply with future ICANN requirements or mandates.

23.4 Receipt of Data via the SRS EPP interface
Data from Registrars concerning the insertion and maintenance of records in the SRS may be processed either via the CoCCA EPP interface (XML over SSL on port 700) or manually via CoCCA’s port 443 SSL web interface. CoCCA was an early adopter of the EPP standard and has operated an EPP based SRS for almost seven years.
The .islam TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing production SRS, which currently has 203 registrars connected. CoCCA’s SRS has a single EPP interface for all hosted TLDs allowing registrars to share the same contact and host objects across multiple TLDs. The .islam TLD will only be made accessible to ICANN accredited registrars, many of which are currently connected to CoCCA for ccTLDs and using the EPP and GUI interface that the .islam TLD will be accessed via when launched.

CoCCA’s pamoja EPP interface currently complies the IETF RFC’s required by ICANN (5730-5734 and 3735) and is explained in more detail in the response to Question 25.

23.5 Receipt of Data via the SRS Graphical User Interface (“GUI”)
Registrars may insert and manage domain, contact and host records as well as the SRS accounting functions via a port 443 GUI. Registrars do not have to use the EPP interface on port 700. Records managed via the GUI connect to the SRS EPP engine on port 700 via background processes; this ensures rigorous conformity with the RFC’s and consistency in auditing and maintenance of historical records.

23.6 Registrar Data Restrictions (Reserved Names)
Restrictions on what domains may be inserted and maintained by registrars is to be controlled by configuration of java regular expressions. In order to comply with the requirements set out in Specification 5 and any Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. policy, the .islam TLD will use three of pamoja’s features as described below.

23.6.1 Prohibited Patterns. Domains that match patterns will be rejected with an EPP 2306 - Parameter Value Policy error, letting the registrar know that these domain names do not fit in with the registry policy for this zone.

23.6.2 Syntax Patterns. Certain strings, such as all-numeric names or single character names may be restricted. An EPP 2005 error - “Parameter Value Syntax error” will be returned to the EPP client, indicating that the name is invalid.

23.6.3 Approval Patterns. Names that match these patterns will not be rejected, but will be registered pending approval. Until they are approved, the name will not appear in the .islam zone files, and will not be able to be transferred, renewed or modified in any way by the registrar.

23.6.4 Both ASCII and non-ASCII contact details can stored and displayed via web-based WHOIS and command line WHOIS.

23.7 SRS GUI, Role-Based Access
The pamoja SRS GUI has numerous role-based logins described below. Several of these have been recently developed by CoCCA in response to ICANN’s proposed gTLD requirements and are currently being used numerous ccTLD production environments.

Administrative Roles
* SRS Systems Administrator - Able to administer and configure the entire SRS system
* CERT / Law Enforcement - Able to view and query the SRS, but not alter records.
* TLD Administrator - Able to administer a TLD or group of TLDs
* TLD Viewer - Able to view but not alter records for a TLD or group of TLDs
* Zone Administrator - Able to administer a Stub Zone, or group of Stub Zones
* Zone Viewer - Able to view but not alter a Stub Zone, or group of Stub Zones
* Customer Service - Can perform tasks on behalf of a number of registrars
* Name Approver - Can approve names matching the Zone Approval Patterns
* CHIP Approver - Can approve domains registered with CHIP codes or other Trademarks.

Registrar Roles

* Registrar Master Account - Able to perform all registrar functions and create subordinate logins
* Registrar Technical - Able to modify domain details
* Registrar Helpdesk - Able to view domains and make various minor changes
* Registrar Finance - Able to view domains financial transactions and also edit financial data
* Registrar Finance - (Read Only) Same as above but view only.

Other Access Roles

* Premium WHOIS - Able to perform various queries in a SRS GUI and extract and save data to a CSV, also able to connect via the SRS EPP API for read-only query.
* Zone File Only - Able to login and request Zone Files

23.8 Zone File Dissemination / Resolution

The .islam will be resolved by propagation of zone file data periodically extracted from the SRS, sent to PCH DNSSEC signing servers for signature, returned to CoCCA and then distributed by CoCCA’s hidden master server to two redundant and independent anycast networks operated by Internet Software Consortium (“ISC” | http://isc.org) and Packet Clearing House (“PCH” | http://pch.net) - as well as two (2) public unicast TLD servers operated by CoCCA.

The .islam will be resolved by a minimum of 80 geographically distributed resolvers, all of which run ISC’s BIND and are configured such that they comply with relevant RFC’s including 1034,1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3266, 3596, 3597, 3901, 4343 and 4472.

The PCH and ISC name servers employ IP-anycast technology for scalable geographic redundancy, strong defense from Denial of Service attacks, high quality of service, and give excellent (fast ) responses to geographically diverse Internet users. DNSSEC and IPv6 are already fully integrated into the PCH and ISC networks.

Registrars will able to continuously inspect the availability and status of each TLD server instance via the SRS GUI and other CoCCA WEB Sites. Should a TLD server be unreachable registrars are to be automatically notified (via email) and EPP polling messages. More detailed information is available in the responses to Questions 24-43.

23.9 Dissemination of Domain Related Information

The SRS public WHOIS server will answer for the .islam TLD on port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912 and the requirements set out Specification Four (4), 1.1-1.7 and Specification Ten (10), Section 4.

The CoCCA SRS features a public port 443, web-based RDDS interface that enables internet users to query and extract information which is at a minimum identical to that which is provided via the port 43 server but using technology that may be more convenient or accessible to many internet users than a port 43 command line query.

The CoCCA SRS also allows any Internet user (or any user with a login to the SRS) to order a complete Historical
Abstract delivered in an easy to understand pdf format.

Individuals may optionally subscribe to CoCCA’s Premium WHOIS service, which provides them with:

* secure access to the SRS (via both a web-based port 443 GUI and read only EPP on port 700).
* the ability to perform a variety of boolean queries online in real-time and save the output to a CSV
* the ability to create “interest lists” using java regular expressions where they receive EPP polling messages and emails if a domain is registered that contains a string of interest to them.

Established CERT’s and law enforcement agencies may request, and will generally be granted, read only GUI and EPP access to the CoCCA SRS free of charge. Currently this access is granted to the Australian Government CERT, who under an MOU may share information with other CERT’s and national and international law enforcement agencies.

23.10 DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC)

CoCCA’s SRS DNSSEC implementation allows registrars to provision public key material via EPP and the GUI. Under an agreement between CoCCA and PCH, .islam TLD Keys are to be stored offline and signed using PCH’s DNSSEC platform that replicates the security process, mechanisms and standards employed by ICANN in securing the ROOT of the DNS.

The CoCCA-PCH key storage implementation deviates from the ICANN model only by diversifying the locations of the secure sites such that two (2) of the three (3) sites are outside the United States. The Singapore facility is hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA). The Swiss facility is hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network. The U.S. facility is hosted by PCH Equinix in San Jose.

The CoCCA SRS DNSSEC implementation complies with RFC’s 4033, 4034, 4035, 5910, 4509, 4641 and 5155. Additional information on the DNSSEC implementation is available in the response to question 43.

23.11 Escrow Deposits

CoCCA’s Registry Services include deposit of escrow data in the format and following the protocols set out in Specification Two. CoCCA currently deposits ccTLD data daily (in both the native CoCCA format and the draft arias-noguchi format) with both NCC group and CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ) Limited. CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ) Limited is a subsidiary and was established in 2009 to provide Failover Registry and escrow services to users of the CoCCA SRS who run the software locally on their own infrastructure.

As part of CoCCA’s Registry Services and to ensure continuity of operations, CoCCA deposits all updates to the pamoja SRS source code with NCC, and daily VMware images of the production SRS with CoCCA Data Escrow Services (NZ) Limited. These same practices will be adopted for the .islam TLD when launched.

.islam SRS data will be deposited with NCC Group, CoCCA Data Escrow and ICANN. Additional information on Escrow is available the response to question 38.

23.12 Document Management

CoCCA’s Registry Services include maintenance of documents related to intellectual property rights, complaints, identification of contacts, court orders etc. These documents are maintained in the SRS and become part of a domain’s (or contacts) permanent history.
23.13 Support for Various Zone States

CoCCA’s Registry Services support Sunrise, Rolling Sunrise, Land-rush and Open Registrations for a given zone. Each “State” can be configured to match common policy options.

23.14 Accounting

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s includes a variety of standardized and add-hoc reports accessible to TLD administrators via the GUI. Standardized reports include one that complies with the requirements set out in Specification Three “Format and Content for Registry Operator Monthly Reporting”.

23.15 Audit Trail

All SRS activity is logged and permanently archived, it can be easily retrieved via the GUI for law enforcement or complaint resolution. A “time-machine” feature allows a user with appropriate rights to view the domain information as it existed on any given date and time. Information is never purged from the SRS, information on deleted domains, hosts, contacts can be easily extracted.

23.16 Monitoring

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include statistics on and real-time monitoring of the primary NOC, CoCCA’s DNS Servers, Escrow NOC (NZ) and failover NOC in Palo Alto California. Additional information is available in the answers to questions 24-42. Monitoring of the ISC and PCH anycast networks is done internally by those entities, with statistics and notices made available to CoCCA in near-real time. Where applicable and relevant monitoring information is made available to registrars by CoCCA via the SRS.

23.17 Maintenance of Failover Facilities

CoCCA Registry Services include maintenance of their geographically dispersed Escrow and Failover SRS facilities (Auckland and Palo Alto, a third is planned for Paris in early 2013).

23.18 Complaint Resolution Service (CRS)

CoCCA’s Registry Services include operating a “single desk” CRS to help resolve complaints, trigger Critical Issue Suspensions (“CIS”) and enforce a Uniform Rapid Suspension (“URS”) request. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will bind all registrants in the .islam to the CoCCA CRS, Acceptable Use Policy and Privacy and RDDS Policy via the .islam Registrant Agreement (“RA”). CoCCA’s front-line CRS services are a “role” performed by CoCCA’s 24/7/365 NOC Support.

23.19 Registrar Support

CoCCA Registry Services provides registrars with 24/7/365 support via email and their virtual manned Network Operations Center (NOC). The CoCCA NOC Support has staff Auckland, Sydney, Jonestown (Guyana) and Paris for around the clock coverage. CoCCA NOC Support all have access to the same cloud hosted monitoring and customer service applications as well as the SRS.

23.20 Security and Stability Audit

The pamoja SRS application is used to mange critical TLD infrastructure, each release is tested prior to release or...
deployment by CoCCA developers, developers and systems administrators at registries that deploy the application locally. Each major release is tested and audited by Yonita (http://yonita.com/).

CoCCA constantly reviews its SRS software and sites to ensure they meet or exceed best practices in the industry, regular external audits of the security policy and CoCCA NOC are planned commencing 2013. The CoCCA NOC and failover facilities will be independently tested twice a year to ensure compliance with the CoCCA security policy, where applicable recommendations included in a security audit will be swiftly implemented.

23.21 Operational Testing and Evaluation (OT&E) Environment

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include the operation of an OT&E SRS that enables registrars to evaluate new versions and features of the SRS software before they are deployed by CoCCA in production. Any ICANN accredited registrar will be granted access to OT&E. Registrars not currently connected to the CoCCA SRS will be required by CoCCA to demonstrate competency in EPP and the .islam policies before being granted EPP or GUI access to CoCCA’s production SRS.

23.22 Authorization Key Retrieval

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include automated public retrieval of domain AuthCodes by the administrative contact via a port 443 web page. The Authorization Key facilitates expedited transfers from one registrar to another.

23.23 Public Drop - List

CoCCA’s Registry Services include publication of drop-lists of domains that are pending purge via a port 443 web page and email reports to registrars.

23.24 Wildcard Brand Registrations

A mechanism thought to be unique to the CoCCA SRS that allows blocking registration of a domain’s “variants” using java regular expressions. This requires approval and manual intervention on the part of CoCCA.

23.25 Co-operation with Law Enforcement and CERTs

CoCCA works with Law Enforcement, CERTs and researchers and will generally grant registry continuous access free of charge to facilitate two-way data exchanges aimed at preventing and mitigating abuse in the DNS.

There are no known security or stability issues with the CoCCA’s SRS, PCH’s DNSSEC platform or ISC’s and PCH’s anycast networks at this time. Should any be identified resources are available internally at CoCCA, PCH and ISC to swiftly address and resolve security or stability issues as they arise.

24. 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
The .islam TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing SRS, which currently has its primary Network Operations Centre (NOC) in Sydney Australia. The Sydney primary SRS is a single SRS instance currently hosting a dozen ccTLDs. CoCCA’s Sydney SRS runs the latest versions of their “pamoja” TLD software application in a High Availability (HA) configuration. The Sydney SRS registry that will host .islam currently complies with the requirements Specifications 4, 6 and 10 and will be scaled or modified to meet SLA requirements or any future ICANN gTLD specifications. Because of CoCCA’s commercial model and technology the primary SRS can be moved from one data center to another with only a few minutes outage.

From an Internet users perspective trusted, secure and responsive DNS implementations are the ultimate objective of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. To ensure this CoCCA will use PCH’s DNSSEC and anycast infrastructure for offline storage, signing and resolving the .islam TLD, additional DNS resolution will be provided by the ISC SNS anycast platform and two CoCCA unicast DNS servers. Additional information and technical details on the DNSSEC and anycast DNS services can be found in the answers to questions 34, 35 and 43.

24.1 Scale of Operations
A decade of operational experience with TLDs that have implemented polices to discourage tasting or otherwise incentivize add-drop registrations confirms the widely held belief that SRS registry databases are largely static. Once registered data associated with a domain is not frequently modified. More than 99% of the queries seen by CoCCA on a daily basis are WHOIS, EPP Domain:Info or Domain:Check queries (read queries) and do not tax a SRS’s resources excessively. Direct experience and anecdotal evidence from other small and mid-sized registries suggest that between 2% and 5% of the records in the register change daily through db “write” operations - new registrations, renewals, name server changes, contact updates automated changes of status, transfers etc.

For a theoretical registry of 1 million domains this equates to roughly 50,000 “write” transactions a day - or an average of 35 a min (50,000 / 1440 min/day). A recent test of CoCCA’s SRS software on an single 8GB cloud server revealed that the pamoja software was able to process 4 million unique EPP registrations in a little over 5 hours. Performance tests can be designed in any number of ways, real world performance depends on a variety of factors- the specific policy and account settings for a given zone.

In terms of both transactional capability and storage, todays “off the rack” hardware and the open source PostgreSQL database used by CoCCA can easily cope with demands that a small to medium sized registry is ever likely to make on an SRS system. While the CoCCA SRS EPP and WHOIS infrastructure and platform may seem comparatively modest, a decade of experience confirms it is more than capable of meeting the ICANN’s gTLD SLA requirements and comply with the required RFC’s.
If future demands require it, CoCCA’s SRS can easily (and affordably) be scaled by adding additional load balanced application servers and bandwidth.

24.1 SRS | High Level Description

Comprehensive information on and descriptions of the CoCCA SRS and NOC may be found the answers to questions 25-42 that follow.

24.1.1 SRS Infrastructure / Architecture

The following describes the key features of CoCCA’s current production SRS that will be utilized for the .islam:

* Primary SRS is operated from Global Switch, a tier 3+ facility and one of the largest carrier-neutral data centers in the Southern Hemisphere.

* Redundant links to the Internet through PIPE networks and Telstra
  http://www.pipenetworks.com/

* DNSSEC Key storage (offline) in Singapore at a PCH facility hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA). Failover storage at a facility is hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network and in the U.S. at facility is hosted by Equinix in San Jose.

* .islam zones signed by PCH in Frankfurt or Palo Alto

* SRS Escrow at tier three co-location facility (Maxnet) in Auckland NZ and Failover a tier four facility (Equnix) supported by PCH in Palo Alto, CA US. A fourth SRS “instance” is planned for Paris in early 2013.

* Dedicated, routable CoCCA Critical Infrastructure IPv4 and IPv6 address blocks.
  IPv4 resources: 203.119.84.0/24 (crit-infra)
  IPv6 resources: 2001:dd8:3::/48 (crit-infra)

* Routers, Firewalls, Switches and Load balancers all configured for failover.

* CoCCA’s pamoja SRS application load balanced and configured for failover.

* PostgreSQL 9.1.3 database replicated synchronously to two secondary DB servers.

* DS Keys lodged by registrars via EPP or the CoCCA SRS GUI

* Servers Virtualized (VMware vsphere v5)

* VM image-based replication for high availability and off-site disaster recovery http://www.veeam.com/vmware-esx-backup.html

* Critical Data continuously replicated asynchronously to two off-site SRS instances – PCH, Equinix Palo Alto CA
(pch.net) and CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ) Limited, Auckland NZ (maxnet.co.nz)

* OT&E Environment for Registrars

* Primary and Secondary hidden master DNS (failover masters).

* CoCCA operated unicast DNS in Sydney Australia and Auckland New Zealand.

* Two anycast solutions operated by PCH and ISC - over 80 DNS nodes.

24.1.2 Specification 6, Section 1.2 Compliance.

The .islam TLD will be added to CoCCA’s production SRS that currently hosts 12 ccTLDs under a single RFC 5730-5743, RFC 5910 and 3915 compliant EPP interface.

A list of the Registrars that currently connect to the CoCCA SRS for one or more ccTLDs follows below.

24.2 EPP Interface

The port 700 EPP interface for .islam will listen on the same IP and port as the EPP server for the other TLDs hosted by CoCCA - currently “production.coccaregistry.net:700”, on launch the production EPP interface for .islam will be branded as epp.nic.islam.

24.3 WHOIS Interface (port 43 and 443)

The WHOIS Interface(s) for .islam will listen on the same IP and port as the WHOIS server for the ccTLDs and prospective gTLDs to be hosted by CoCCA - currently “whois.coccaregistry.net:43-443” on launch the interface for .islam will be branded as “whois.nic.islam”. Each TLD (ccTLD⁄gTLD) in the CoCCA SRS may have different WHOIS disclosure settings based on the TLD policy. The .islam will comply with the ICANN gTLD disclosure requirements.

24.4 GUI Interface (port 443)

The GUI Interface for .islam will listen on the same IP and port as the GUI server for ccTLDs and prospective gTLDs to be hosted by CoCCA - currently https://production.coccaregistry.net:443. On launch, the interface for .islam will be branded as “registry.nic.islam”.

24.5 Hidden Master DNS (s) (port 53)

The there are two hidden master servers. CoCCA will transfer the .islam zone from the “signature master” to PCH for DNSSEC signature using TSIG IXFR ⁄ AXFR and IP restrictions at the OS and firewall level. PCH will sign the Zone and transfers it back to CoCCA using TSIG and IXFER ⁄ AXFER, CoCCA will then loads the zone on a second “distribution master” which allows distribution to the PCH and ISC anycast transfer points and the CoCCA unicast DNS servers.

24.6 CoCCA Public Unicast DNS

DNS servers on virtual machines running BIND in the Sydney NOC and NZ SRS will pull and resolve the .islam TLD zones.

24.7 Public anycast DNS
CoCCA’s distribution master notifies the anycast providers (PCH and ISC) and .islam TLD zones are transferred to the respective provider’s transfer point IPs (hidden IPS for DNS transfers only) using TSIG IXFER / AXFR and then propagated by PCH and ISC across their respective anycast networks.

24.8  ftp Server
Server to distribute zone files as required under Specification 4 Section 2.

24.9  Escrow Server
Server used to deposit TLD data with NCC and transfer data to CoCCA’s Failover and Escrow SRS. Uses Secondary IP range.

24.10 Number of Servers
There are seven physical server appliances in Sydney NOC configured such that they host 17 virtual machines.

24.11 High Availability (HA) Configuration
The Sydney NOC’s network appliances are configured for failover and HA in either hot or warm standby mode. The PostgreSQL databases are locally replicated using 9.1.3’s synchronous replication and asynchronously over the WAN to the Failover facilities. The status of the local and off-site replication is continuously monitored by the CoCCA NOC. CoCCA also ships WAL files so that in the event of an extend WAN outage the offsite SRS can be updated using Point in Time Recovery (PITR).

RDDS and EPP services are load balanced between two different application servers at the primary SRS (more application servers can easily be added). Public read-only RDDS may also load balanced by simply having the nagios monitoring software automatically modify the resource records and send WHOIS traffic to either of the secondary/failover SRS’s for near-real time WHOIS, When the primary becomes available or SLA issues (DoS etc) are resolved, RDDS services are automatically switched back to the primary SRS.

The public IPs at the NOC used for EPP, WHOIS and GUI are on routable critical infrastructure ranges assigned to CoCCA by APNIC. In the event of an issue with the primary Internet link at the Sydney NOC (PIPE networks) CoCCA may either modify A and AAA records for GUI / RDDS and EPP services to the local failover link, or the entire IP range can be re-routed using BGP routing to a CoCCA failover SRS. If the entire Sydney NOC suffers an extended outage the traffic can be routed to the failover SRS (Palo Alto) or Escrow SRS (Auckland) as conditions dictate by either modification of resource records (A, cname) or BGP of the CoCCA AS.

VMware images of all virtual machines are made daily using Veeam Backup & Replication software.

In addition to streaming replication, SRS data is sent to CoCCA’s failover SRS and Escrow sites every 10 minutes (or sooner depending on activity) via SCP in the form of postgresql PITR files, and daily in the form of compressed database dumps and VMware images.

24.12 List of Registrars Connected to the CoCCA SRS in Sydney AU as of March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12idn Limited</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1API GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3w Media GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abayard</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB NameISP</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active24 .CZ</td>
<td>CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGNIC Registrar</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGJ Times</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Communications Network</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascio Technologies</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantis North Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automattic Inc</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainReg</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamik Network Information</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBCWYSE Technology Co. Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB Online UK Limited</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing Guoxu Network</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizcn.com, Inc.</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biz.Vi Networks Ltd.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacknight Internet Solutions</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brights Consulting Inc.</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Domain Services</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cctldnames</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogent IPC</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Laude</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communigal Communication Ltd</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect-Ireland</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Council of Registrars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS-Datensysteme GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronon AG</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Service Company</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium For Success, Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybernaptics Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Domains</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANILOU.COM</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Technology</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinahosting SL</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipcon AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentdata anstalt</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainClub.com</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaine.fr</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaininfo AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainKeep</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain The Net Technologies</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominiando IT</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Network Services</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-advert Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Line Host</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easyspace Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encirca</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enet Corporation</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enom</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entorno Digital S.A  
EPAG Domainservices  
Euro Billing Grona Verket AB  
EuroDNS  
IVX B.V.  
FBS  
PFS  
FING GLOBAL NETWORK Inc  
Pody Technologies Ltd.  
FRCI eServices Ltd  
Gabiya, Inc  
Gandi SAS  
Gastein IT Services  
Gauss research Laboratory, Inc.  
Guyananet  
Government Online Centre (MU)  
GoHoto Pty Ltd  
Golden Internet  
GRAFIKLIF-WebalaMinute  
Gransy s.r.o.  
GUYANANET  
HAICOM ( HAITI Communications )  
HAINET S.A.  
Haiti Domain  
Haqmal ICT Solution Services  
Hikaru Kitabayashi  
Holomedia  
h_t_hostmicrofos  
Hostnet bv  
Ultraspeed UK  
FSM II  
HTG  
GaMa Consulting S.A.  
Koborg  
Indeca GmbH  
INDOMCO  
Innovative Systems  
Innter.Net  
Instra Corporation  
IntaServe  
InterNetworX Ltd. & Co. KG  
InterNetX GmbH  
Indian Ocean Territories  
IP Mirror Pte Ltd  
Iron Mountain IPM  
Interactive.tool.biz  
Jestina Mesepitu  
Jms-Networks (TM)  
J SQUAD SYSTEMS INC.  
Jms-Networks (TM)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kawing Chiu</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiichi SHIGA (old: Keiichi dot business)</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key-Systems</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klute-Thiemann GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knipp</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen Data</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legekko Info Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexsynergy Limited</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGLovells</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MailClub (France)</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcaria.com</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Cake</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIDAN InterNET GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MarkMonitor</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maudeline Auguste</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWars CO LTD</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne IT CBS AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domainbox</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROCIS</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moniker Online Services, LLC.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius Domains</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naikbeen_NCP</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVING BY BLUE CO,.LTD</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameAction</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name.com LLC</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nameshield</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameWeb BVBA</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATCOM S.A</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Computer Board</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesys Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nessus GmbH</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetAccess / AccessHaiti S.A.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetNames Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-Chinese Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETCOM S.A.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETLINKS</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking4all</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius.biz Hosting</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexus</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE S.r.l. d-b-a niceweb.eu</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island Data Services</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novagroup</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novutec Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE DE MANAGEMENT ET DE RESSOURCES HUMAINES</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB OPTIMAL SYSTEMS LTD</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Telekom</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVH</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OXWELL CC
Multilink S.A
Peweb Ltda
PlanA Corp
pointcruz.com
pro.vider.de
Quick Net
Redspider.biz
register_com
Register.it spa
Register.mu
Register.eu
Domain Name Registration Service Reg.Net.Ua
101Domain, Inc.
RWGUSA
Safenames
Solomon Telekom
Solutions S.A.
SpeedPartner GmbH
studio28
SunnyNames LLP
TainoSystems
Telecommunications Authority of Kiribati
Telecom Plus Ltd
TierraNet Inc.
Timor Hosting
TradeMark Unlimited, Inc
Todaynic.com,Inc.
TPP Domains Pty Ltd
I.C.S. Trabia-Network S.R.L.
TRANSNET S.A
TRANSVERSAL
Timor Telecom
Tucows
ucgit
UNICART Ltd.
united-domains AG
Variomedia AG
Melbourne IT DBS, Inc.
V-Trade Ltd
Visiant Outsourcing S.r.l.
Web Commerce Communications WebCC
WEB Development and Hosting Ltd
WEB Ltd
Web Solutions ApS
WebWorkers Internet Consultants cc
NamIT cc Namibia
WSR Corporation
25. 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.

CoCCA was among the first registry providers to embrace the EPP standard seven years ago. CoCCA’s traditional clients have been small to medium sized ccTLD operators un-encumbered by the legal, contractual and governance issues that often result in protracted delays in rolling out new policy, technology or standards in larger ccTLDs or in the gTLD environment. CoCCA and the users of its SRS software have been historically free to trial and introduce innovative technology policy.

The CoCCA SRS is an “all in one” software package (RDDS / EPP / GUI / Accounting) however this does not prevent it from being deployed in a clustered environment where multiple instances answer for a specific protocol under a load balanced, high availability environment. Using a load balance appliance EPP traffic can be sent to one or more servers which are in turn connected to the same database. In all small to medium sized deployments tested to date load balancing the EPP service is not required - the load balancer is simply configured to provide failover and HA.

An aggressive three-year development program commenced in January 2009 with the objective of ensuring CoCCA’s software was compliant with ICANN’s new gTLD requirements - as well as the meeting needs of new and existing users in the ccTLD community.

25.1 Current EPP RFC Compliance:

RFC 5730 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)

This RFC is a base protocol document for EPP. EPP is an XML-text object based client-server protocol, atomic in its transactions, and developed to support multiple transports and lower level security protocols. There are no partial failures; all commands either succeed or fail definitively. Object-to-object associations are standard with limited application of parent-child relationships where delegate relationships are necessary for affected functionality, such as internal host data and its relationship to domain objects. The pamoja SRS fully implements the service discovery, commands, responses, and the extension framework described.

RFC 5730

This RFC is a base protocol document for EPP. EPP is an XML-text object based client-server protocol, atomic in its transactions, and developed to support multiple transports and lower level security protocols. There are no partial failures; all commands either succeed or fail definitively. Object-to-object associations are standard with limited application of parent-child relationships where delegate relationships are necessary for affected functionality, such
as internal host data and its relationship to domain objects. The pamoja SRS fully implements the service discovery, commands, responses, and the extension framework described.

RFC 5731

This RFC explains the mapping of the primary EPP registry object, the domain object. It reviews associated attributes and states of the domain object as well as child object relationships (hosts). It also details associations with other contact objects. The pamoja SRS complies with the full XML examples and descriptions and applies flexibility where permitted. For example, 5731 allows operators to implement the info command with different responses for a “sponsoring registrar” and a “non-sponsoring registrar” in regards to many domain object attributes. The pamoja SRS implements this as a base protocol document for EPP.

RFC 5732

The pamoja SRS implements this as a base protocol document for EPP. The pamoja SRS notes this RFC describes the mapping of relationships to host objects, which are by definition subordinate to the superordinate domain name object. Host objects that are defined as internal or in the namespace of the registry must be related to a superordinate domain object to be created. Internal hosts, as full child objects, face restrictions associated with the management of their superordinate domain object. External hosts are hosts belonging to another domain namespace and as such are not subordinate in the present namespace. Internal hosts can have a glue or an A record associated with them, external hosts refer to another namespace or zone for the associated A record.

RFC 5733

Another RFC implemented in the The pamoja SRS server, this RFC describes the contact object mappings in EPP. Contact objects are used to contain related data surrounding the standardized contacts types in TLD registries including attributes such as contact type, country, telephone numbers, email addresses, etc. As a standalone object, a contact object can be created and associated with no domain objects or with any number of domain objects available in the registry. This is used commonly by registrars to update common contact information associated across large numbers of domains in a single transaction. Like the domain object, it can be secured with a passphrase or “authinfo” code. Contact object data represents the definitive data source for authoritative RDDS (WHOIS) in new TLDs.

RFC 5734

The pamoja SRS implements this RFC as the preferred industry transport and in compliance with ICANN’s requirements. This RFC describes a standard implementation of TCP incorporating TLS. The transport of choice for the EPP registry community has been TCP. Implementers are encouraged to take precautions against denial of service attacks through the use of standard technologies such as firewall and border router filters.

RFC 5735

The pamoja SRS implements this RFC as applicable to any extensions it utilizes as this RFC provides specific and detailed guidance on EPP extensions. An important principle in creating extensions to, as opposed to modifying, the EPP protocol was to fully preserve the integrity of the existing protocol schema. Additionally, a valid extension itself should be extensible. Another important requirement in the RFC is to include announcements of all available extensions in the EPP server greeting element before establishing an interactive client session.

RFC 3915
The pamoja SRS supports this extension since all CoCCA managed TLDs implement the grace period implementation known as the Redemption Grace Period or “RGP”. When RGP is in use, domains are deleted into the RGP where Registrars may request a restoration of the domain. This is a billable event and requires a three-step process: placement of the domain into a pending restore state, submission of a restore report explaining why the domain is being restored, and finally the restoration of the domain. The RFC extends the domain update command, adds related domain statuses, such as “redemptionPeriod” and “pendingRestore,” and extends the responses of domain info and other details. The RFC provides a lifecycle description of the RGP and defines the format and content for client to server submission of the associated restore reports.

RFC 5910

The pamoja SRS will support DNSSEC and therefore will also support this extension from initiation of the registration process. DNSSEC is a mechanism for cryptographically verifying that each delegate zone in the DNS hierarchy has been referred to or is referring to its genuine parent or child zone respectively. Since TLD zone files are generated from authoritative registry data, this extension specifically provides the ability to add elements to the domain-create and domain-update functions and to the domain-info responses, allowing registrars to submit associated delegated signer (DS) information of the child zone indicating it is digitally signed and that the parent zone recognizes the indicated key as a valid zone key for the child zone.

SRS General

The pamoja SRS Session Management - pamoja listens on port 700 for client requests.
The pamoja SRS Message Exchange - pamoja complies with the EPP message exchange rules
The pamoja SRS Data Unit Format - pamoja uses the prescribed packet formats

25.2 EPP Security:

CoCCA’s SRS performs username-clid-password-ssl certificate checks and also contains application level code to restrict connections to a set of IP addresses for each client and login.

Additional security is provided by firewall IP restrictions that restrict port 700 access to the SRS to trusted IP’s and the use of stateful firewalls and load balancing devices to mitigate DoS attacks or other malicious activity.

25.3 EPP - Demonstrating Capability

CoCCA authors the most widely deployed EPP SRS solution and has a long history of both development of and production experience operating an EPP SRS. The CoCCA NOC currently has 12 TLDs on it’s production EPP SRS, over 20 TLD managers have deployed the CoCCA EPP solution locally for production use.

In order to demonstrate capability and compliance with the RFC’s in 24.1 and CoCCA’s Extensions in 25.3. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has instructed CoCCA to make available to evaluators an Operational and Testing and Evaluation (OTE) EPP interface should they desire to evaluate CoCCA’s RFC compliance. Alternatively, evaluators may download CoCCA’s pamoja SRS, install locally and contact CoCCA for configuration advice.

The URL to download pamoja is https://downloads.coccaregistry.net. Installers are available for Linux64x (Centos - Ubuntu), OSX (10.6+) and WIN7+ servers.
25.3 EPP Extensions

The CoCCA SRS currently provides several extensions to EPP, using the practices defined in RFC-3735. The CoCCA greeting currently defines the following four extensions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{svcMenu} \rangle \\
\langle \text{objURI} \rangle \text{urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:host-1.0} \langle \text{/objURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{svcExtension} \rangle \\
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{https://..\cocca-ip-verification-1.1} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{https://..\cocca-contact-proxy-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{https://..\cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{https://..\cocca-reseller-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle \\
\langle \text{svcExtension} \rangle \\
\langle \text{/svcMenu} \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

25.3.1 Registry Grace Period Extension

\[
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle
\]

Implemented as defined in RFC-3915 - http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3915.txt

25.3.2 Reseller Mapping Extension

\[
\langle \text{extURI} \rangle \text{https://..\cocca-reseller-1.0} \langle \text{/extURI} \rangle
\]

Extensions for Domain:Create and Domain:Update

This extension tags a domain as being registered via one of registrars’ resellers. The reseller reference is provided in the reference section, and is recorded against the domain as it is registered or updated. The reseller list must be maintained by the Registrar through the CoCCA Registry web interface.

If a registrar decides to load reseller information and map domains, the .islam WHOIS server (port 43 and 443), Historical Abstracts, and Premium WHOIS will display the reseller contact information as well as the Registrar information. If ICANN advises that display of reseller information in the port 43 WHOIS is inconsistent with the response format required in Specification 4, 1.4.2 then CoCCA will disable port 43 and or port 443 display of reseller data for the .islam TLD. Reseller information would still be stored and available for Historical Abstracts and users of the CoCCA’s Premium WHOIS service.

\[
\langle \text{xml version=“1.0“ encoding=“UTF-8”}\rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{xs:schema targetNamespace=“https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-reseller-1.0”} \\
\text{xmlns=“https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-reseller-1.0”} \\
\text{xmlns:xs=“http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema”} \\
\text{elementFormDefault=“qualified”}\rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{xs:element name=“extension“} \rangle
\langle \text{xs:complexType} \rangle \\
\langle \text{xs:sequence} \rangle \\
\langle \text{xs:element name=“reference“ type=“xs:string“} \rangle
\]
25.3.3 Clearinghouse for Intellectual Property Extension

Extension to connect to an external database to validate IP rights.

<extURI>https://..coccaregistry.net/cocca-ip-verification-1.1</extURI>

Extension for Domain:Create

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://..cocca-ip-verification-1.1"
xmlns="https://..production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-ip-verification-1.1"
xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
elementFormDefault="qualified">

<xs:annotation>
  <xs:documentation>
  Extensible Provisioning Protocol v1.0
  Extension for providing IP Verification to CoCCA Registries
  v1.1 adds extra fields for trademark verification
  </xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>

<xs:element name="extension">
  <xs:complexType>
    <xs:choice>
      <xs:element name="chip" type="chipType"/>
      <xs:element name="trademarks" type="trademarkType"/>
    </xs:choice>
    <xs:complexType name="chipType">
      <xs:sequence>
        <xs:element name="code"/>
      </xs:sequence>
      <xs:simpleType>
      </xs:simpleType>
    </xs:complexType>
  </xs:complexType>
</xs:element>
<xs:restriction base="xs:token">
  <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
  <xs:minLength value="1"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
</xs:element>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:complexType name="trademarkType">
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="trademark" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded">
      <xs:complexType>
        <xs:sequence>
          <xs:element name="registeredMark">
            <xs:simpleType>
              <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
                <xs:minLength value="1"/>
              </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
          </xs:element>
          <xs:element name="registrationNumber">
            <xs:simpleType>
              <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
                <xs:minLength value="1"/>
              </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
          </xs:element>
          <xs:element name="registrationLocality">
            <xs:simpleType>
              <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                <xs:pattern value="[A-Z]{2}"/>
              </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
          </xs:element>
          <xs:element name="capacity">
            <xs:simpleType>
              <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                <xs:enumeration value="OWNER"/>
                <xs:enumeration value="ASSIGNEE"/>
              </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
          </xs:element>
          <xs:element name="companyNumber" minOccurs="0">
            <xs:simpleType>
              <xs:restriction base="xs:token"/>
            </xs:simpleType>
          </xs:element>
        </xs:sequence>
      </xs:complexType>
    </xs:element>
  </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
This extension allows registrars to provide proof of their Intellectual Property claim for a name, when registering. It can be used to specify Clearing House for IP codes, or Trademarks. A CHIP request XML is as follows:

```xml
<extension>
  <coccaip:extension xmlns:coccaip="https://..//cocca-ip-verification-1.1">
    <coccaip:chip>
      <coccaip:code>XXXXXXX</coccaip:code>
    </coccaip:chip>
    <coccaip:extension/>
  </coccaip:extension>
</extension>
```

An extension containing trademark information is as follows:

```xml
<extension>
  <coccaip:extension xmlns:coccaip="https://..//cocca-ip-verification-1.1">
    <coccaip:trademarks>
      <coccaip:trademark>
        <coccaip:registeredMark>CoCCA</coccaip:registeredMark>
        <coccaip:registrationNumber>12345</coccaip:registrationNumber>
        <coccaip:registrationLocality>NZ</coccaip:registrationLocality>
        <coccaip:capacity>OWNER</coccaip:capacity>
        <coccaip:companyNumber>1234</coccaip:companyNumber>
      </coccaip:trademark>
      <coccaip:trademarks/>
    </coccaip:trademark>
    <coccaip:extension/>
  </coccaip:extension>
</extension>
```

At the time of application it is not envisioned that this extension will be used for the .islam TLD. However it demonstrates an existing technical capacity to query and synchronize data with external databases in order to validate IP or other rights.

25.3.4 Contact Proxy Extension

```xml
<extURI>https://epp.ote.islam.coccaregistry.net//cocca-contact-proxy-1.0</extURI>
```

Extension to allow registrars to lodge several sets of contact details for a given domain and select which one is
displayed in the port WHOIS.

https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0 and https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0 - extensions for Contact:Create and Contact:Update.

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
    xmlns="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
    xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
    xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
    xsi:schemaLocation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0 cocca-contact-proxy-1.0.xsd"
    elementFormDefault="qualified"/>

<xs:import namespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0" schemaLocation="cocca-contact-proxy-1.0.xsd"/>

<xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
        Extensible Provisioning Protocol v1.0
    </xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>

<xs:element name="extension">
    <xs:complexType>
        <xs:choice>
            <xs:element name="newProxy" type="proxyType"/>
            <xs:element name="existingProxy"/>
        </xs:complexType>
        <xs:complexType>
            <xs:sequence>
                <xs:element name="reference" type="proxy:referenceType"/>
            </xs:sequence>
        </xs:complexType>
    </xs:choice>
</xs:element>

<xs:complexType name="proxyType">
    <xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="proxyDetails">
  <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="reference" minOccurs="0" type="proxy:referenceType"/>
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>
          This is an optional field you can use to give this proxy info a particular reference. Each reference must be unique, so if you have an existing contact proxy info record with this reference value, you will UPDATE that record, changing the proxy info for any existing contact referencing that proxy.
        </xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
      <xs:element name="email">
        <xs:simpleType>
          <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
            <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
            <xs:minLength value="1"/>
          </xs:restriction>
        </xs:simpleType>
      </xs:element>
      <xs:element name="voice" type="proxy:phoneNumberType"/>
      <xs:element name="fax" minOccurs="0" type="proxy:phoneNumberType"/>
      <xs:element name="internationalAddress" type="proxy:addressType"/>
      <xs:element name="localAddress" type="proxy:addressType" minOccurs="0"/>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
  <xs:element name="resData">
    <xs:annotation>
      <xs:documentation>
        If a contact is created or updated with contact proxy information specified, or if the registrar creating the contact has a default proxy specified, then the reference value identifying the proxy is returned in the response, in the extension-resData field described here. If the contact was updated to clear the reference field (i.e. setting the contact’s proxy using the existingProxy type, but leaving the reference field empty) then the reference value will be empty, confirming the update.
      </xs:documentation>
    </xs:annotation>
  </xs:element>
</xs:complexType>
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
    xmlns="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
    xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    elementFormDefault="qualified"/>

<xs:simpleType name="referenceType">
    <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
        <xs:maxLength value="40"/>
        <xs:minLength value="0"/>
    </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:complexType name="phoneNumberType">
    <xs:sequence>
        <xs:element name="number">
            <xs:simpleType>
                <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                    <xs:maxLength value="64"/>
                    <xs:minLength value="1"/>
                </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
        </xs:element>
        <xs:element name="extension" minOccurs="0">
            <xs:simpleType>
                <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                    <xs:maxLength value="64"/>
                    <xs:minLength value="1"/>
                </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
        </xs:element>
    </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:complexType name="addressType">
    <xs:sequence>
        <xs:element name="street1">
            <xs:simpleType>
                <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
                    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
                    <xs:minLength value="1"/>
                </xs:restriction>
            </xs:simpleType>
        </xs:element>
    </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="street2" minOccurs="0"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
    <xs:minLength value="0"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="street3" minOccurs="0"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
    <xs:minLength value="0"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="city"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
    <xs:minLength value="1"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="stateProvince" minOccurs="0"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
    <xs:minLength value="0"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="postcode" minOccurs="0"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
    <xs:minLength value="0"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element name="countryCode"/>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:pattern value="[A-Z]{2}"/>
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
This extension allows the association of a contact proxy with a contact.

The contact:create and contact:update extensions can specify an existing proxy contact by ID or create a new proxy contact. To associate a contact with an existing contact proxy, use this form:

```xml
<extension>
  <proxyupdate:extension xmlns:proxyupdate="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0">
    <proxyupdate:existingProxy>
      <proxy:reference xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0">XXXXX</proxy:reference>
    </proxyupdate:existingProxy>
  </proxyupdate:extension>
</extension>
```

where XXXXX is the ID of the proxy contact you wish to use. To create a new contact and associate it with a contact, use this form of the create or update extension:

```xml
<extension>
  <proxyupdate:extension xmlns:proxyupdate="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
    xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0">
    <proxyupdate:newProxy>
      <proxyupdate:proxyDetails>
        <proxy:reference>XXXXX</proxy:reference>
        <proxy:email>XXXXX</proxy:email>
        <proxy:voice>
          <proxy:number>XXXXX</proxy:number>
          <proxy:extension>XXXXX</proxy:extension>
        </proxy:voice>
        <proxy:internationalAddress>
          <proxy:street1>XXXXX</proxy:street1>
          <proxy:street2>XXXXX</proxy:street2>
          <proxy:city>XXXXX</proxy:city>
          <proxy:stateProvince>XXXXX</proxy:stateProvince>
          <proxy:postcode>XXXXX</proxy:postcode>
          <proxy:countryCode>XXXXX</proxy:countryCode>
          <proxy:internationalAddress>
            <proxyupdate:proxyDetails>
              <proxyupdate:newProxy>
                <proxyupdate:extension>
                  <extension>
```

At the time of application it is not envisioned that this extension will be used for the .islam TLD.
In addition to the above statuses, the CoCCA Registry provides additional lifecycle statuses over and above those defined in RFC-5731. The CoCCA Activation statuses are provided using namespaced status elements in the Domain:Create and Domain:Info responses, and are accompanied by an RFC-3735 compliant extension section. A Domain:Create response for a newly registered domain would appear as follows:

```xml
     xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:epp-1.0 epp-1.0.xsd">
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="229" id="21192"/>
  </response>
  <resData>
    <domain:infData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0"
                    xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
      <domain:name>info.confirm.test</domain:name>
      <domain:roid>234511-CoCCA</domain:roid>
      <domain:status s="inactive">Delegation information has not been supplied</domain:status>
      <activation:status xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0" s="pendingActivation">
        This domain requires acceptance of AUP and registrant agreement by 2012-02-29 10:19
      </activation:status>
      <domain:registrant>regis-80ESbGtje</domain:registrant>
      <domain:c1ID>registrar</domain:c1ID>
      <domain:c1Rd>registrar</domain:c1Rd>
      <domain:crDate>2012-02-21T21:19:32.887Z</domain:crDate>
      <domain:exDate>2013-02-21T21:19:33.006Z</domain:exDate>
      <domain:authInfo/>
      <domain:pw>Hh7Wz3c9dC</domain:pw>
    </domain:infData>
    <extension>
      <rgp:infData xmlns:rgp="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0"
                    xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0 rgp-1.0.xsd">
        <activation:extension xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0">
          <activation:url>https://registry-adam-activate.jsp?activationCode=ITIhilkma8SmbsCysYeY18uEajJikwOXXKNL0MLuOHHXkXj2UynrDZ2UUh6SB2h8h1d8</activation:url>
          <activation:link>activate.jsp?activationCode=ITIhilkma8SmbsCysYeY18uEajJikwOXXKNL0MLuOHHXkXj2UynrDZ2UUh6SB2h8h1d8</activation:link>
        </activation:extension>
      </rgp:infData>
    </extension>
  </resData>
</epp>
```
25.4 EPP Access Requirements

1. IP Address white listing (firewall and application layer)
2. Signed registry issued SSL certificates
3. Username-Password

Authentication requires that the IP address the connection is made from be white listed IP, that the entity
connecting use a CoCCA-issued SSL certificate and that correct clientID and passwords be used. By default registrars
have only GUI access to the SRS, EPP is enabled by request and only after a Registrar has been certified on CoCCA’s
OT&E platform.

25.5 CoCCA GUI Environment
In addition to providing the standard implementation of EPP that runs on Port 700, CoCCA also provides a secure web
based Graphical User Interface running on Port 443 that allows Registrars to register and manage domains in their
portfolio without connecting by EPP.

25.6 EPP Via the GUI
In cases where a registrar uses the SRS GUI, all domain, host and contact operations supported by the RFC’s are
executed by pamoja’s internal EPP engine to ensure that GUI and port 700 EPP interfaces behave identically.

These methods of authentication include:
1. IP Address white listing
2. Using a one-time password (“OTP”) delivered via hardware token, soft token or SMS is issued by CoCCA.
3. The use of a Username-Password

25.7 Registrars
A list of registrars that have already successfully integrated and connected to CoCCA’s SYD SRS is attached. CoCCA’s
SYD SRS is used by 200+ Registrars, many of which currently utilize the XML based EPP protocol for the purpose of
providing automated services to their clients.

25.8 Resourcing and Continuous Development

CoCCA’s software development team and systems administrators support both their own in-house SRS and that of over 23
other TLD managers who have deployed the pamoja SRS software locally on their own infrastructure. Development is on-
go ing and active. The CoCCA SRS has been developed over the past 9 years, the bulk of the development on the EPP
platform has been completed, however two full time developers are employed by CoCCA to customize, maintain and
improve the software for the TLD’s that use it.

Because of the co-operative nature of the development process CoCCA works closely with over a dozen developers and
network engineers employed by users of CoCCA’s TLD software to resolve bugs, continuously improve pamoja’s
performance and add new features.
26. Whois: describe

- how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookups 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:

- A high-level Whois system description;
- Relevant network diagram(s);
- IT and infrastructure resources (e.g., servers, switches, routers and other components);
- Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems; and

Frequency of synchronization between servers.
To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:

- Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and
- A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

CoCCA currently delivers proven, innovative WHOIS and Registration Data Directory Services (“RDDS”) technology to the TLDs hosted by CoCCA and to the TLDs that deploy the pamoja SRS on their own infrastructure. CoCCA’s Specification Four compliant WHOIS and RDDS technology will be utilized by CoCCA for the .islam TLD. Under CoCCA’s SRS Architecture one WHOIS server will answer for all the TLDs in the SRS. Each TLD Sponsor can configure the WHOIS such that it serves different results depending on the wishes of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and applicable ICANN requirements.

26.1 WHOIS Architecture and Infrastructure Overview

CoCCA’s flexible WHOIS architecture is designed for high availability, complies with RFC 3912 and surpasses the requirements in Specifications 4 and 10. The flexible pamoja WHOIS server may be configured to provide a variety of information, and in a variety of formats that supplements ICANN’s proposed gTLD requirements.

As registrations appear (or are modified) in the registration database, changes are committed to a replicated read only secondary database utilized by CoCCA’s WHOIS server. Because the replication is synchronous WHOIS data is presented in real time. If at a future date WHOIS query response times becomes an SLA issue, WHOIS responses may be cached using “infinite cache” horizontal caching technology, which has been tested and can readily scale to meet future demand, alternatively RDDS services may be answered by a SRS instance off-site (one of the CoCCA
secondary-failover SRS’s) for near real-time WHOIS and RDDS.

26.2 Port 43 WHOIS (command line)

CoCCA has confirmed that the format of the domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state-province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses can and will be configured to conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFC’s 5730-5734. The originating IP address and date time of all WHOIS queries are logged and will be stored for a minimum of 28 days in the production SRS.

GUI configuration and command line flags allow a client to request output in ASCII, Unicode, ASCII and Unicode or HTML output (with tables). For IDN TLDs, a variety of command line WHOIS options have been tested in conjunction with the Arabic TLDs that use the CoCCA SRS. CoCCA supports all the current IETF standards and several developed for current IDN users. CoCCA’s SRS can be readily modified should ICANN mandate a particular technology in the future.

26.2.1 Domain Name Data:
* Proposed Production Query format: whois "h -whois.nic.〈TLD〉 domain
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.4.2 (pages 40-41).

26.2.2 Registrar Data:
* Proposed Production query format: whois "h -whois.nic.islam registrar
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.5.2 (pages 41-42) -- with the exception of the registrar "WHOIS Server" object (p. 42), under the proposed .islam thick registry model registrars will not operate their own WHOIS servers.

Inclusion of this object seems redundant and may cause confusion regarding the authoritative WHOIS server for the .islam. If required by ICANN the registrar WHOIS object data will be collected and displayed by CoCCA.

26.2.3 Name Server Data:
* Proposed Production Query format: whois "h -whois.nic.〈TLD〉 (Host or IP)
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.6.2 (p. 42)

26.3 Public WHOIS service via a secure port 443 web-based interface:
CoCCA’s pamoja software has a publicly accessible port 443 GUI service that allows individuals to query the SRS for registration data for individual domain, registrar or host records.

CoCCA has confirmed that the format of the domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state-province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses can and will be configured to conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFC’s 5730-5734.

To prevent abuse, CoCCA implements rate limiting via CAPTCHA for each individual transaction. The procedure would follow as per below.

1) An individual would navigate in a browser to https:⁄⁄whois.nic.〈TLD〉
2) Click on the appropriate button (Domain, Registrar, or Name Server)
3) Enter the applicable parameter:
----Domain name, including the TLD (e.g., EXAMPLE.TLD)
----Full name of the registrar, including punctuation (e.g., Example Registrar, Inc.)
----Full host name or the IP address (e.g., NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD or 198.41.3.39)
4) Enter the CAPTCHA phrase or symbols
5) Click on the Submit button

Possible Outcomes from the query:
* If an exact match for the domain, host, or registrar exists in the SRS, the Port 443 WHOIS will display the same information and with the same formatting, as the port 43 WHOIS (see above and Specification 4, Sections 1.4 " 1.6 ).

* If there is no exact match but a super-ordinate domain exists the SRS data for the super-ordinate name is to be displayed. By way of example if an individual searches for abc.domain.islam and abc.domain.islam does not exist then the SRS would display the information on domain.islam and advise the individual accordingly.

26.4 WHOIS and RDDS | Demonstrating Capability

CoCCA has almost a decade of experience running multiple TLDs and providing WHOIS services. WHOIS and RDDS are integrated into CoCCA’s pamoja software. In order to demonstrate capability and compliance with the Specification Four, Section One, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has instructed CoCCA to make available to evaluators an Operational and Testing and Evaluation (OTE) WHOIS and RDDS interface on request. Alternatively, evaluators may download CoCCA’s pamoja SRS, install locally and contact CoCCA for configuration advice.

The URL to download pamoja is https://downloads.coccaregistry.net. Installers are available for Linux64x (Centos - Ubuntu), OSX (10.6+) and WIN7+ servers.

26.5 Network Diagrams

CoCCA’s RDDS services serve data directly from the SRS, there is no separate WHOIS database. If performance becomes an issue pamoja’s RDDS read-only services can be configured to extract data from a replicated copy of the SRS.

Individuals or entities that desire to run multiple queries against the SRS for law enforcement purposes, IP protection or to mitigate cyber-crimes need simply subscribe to CoCCA’s Premium RDDS Service and may query the SRS via EPP as well as port 43 and the 443 GUI. Premium RDDS users are granted EPP read-only access (on request) and need not be ICANN Accredited registrars. In many cases EPP may be a better tool for automation of multiple queries than port 43 WHOIS.

The systems supporting WHOIS are fully redundant with hardware and software that can easily scale to meet the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s growth projections of the TLD. For comprehensive description of the SYD NOC see questions 31 and 32.

The WHOIS server at the CoCCA Data Centre in Sydney currently answers for 12 TLDs and processes on average fewer than 8000 WHOIS requests per hour. The current WHOIS server and database has been tested and can answer in excess of 9,000 TPS as currently configured - network latency may impact real world results depending on the origin of the query.

26.6 Synchronization Frequency Between Servers

CoCCA’s WHOIS architecture is designed to ensure WHOIS data is current, accurate and reliable. CoCCA’s RDDS services serve data directly from the SRS, in the default configuration there is no separate WHOIS database. CoCCA uses PostgreSQL and synchronous replication data is committed to the production SRS master database and a secondary database (read only) server configured to serve WHOIS data, so that at all times the SRS and CoCCAs WHOIS servers serve the same data.
CoCCA streams SRS data off-site asynchronously (and by log file shipping as a failover) to their SRS servers in Palo Alto and Auckland to enable those SRS’s to serve near-real time WHOIS data if the primary SRS experiences an issue that negatively impacts CoCCA’s ability to meet SLA’s for the .islam TLD.

If WHOIS caching is required as the .islam TLD grows, compliance with the SLA requirements in the ICANN agreement may necessitate that Failover SRS or Escrow SRS answer RDDS queries or that cache servers be deployed, in such a circumstance, the WHOIS response would be near real-time (accurate to within a min or two of the primary SRS).

26.7 Compliance with Specification 4

CoCCA will provide free RDDS Services via both port 43 and a web-based port 443 site in accordance with RFC 3912.

Additionally, the CoCA will also provide fee-based Premium RDDS service described in further detail below. CoCCA and the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. acknowledge that ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols and if such change were to occur; CoCCA will implement specification changes as soon as practical.

CoCCA and the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will provide bulk access of thin RDDS data to ICANN to verify and ensure operational stability of registry services, as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars. Access will be provided to ICANN on a weekly basis and the format will be based on section 3 of Specification 4. Further, exceptional access to thick RDDS will be provided to ICANN per Specification 2.

Should ICANN request it CoCCA will provide ICANN with a Premium RDDS login at no charge which will provide them with continuous access to the SRS to extract thick SRS data for the .islam at its leisure.

The proposed format of the data objects for domains, name servers, and the registrar output are provided below:

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 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
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

1.6. Nameserver 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

26.8 Supplemental Data
Subject to ICANN Approval, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will ensure the SRS is configured

to display the following Supplemental RDDS data (objects only displayed if applicable).

Activation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Contact Confirmation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Contact Confirmation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Registration Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Registration MIN Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Redemption Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Purge Date: 2011-12-31
Renewal Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Transfer Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31

Reseller ID: 4261797-ERL
Reseller Name: ACME Reseller A
Reseller Street: 123 RESELLER STREET
Reseller City: RESELLER VILLE
Reseller State/Province: RS
Reseller Postal Code: 12345
Reseller Country: US
Reseller Phone: +1.5555551219
Reseller Phone Ext: 1239
Reseller Fax: +1.5555551219
Reseller Fax Ext: 4329
Reseller Support Email: helpdesk@reseller. TLD
26.9 Compliance with Specification 10

CoCCA’s WHOIS service will comply and/or exceed the Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS) performance specifications outlined in Specification 10 of the proposed Registry agreement. For the existing TLDs supported by CoCCA, all service levels already exceed the Specification 10 Requirements:

* RDDS Availability > 98%
* RDDS Query > 95%
* RDDS Update > 95%

CoCCA’s current RDDS availability statistics are available online at http://stats.coccaregistry.net

RDDS Services that are near real time can be provided from the failover or escrow SRS’s by simply changing the IP-CNAME for the whos.nic.[TLD] if there are SLA related or loading issues. This has been tested and is being done automatically at any time by CoCCA’s monitoring software with near immediate effect < 30 seconds.

26.10 Historical Abstracts

In addition to CoCCA’s RDDS services, detailed Historical Abstracts for individual domains are also made readily available to the general public, law enforcement and rights owners.

Historical Abstracts are a compilation of all information available on a domain (including deleted - archived domains) that are held in the registry. This includes the time and date of all changes in contacts, hosts, registrars, resellers, status’s as well as all registration, activation, confirmation, renewal, restore or commercial transactions related to the maintenance of domain in the SRS.

A representative sample of a Historical Abstract detailing the full history of a domain is attached.

26.11 Premium RDDS (port 443 and port 700 EPP)

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., with the service support of CoCCA, intends to offer Boolean partial and exact match search capability of all Domain, Contact, Host, Registrar data in the SRS within the Directory Service via a web interface. This Premium service will be billed at a monthly rate depending on the number of queries.

ICANN’s requirement that thin SRS data be made available in bulk makes it trivial for any entity who has thin data provided by the Centralized Zone Data Access Provider to run automated queries against the .islam WHOIS public WHOIS server and extract thick SRS data - for all the domains in a zone. CoCCA’s Premium RDDS makes access to registration data by IP Owners, Law Enforcement and CERT’s efficient (EPP and GUI) and timely (real-time), Premium RDDS does not expose any information that ICANN’s gTLD policy does not effectively require Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to otherwise make publicly available to the public via WHOIS and the services of CZDA Provider.

Because experience has demonstrated that entities often attempt to use the WHOIS for a variety of purposes, rights protection, research etc., and because WHOIS is a rather blunt instrument which does not provide always provide the most useful advice on reserved domains, wildcard string registrations etc. entities with a Premium RDDS Service will, on request, be granted read-only EPP access to retrieve domain information.

In order to make it unnecessary for IP owners or others to continuously query the SRS via EPP or command line WHOIS
subscribers to the Premium RDDS may create lists that use regular java expressions and boolean operations that will notify them by email and if applicable EPP polling messages when a domain that matches a given string is registered.

To mitigate abuse of this feature, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will implement the following measures to ensure legitimate authorized users and ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies:

* Premium RDDS subscribers must agree, as a condition of access to comply with Section 2.1.5 of Specification 4. To monitor that RDDS services are not being abused and used to “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” CoCCA will seed the SRS with unique records and that enable them to track reported abuse back to an individual RDDS subscriber.

* Because this is only offered as a premium and paid service, the request must follow the CoCCA application process to confirm the user identification and process the financial transaction. Thus, the typical end-user will not have access to this service.

* All GUI searches are conducted via authenticated user access using a combination of username and password and OTP tokens.

* CoCCA will monitor for out of band usage patterns of the Premium RDDS service and take appropriate action if policy thresholds are exceeded.

26.12 Zone File Access

Subscribers to the Premium RDDS may download .islam zone files via the port 43 GUI up to six (6) times in any 24 hour period.

CoCCA will comply all the requirements set out in Specification 4, Sections 2.1-2.1.7. Specifically, CoCCA will operate a dedicated server supporting FTP, and or other data transport access protocols in a manner specified by ICANN and the Centralized Zone Data Access Provider.

26.13 Resource Plans

The .islam TLD will be added to CoCCA’s SRS at their primary data center in Sydney which currently supports the features noted above.

The Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will dedicate 2 professionals to coordinate the operation of the .islam TLD. At the same time, the technical professionals at CoCCA will be supporting the vast majority of the technical aspects of operating the .islam TLD.

27. Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD. The description must:
• explain the various registration states as well as the criteria and procedures that are used to change state;
• describe the typical registration lifecycle of create/update/delete and all intervening steps such as pending, locked, expired, and transferred that may apply;
• clearly explain any time elements that are involved - for instance details of add-grace or redemption grace periods, or notice periods for renewals or transfers; and
• describe resourcing plans for this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).

The description of the registration lifecycle should be supplemented by the inclusion of a state diagram, which captures definitions, explanations of trigger points, and transitions from state to state. If applicable, provide definitions for aspects of the registration lifecycle that are not covered by standard EPP RFCs. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adopt the CoCCA harmonized life cycle currently adopted by a dozen ccTLDs. The .islam life-cycle described below builds on the CoCCA technology and policy launched in November 2011 that sought to increase the accuracy of WHOIS data, minimize harm and increase consumer trust in TLDs. The life-cycle for the .islam TLD builds on the traditional gTLD life-cycle by adding direct Registrant-Registry interaction.

The proposed .islam life-cycle ensures key elements of the .islam TLD abuse prevention and mitigation framework are adhered to by delaying mapping of the Registrant’s desired NS delegation information until the registrant has Activated a domain. All .islam registrations are provisional until Activated. Activation requires that the registrant confirm (with CoCCA) the accuracy of the contact information lodged by the registrar and reads agrees to the .islam Registrant Agreement (RA), AUP and Privacy RDDS Policy.

Activation takes place via automated processes that store the time : date and IP address of the Activation as part of the domains history.

Registrants will also be required to confirm (with CoCCA) the accuracy of the contact details and agreement with the .islam RA, AUP and Privacy RDDS Policy at a) the time of renewal, b) on transfer and c) on the anniversary of registration. The following Life-Cycle describes the CoCCA SRS EPP and WHOIS behavior at various stages in the Life-Cycle.

27.1 Registration | Initial Registration

Not Registered
SRS EPP domain:check response

```xml
<"xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no""/>
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="309" id="21153"/>
  </response>
</epp>
```
SRS WHOIS response
$ whois no-exist.example
Domain Name: no-exist.example
Domain Status: Available

TERMS OF USE: <Legal Notice>

Note if a string cannot be registered for policy reasons the following the SRS will return the following. EPP
domain:check Status

<xsd:schema version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no">
WHOIS Status Display

$ whois profanity.example
Domain Name: profanity.example
Domain Status: Not Registered
Notes: This name is not allowed by the policy of this registry, and cannot be registered


Registered | Status “Pending Activation”

The Activation and Confirmation requirements run in parallel to Grace, MIN, Pending Delete, Pending Purge and other SRS states. As soon the application is lodged via the SRS EPP and WHOIS servers will return the following.

EPP domain:info Status

```
<response>
  <epp>
    <response>
      <result code="1000">Command completed successfully</result>
      <result id="21153">
        <msgQ count="309" id="21153"></msgQ>
        <resData>
          <domain:infData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
            <domain:name>pending.example</domain:name>
            <domain:roid>1234-CoCCA</domain:roid>
            <domain:status s="inactive">Delegation information has not been mapped</domain:status>
            <activation:status xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0" s="pendingActivation">This domain requires acceptance of AUP and registrant agreement by 2012-04-09 15:39</activation:status>
          </domain:infData>
        </resData>
      </result>
    </response>
  </epp>
</response>
```
WHOIS Status Display Example

$ whois pending.example
Domain Name: pending.example
Domain ID: 12345-CoCCA
WHOIS Server: whois.example
Referral URL: 
Updated Date: 2012-02-07T03:51:17.543Z
Creation Date: 2010-03-04T04:15:10.423Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2015-07-04T04:15:10.434Z
Sponsoring Registrar: Example Registrar
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 1234
Domain Status: pendingActivation

Registrant ID: 12345-CoCCA
Registrant Name: Example Registrant
Registrant Organization: Example Org
Registrant Street: 1 Example Rd
Registrant City: Exampleville
Registrant State-Province: EX
Registrant Postal Code: 1234
Registrant Country: EX

Name Server: ns1.example.com
Name Server: ns2.example.com

DNSSEC: unsigned

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and an EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.
27.1.1 Contractual Considerations:

Under the .islam TLD policy all registrations are considered provisional by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. until the Registrant accepts the .islam RA and confirms the accuracy of the contact details lodged by the Registrar.

27.1.2 Behavior:

Until such time as the domain is Activated it is parked on a Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. controlled website that displays the domains port 43 WHOIS information. The SRS ignores the registrar-submitted Name Server ("NS") delegation information for all domains with a status of "Pending Activation" and replaces them with the CoCCA parking servers.

27.1.3 Duration:

A provisional application may be Activated by the Registrant or Administrative Contact at any time during the first 28 days after the Registration request is lodged in the SRS. On the 29th day after registration if a domain has not already been deleted by the Registrar, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. deems the application to have been withdrawn by the registrant and the Status is changed to "Pending Purge " Restore Not Possible".

```xml
<response>
  <result code="2303">
    <msg>Object does not exist</msg>
  </result>
  <trID>
    <clTRID>TR-2</clTRID>
    <svTRID>1333583795929</svTRID>
  </trID>
</response>
</epp>

EPP domain:check Status

```xml
<response>
  <result code="1000">
    <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
  </result>
</response>
</epp>
```
WHOIS Status Display (Domain Status: Excluded - Pending Purge). The Registrant and their Registrar are sent an email and EPP Polling message indicating the Status change.

On the 31st day after Registration, a domain that has not been Activated is purged from the SRS and instantly available for registration. Registrars are sent a polling message and email informing them that the domain application has been rejected and the domain has been deleted.

27.1.4 Commercial Considerations:

Funds are debited from the Registrars account instantly and refunded in full after 31 days if a domain is not activated and where Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has deemed the application to register to have been withdrawn. Names that are not Activated are not delegated in accordance with the Registrants wishes and cannot be used for tasting.

27.2 Registered Activated

Once Activated the EPP Domain:info Status is automatically changed to "Active - Delegated" and the WHOIS display to "Active - Delegated".

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

- Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
- Contact Confirmation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
- Registration Grace Expiry Date: [Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z]

Note: [Grace Period expires as soon as a name is activated]

27.3 Registration Grace

A one (1) day Grace period applies to all registrations, Provisional (pending activation) registrations. If a name is Activated the Grace Period is instantly expired. This policy effectively mitigates the prospect of abuse of the .islam TLD or CoCCA’s SRS for domain tasting, kiting or other similar activity, while allowing a registrar 24 hours
to reverse a registration that included a typographical error or was found to be fraudulent without incurring a commercial penalty.

EPP domain:info Status

```xml
<"xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"">
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="309" id="21153"/>
  </response>
  <domain:infData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
    <domain:name>pending.example</domain:name>
    <domain:roid>1234-CoCCA</domain:roid>
    <domain:status s="inactive">Delegation information has not been supplied</domain:status>
    <domain:registrant>example</domain:registrant>
    <domain:clID>adam</domain:clID>
    <domain:crID>adam</domain:crID>
    <domain:crDate>2012-04-02T03:39:55.925Z</domain:crDate>
    <domain:exDate>2013-04-02T03:39:55.942Z</domain:exDate>
    <domain:authInfo>
      <domain:pw>example</domain:pw>
    </domain:authInfo>
  </domain:infData>
  <extension>
    <rgp:infData xmlns:rgp="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0 rgp-1.0.xsd">
      <rgp:rgpStatus s="addPeriod"/>
    </rgp:infData>
  </extension>
</epp>
```

WHOIS Status Display

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values – after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

Activation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
27.3.1 Registration Grace | Behavior
Domains deleted during Grace do NOT go into redemption and are instantly available. Domains may NOT be transferred during GRACE. The Domain Status shown in a WHOIS and EPP query during grace is “clientTransferProhibited”.

27.3.2 Registration Grace | Commercial Considerations
A full refund equal to 100% of the registration value is applied to a registrars account for domains that are not activated in the first 24 hours. If a domain is Activated in the first 24 hours then deleted it is considered to have been deleted during the “MIN” period as Grace expires on Activation. See Section 28 below for explanation of “MIN”.

27.4 MIN Period
The MIN period is a life-cycle element that is probably unique to the CoCCA SRS - and mostly commercial in nature. The MIN period for the .islam is 14 days, the MIN period starts when a name is registered.

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following value - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

27.4.1 Registration MIN | Behavior
Domains deleted by a registrar during the MIN period do NOT go into redemption. Domains may not be transferred during MIN. (the Domain Status shown in a WHOIS and EPP query is “clientTransferProhibited”). An EPP polling message is sent when the MIN period expires.

27.4.2 Registration MIN | Commercial Considerations
Since the Grace period is only one day - and only for domains that are not activated, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will give registrars a partial refund (80% of the annual registration fee) for Activated names that are deleted in the first 14 days after registration.

27.5 Renewals
Under the .islam TLD RA registrants are required to confirm the accuracy of the contact details and accept the .islam TLD RA, AUP and Privacy Policy with the registry within 28 days of renewal or the domain is suspended until such time as the RA is accepted and contact details confirmed.

27.6 Expiry
The SRS supports “registrar configurable auto renew”, registrars may custom configure the auto-renew behavior via CoCCA’s GUI. Some registrars may wish to auto renew domains on expiry while others may not. If a registrar has configured auto renew the SRS, and they have available credit, the SRS will renew the domain for the period selected by the registrar (up to the maximum allowable) on the day it expires. If a name expires the following would apply.

Unless ICANN objects, the SRS will automatically update the domain record so that a query of the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) or EPP Domain:info query will also display the following value - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

> Contact Confirmation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
> Registration Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
> Registration MIN Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
27.6.1 Expiry Grace | Suspension
On Expiry a domain automatically enters a seven day Expiry Grace period in which the domain is Suspended by the SRS and parked on a Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. parking page.

An expired and suspended name is not locked and may be renewed without a restore fee in the first seven (7) days after expiration. Suspended domains may NOT be transferred.
27.6.2 Expiry | Pending Delete - Restorable (Redemption)

On the eighth day after expiration the SRS will change the domain’s Status to "Pending Delete Restorable" for a period of 28 days. Suspended and Pending Delete domains may NOT be transferred. At any point between after day seven (7) and before day 29 a registrar may Restore a domain via EPP (RFC-3915) after restoration a domain must be renewed.

The SRS will automatically update the domain record so that a query of the WHOIS or EPP will also display the following values.

› Redemption Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
› Purge Date: 2011-12-31

27.6.3 Expiry | Pending Purge (No longer Restorable)

On the 29th day after expiry the SRS will change the status of the domain to "Pending - Purge" and apply a registry lock. The WHOIS status and EPP Domain:info query would be displayed as Pending Purge. The domain would stay in this state for seven (7) days until purged from the SRS 35 days after Expiry. Once purged it is available - subject to any restrictions or policies in effect at the time.

See Attached Life - Cycle Diagram

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 described below.

- 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;
- Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (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:
  - Requiring multi-factor authentication (i.e., strong passwords, tokens, one-time passwords) from registrants to process update, transfers, and deletion requests;
  - Requiring multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests; and
  - Requiring the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 20 pages.

28.1 Policy Matrix
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has chosen to adopt CoCCA’s tested acceptable use-based policy matrix, recommendations for minimising harm in TLDs, and subject the .islam TLD to the CoCCA Complaint Resolution Service ("CRS"). Any individual who has a concern regarding abuse involving a .islam domain, glue record, or the CoCCA PCH or ISC’s network services as they relate to .islam needs to lodge a complaint via the CRS. CoCCA’s policy regarding glue records is quite simple, Registrars cannot create or use a host if the super-ordinate domain does not exist. When a domain is purged from the SRS CoCCA automatically deletes any glue records. All other glue record related issues can be dealt with via the CRS.

The CoCCA Best practice policy matrix has been developed over a decade and has currently been adopted by 16 TLDs. It was developed for (and by) ccTLDs managers that desired to operate an efficient standards-based SRS system complemented by a policy environment that addressed a registrants use of a string as well as the more traditional gTLD emphasis rights to string.

A key element of CoCCA’s policy matrix is that it provides for registry-level suspensions where there is evidence of AUP violations. The .islam TLD will join other TLDs that utilize the CoCCA’s single-desk CRS. The CRS provides a framework for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to swiftly address concerns regarding the use of .islam domains, and the COCCA network. The AUP can be used to address concerns regarding a domain or any other resource record that appears in the .islam zone.

The CRS procedure provides an effective alternative to the court system while allowing for Complaints against domains to be handled in a way treats each complaint in a fair and equal manor and allows for all affected parties to present evidence and arguments in a constructive forum.
In certain cases, it may be necessary for the CRS to trigger a Critical Issue Suspension, which suspends service of a domain, or removes a host record, when there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. The intent of any CIS is to minimize any abuse that may occur in a timely manner. Any CIS may be appealed through the CoCCA ombudsman’s Amicable Complaint Resolution service.

28.1 Contractual Framework
Under the proposed framework Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will bind registrants to a .islam TLD Registrant Agreement (“RA”). This RA is a collateral agreement that supersedes any Registrar – Registrant agreement and binds all Registrants to the .islam AUP, Privacy and WHOIS policy, CoCCA CRS and any other requirements or dispute mechanisms mandated by ICANN.

The draft .islam AUP follows below in sections 28.4. The RA and WHOIS and Privacy Policy may be viewed at http://coccaregistry.net/.islam-policy

28.2 Minimizing Harm, Pro-active Measures
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adopt the following five (5) key provisions of CoCCA’s already field – tested policies and technology aimed at preventing and mitigating abuse.

28.2.1 “Trust but Verify”
Applicants for .islam registrations must confirm to the registry that they agree to be bound by the registrant agreement and confirm the accuracy of contact details lodged by the Registrar with the registry. Until the Registrant or Administrative contact confirm their contact details with the Registry directly, and view accept the Registrant Agreement .islam domains are excluded from the zone. See Life-Cycle Policy.

Automated Activation processes are already in place for 12 TLD currently using the CoCCA SRS. The process involves direct registry – registrant communication using email details provided to the registry by the Registrar. An automated email is sent to the Registrant and Admin contact that contains a link. The recipient must click on the link where they are directed to a web page that 1) displays the contact information the Registrar provided, 2) displays the .islam RA and AUP policy.

All responses (positive or negative) are lodged against the domains permanent history in the SRS and the time: date / IP address stored.

The process also allows the registry the opportunity to independently verify the accuracy of contact data supplied by the registrar, or at least that there is a functioning email – improving WHOIS accuracy. The SRS uses dynamically generated images as a challenge-response verification to prevent automated processes activating domains and to directly collect and store additional identifying information about individuals Activating a domain, which can be utilised to control fraud or investigate cyber crimes.

Although registrars are required to advise registrants of the TLD policies and conditions, with the prevalence of highly automated registration systems and expansive reseller networks it cannot be guaranteed that registrants have reviewed or agreed to the policy.

The registrant or administrative contact must confirm the accuracy of the WHOIS data on not only on Registration but also the anniversary of Registration and Renewal. On any change of Registrant or Transfer the new Registrant must also agree to the RA and AUP directly with the Registry before the changes to the contacts are committed in the registry.

These procedures and the underlying technology are in use now and undergoing constant refinement in response to Registrar and Registrant suggestions.
28.2.2 Registrants’ rights to a limited license
The .islam RA and AUP limit a registrants’ rights to a limited license to use but not to sub-license the use of any portion of the allocated SLD, subject to continuing compliance with all policies in place during that time. Registrants must warrant they will not assign the licence or sub-license any sub-domain without:

(a) securing the sub-licensee’s agreement to the RA, AUP and all other applicable policies; and
(b) obtaining the registry’s consent in writing.

Rationale: It has occurred that registrants have registered a second level domain in order to set up what amounts to a third level registry, effectively sub-licensing to third parties the use of portions of their allocated second level domain. Most abuse seems to occur in lower level domains created by Registrants or third parties.

The .islam TLD policy is recursive, however combating abusive activity in a TLD is complicated if the registry has no information as to the user of the subordinate domain or any way to suspend a single domain created by a registrant at a subordinate level.

28.2.3 Fast flux mitigation
Fast flux mitigation - queue for manual intervention by SRS admins all DNS delegation modifications that exceed four (4) requests in any 28 day period or three (3) in a one week period.

Rationale: This minimizes a registrant’s ability to frequently redelegate a domain, in order to overcome service limitations imposed by Internet service providers. Frequent redelegation may also assist a malicious user to obscure their identity. Limiting frequent redelegations enhances the effectiveness of service termination as a sanction by an Internet service provider.

28.2.4 Anycast Resiliency
A denial of service attack from, say, a single ISP will usually only affect a single node. All other nodes in the world will not notice anything about the attack and the rest of the Internet will thus not notice it either. A local attack is therefore only affecting the local neighborhood. Distributed denial of service attacks usually affects a few nodes only, but because the attack is spread out between nodes, so is the amount of traffic flowing to each node. With 80+ noes and two Anycast networks, the .islam TLD is well protected against abuse targeting the .islam DNS resolvers.

28.2.5 High Risk Strings
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will require manual intervention by the registry operator before domains that contain various strings such as “bank”, “secure”, “PayPal” etc., go into the zone. A comprehensive list of high-risk strings

28.2.6 Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. CERT Law Enforcement Collaboration
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will provide CERT, Law Enforcement and other interested parties direct read - only Access to the SRS on application for research and other activities related to identifying and mitigating abuse. The CoCCA already provides direct access to the Australian Government CERT.

The CoCCA SRS contains a variety of login types with various permissions, one such type is “Cert \ Law Enforcement” which allows GUI - based query as well as EPP and Zone Access.

28.3 COCCA Complaint Resolution Service
The Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”) provides a transparent, efficient and cost effective way for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to have their concerns addressed regarding use of a TLD managers network or SRS services. The CRS provides a single framework in which cyber-crime, accessibility of prohibited Internet content and abuse of intellectual property rights are addressed. The framework relies on three tiers of review: immediate action to protect the public interest, amicable complaint resolution lead by an independent Ombudsman, and where applicable, adjudication by an Expert. The CRS provides an efficient and swift
alternative to the Courts.

All complaints made against a domain to CoCCA are referred through the CRS protocol. When a complaint is filed, a CoCCA Complaints Officer (CCO) ensures that it meets the necessary criteria. If it does, notice is sent to involved parties and CRS Proceedings begin. If a Registrant responds to the complaint, it may be referred to an Ombudsman for Amicable Complaint Resolution (ACR). If ACR does not achieve acceptable resolution, binding arbitration by an Expert be requested by the Complainant.

In some cases, a Critical Issue Suspension (CIS) may become necessary. If a CIS has been determined to be necessary, the domain, or other resource record in a zone will be disabled until a resolution is found using the CRS protocol. A CIS is triggered in cases where there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. A CIS does not terminate the license to a domain, and cannot be used to trigger the transfer a domain – it simply suspends resolution.

CRS Overview Diagram – cocca-crs1.pdf

28.4 .ISLAM Acceptable Use Policy

This Acceptable Use Policy (“AUP”) sets out the actions prohibited to users of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) (“applicant”) network. “Users” are defined as anyone who uses or accesses the .ISLAM domain SRS, who has responsibility for one or more host records in the .ISLAM zone files generated from the .ISLAM SRS, registrants of a .ISLAM Top Level (“TLD”) Domain name (“.ISLAM Domain name”), and/or users of hardware, name servers, bandwidth, telecommunications transport, zone files or e-mail routing services or of any other domain name resolution systems and services in the .ISLAM SRS and zone. Exceptions for use will be made for sites that denigrate the Islamic Principles, Culture and History.

This AUP policy applies recursively to all Domain names (which end in the suffix .ISLAM), including second-level .ISLAM Domain names (such as <nic.ISLAM>) and sub second-level domains (such as <example.nic.ISLAM>) which are maintained in the authoritative .ISLAM register (managed by AGITSys); and those that are created outside the AGITSys TLD register and resolve as a result of sub-delegation by a Registrant.

No reference in this document constitutes a license to sub-delegate or otherwise sub-license any right obtained under the .ISLAM Registrant Agreement, this AUP or other applicable .ISLAM TLD Policies.

This AUP is in addition to rules governing qualifications for registration. Use of a .ISLAM Domain name or the AGITSys Network in a manner that contravenes this AUP, may result in the suspension or revocation of a registrant’s right to use a .ISLAM Domain name or to continue to be recognized as the registrant of a .ISLAM Domain name.

Suspension or revocation may apply to one or more .ISLAM Domain names for which User is a registrant in addition to a particular .ISLAM Domain name which may have given rise to a particular complaint.

AGITSys reserves the right to modify or update this AUP at any time and any such modifications or restatements shall be posted on AGITSys’ website at http://registry.ISLAM-legal-aup.htm from time to time. AGITSys will use reasonable commercial efforts to inform designated contacts in the event of changes to this AUP. Such efforts may include posting the revised AUP on AGITSys’ website and/or sending email notice that this AUP has been modified or updated.

INTRODUCTION

AGITSys supports the free flow of information and ideas over the Internet. However, AGITSys protects the .ISLAM TLD with rigorous acceptable use certification program in addition to a robust enforcement platform.

AGITSys may discontinue, suspend, or modify the services provided to the registrant of an .ISLAM Domain name (for example, through modification of .ISLAM zone files), to address alleged violations of this AUP (described further below). AGITSys may determine in its sole discretion whether use of the AGITSys network or a .ISLAM Domain name is prima facie violation of this AUP. AGITSys or affected parties may utilize the AGITSys AUP CRS and/or the courts in the jurisdiction and venue specified in the Registrant Agreement to resolve disputes over interpretation and
implementation of this AUP, as described more fully in the AGITSys AUP CRS.
Users of the AGITSys Network are obliged and required to ensure that their use of a .ISLAM Domain name or the AGITSys
Network is at all times lawful and in accordance with the requirements of this AUP and applicable laws and
regulations of Turkey.
This AUP should be read in conjunction with the AGITSys Registrant Agreement, Complaint Resolution Policy, Privacy
Policy, Acceptable Use Policy, and other applicable agreements, policies, laws and regulations. By way of example,
and without limitation, the Registrant Agreement sets forth representations and warranties and other terms and
conditions, breach of which may constitute non-compliance with this AUP.

PROHIBITED USE
A “Prohibited use” of the AGITSys Network or a .ISLAM Domain name is a use which is expressly prohibited by
provisions of this AUP. The non-exhaustive list of restrictions pertaining to use of the AGITSys Network and .ISLAM
Domain names in relation to various purposes and activities are as follows. Registration of one or more .ISLAM Domain
names or access to services provided by AGITSys may be cancelled or suspended for any breach of, or non-compliance
with this AUP:

1. COMPLIANCE WITH AGITSys AUP
1.1 The AGITSys Network and .ISLAM Domain names must be used for lawful purposes and comply with this AUP. The
creation, transmission, distribution, storage of, or linking to any material in violation of applicable law or
regulation or this AUP is prohibited. This may include, but is not limited to, the following:
(1.1) Communication, publication or distribution of material (including through links or framing) that infringes upon
the intellectual and/or industrial property rights of another person. Intellectual and/or industrial property rights
include, but are not limited to: copyrights (including future copyright), design rights, patents, patent
applications, trademarks, rights of personality, and trade secret information.
(1.2) Communication, publication or distribution of material (including through links or framing) that denigrates the
Islamic Principles, Culture and History.
(1.3) Registration or use of a .ISLAM Domain name in circumstances in which, in the sole discretion of the AGITSys:
(1.3.a) The .ISLAM Domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a personal name, company, business or other
legal or trading name as registered with the relevant Turkish agency, or a trade or service mark in which a third
party complainant has uncontested rights, including without limitation in circumstances in which:
(1.3.a.i) The use deceives or confuses others in relation to goods or services for which a trade mark is registered
in Turkey, or in respect of similar goods or closely related services, against the wishes of the registered
proprietor of the trade mark; or
(1.3.a.ii) The use deceives or confuses others in relation to goods or services in respect of which an unregistered
trade mark or service mark has become distinctive of the goods or services of a third party complainant, and in which
the third party complainant has established a sufficient reputation in Turkey, against the wishes of the third party
complainant; or
(1.3.a.iii) The use trades on or passes-off a .ISLAM Domain name or a website or other content or services accessed
through resolution of a .ISLAM Domain as being the same as or endorsed, authorized, associated or affiliated with the
established business, name or reputation of another; or
(1.3.a.iv) The use constitutes intentionally misleading or deceptive conduct in breach of AGITSys policy, or the laws
of Turkey; or
(1.3.b) The .ISLAM Domain name has been used in bad faith, including without limitation the following:
(1.3.b.i) The User has used the .ISLAM Domain name primarily for the purpose of unlawfully disrupting the business or
activities of another person; or
(1.3.b.ii) By using the .ISLAM Domain name, the User has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with respect
to the third party complainant’s intellectual or industrial property rights and the source, sponsorship, affiliation,
or endorsement of website(s), email, or other online locations or services or of a product or service available on or through resolution of a .ISLAM Domain name;
(1.3.b.iii) For the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the Domain name to an entity or to a
commercial competitor of an entity, for valuable consideration in excess of a User’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly associated with acquiring the Domain Name;
(1.3.b.iv) As a blocking registration against a name or mark in which a third party has superior intellectual or industrial property rights.
(1.4) A .ISLAM Domain name registration which is part of a pattern of registrations where the User has registered domain names which correspond to well-known names or trademarks in which the User has no apparent rights, and the .ISLAM Domain name is part of that pattern;
(1.5) The .ISLAM Domain name was registered arising out of a relationship between two parties, and it was mutually agreed, as evidenced in writing, that the Registrant would be an entity other than that currently in the register.
(1.6) Unlawful communication, publication or distribution of registered and unregistered know-how, confidential information and trade secrets.
(1.7) Publication or distribution of content which, in the opinion of the AGITSys:
(1.7.a) is capable of disruption of systems in use by other Internet users or service providers (e.g. viruses or malware);
(1.7.b) seeks or apparently seeks authentication or login details used by operators of other Internet sites (e.g. phishing); or
(1.7.c) may mislead or deceive visitors to the site that the site has an affiliation with the operator of another Internet site (e.g. phishing).
(1.8) Communication, publication or distribution, either directly or by way of embedded links, of images or materials (including, but not limited to pornographic material and images or materials that a reasonable person as a member of the Muslim community would consider to be obscene or indecent) where such communication, publication or distribution is prohibited by or constitutes an offence under the laws of Turkey, whether incorporated directly into or linked from a web site, email, posting to a news group, internet forum, instant messaging notice which makes use of domain name resolution services in the .ISLAM TLD.
Material that a reasonable member of the Muslim community would consider pornographic, indecent, and/or obscene or which is otherwise prohibited includes, by way of example and without limitation, real or manipulated images depicting child pornography, bestiality, excessively violent or sexually violent material, sexual activity, and material containing detailed instructions regarding how to commit a crime, an act of violence, or how to prepare and/or use illegal drugs
(1.9) Communication, publication or distribution of defamatory material or material that constitutes racial vilification.
(1.10) Communication, publication or distribution of material that constitutes an illegal threat or encourages conduct that may constitute a criminal offence.
(1.11) Communication, publication or distribution of material that is in contempt of the orders of a court or another authoritative government actor within Turkey.
(1.12) Use, communication, publication or distribution of software, technical information or other data that violates Turkey’s export control laws.
(1.13) Use, communication, publication or distribution of confidential or personal information or data including confidential or personal information about persons that collected without their knowledge or consent.
1.2 Acceptable Use Certification Program
Use being deemed “Acceptable” begins with certifications in the registration and renewal process. Certification constitutes a series of acknowledgements that the Registrant is either of Muslim faith, or has a clear interest in ameliorating the community. Acceptable Use Certification contains the following:
1. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God.”, as a Muslim.
2. Registrants must accept and abide by the following:
   a. No denegation of The Prophet Mohammad will be propagated within any site content of the .ISLAM TLD
b. Messaging about Islam or the Quran will not criticize Islam and the Muslim faith

c. Registrants and Users will refrain from activities that run contrary to Islamic principles

d. Not use the .ISLAM TLD or site content as a communications and coordination vehicle of radical or terrorist activities

e. Will not establish third level DNS management of a second level .ISLAM domains

2. ELECTRONIC MAIL

2.1 AGITSys expressly prohibits Users of the AGITSys Network from engaging in the following activities:

(1.1) Communicating, transmitting or sending unsolicited bulk e-mail messages or other electronic communications (“junk mail” or “Spam”) of any kind including, but not limited to, unsolicited commercial advertising, informational announcements, and political or religious tracts. Such messages or material may be sent only to those who have expressly requested it. If a recipient asks a User to stop sending such e-mails, then any further e-mail messages or other electronic communications would in such event constitute Spam and violate the provisions and requirements of this AUP.

(1.2) Communicating, transmitting or sending any material by e-mail or otherwise that harasses, or has the effect of harassing, another person or that threatens or encourages bodily harm or destruction of property including, but not limited to, malicious e-mail and flooding a User, site, or server with very large or numerous pieces of e-mail or illegitimate service requests.

(1.3) Communicating, transmitting, sending, creating, or forwarding fraudulent offers to sell or buy products, unsolicited offers of employment, messages about “Make-Money Fast”, “Pyramid” or “Ponzi” type schemes or similar schemes, and “chain letters” whether or not the recipient wishes to receive such messages.

(1.4) Adding, removing, modifying or forging AGITSys Network or other network header information with the effect of misleading or deceiving another person or attempting to impersonate another person by using forged headers or other identifying information (“Spoofing”).

(1.5) Causing or permitting the advertisement of a .ISLAM Domain name in an unsolicited email communication.

3. DISRUPTION OF AGITSys NETWORK

3.1 No-one may use the AGITSys Network or a .ISLAM Domain name for the purpose of:

(1.1) Restricting or inhibiting any person in their use or enjoyment of the AGITSys Network or a .ISLAM Domain name or any service or product of AGITSys.

(1.2) Actually or purportedly reselling AGITSys services and products without the prior written consent of AGITSys.

(1.3) Transmitting any communications or activity, which may involve deceptive marketing practices such as the fraudulent offering of products, items, or services to any other party.

(1.4) Providing false or misleading information to AGITSys or to any other party through the AGITSys Network.

(1.5) Facilitating or aiding the transmission of confidential information, private, or stolen data such as credit card information (without the owner’s or cardholder’s consent).

4. NETWORK INTEGRITY AND SECURITY

4.1 Users are prohibited from circumventing or attempting to circumvent the security of any host, network or accounts (“cracking” or “hacking”) on, related to, or accessed through the AGITSys Network. This includes, but is not limited to:

(1.1) accessing data not intended for such user;

(1.2) logging into a server or account which such user is not expressly authorized to access;

(1.3) using, attempting to use, or attempting to ascertain a username or password without the express written consent of the operator of the service in relation to which the username or password is intended to function;

(1.4) probing the security of other networks;

(1.5) executing any form of network monitoring which is likely to intercept data not intended for such user.

4.2 Users are prohibited from effecting any network security breach or disruption of any Internet communications including, but not limited to:

(2.1) accessing data of which such User is not an intended recipient; or
For the purposes of this section 4.2, "disruption" includes, but is not limited to:
port scans, TCP-UDP floods, packet spoofing;
forged routing information;
deliberate attempts to overload or disrupt a service or host;
using the AGITSys Network in connection with the use of any program, script, command, or sending messages with the intention or likelihood of interfering with another user’s terminal session by any means, locally or by the Internet.

4.3 Users who compromise or disrupt AGITSys Network systems or security may incur criminal or civil liability. AGITSys will investigate any such incidents and will cooperate with law enforcement agencies if a crime is suspected to have taken place.

5. NON-EXCLUSIVE, NON-EXHAUSTIVE
This AUP is intended to provide guidance as to what constitutes acceptable use of the AGITSys Network and of .ISLAM Domain names. However, the AUP is neither exhaustive nor exclusive.

6. COMPLAINTS
Persons who wish to notify AGITSys of abusive conduct in violation of this AUP may report the same pursuant to the AGITSys Acceptable Use Policy Enforcement Procedure, which is instituted by submitting to AGITSys a completed AGITSys Acceptable Use Policy Violation Complaint Form.

7. ENFORCEMENT
AGITSys may, in its sole discretion, suspend or terminate a User's service for violation of any of the requirements or provisions of the AUP on receipt of a complaint if AGITSys believes:
(1.1.a) a violation of the AUP has or may have occurred; or
(1.1.b) suspension and/or termination may be in the public interest.
AGITSys may delegate its right to take any action to an Internet security agency or may act upon any report from an Internet security agency without prior notification to the User.
If AGITSys elects not to take immediate action, AGITSys may require Registrants and a complainant to utilise the AUP Complaint Resolution Service and Policy to ensure compliance with this AUP and remedy any violation or suspected violation within a reasonable time prior to suspension or terminating service.

Enforcement Techniques:
Scan of Zone for Content
Scan of Zone for Registered names that fail to meet registration requirements
Scan of zone for third level DNS and domain registration activity
Acceptable Use Recertification at registration and renewal via online registration systems
Review of Registrant contact information against international terrorist watch lists, and collaboration with counter-terrorism organizations
User and/or Registrant self-policing and notification of abusive content or activity

8. LIMITATION OF LIABILITY
In no event shall AGITSys be liable to any User of the AGITSys Network, any customer, nor any third party for any direct, indirect, special or consequential damages for actions taken pursuant to this AUP, including, but not limited to, any lost profits, business interruption, loss of programs or other data, or otherwise, even if AGITSys was advised of the possibility of such damages. AGITSys' liability for any breach of a condition or warranty implied by the Registrant Agreement or this AUP shall be limited to the maximum extent possible to one of the following (as AGITSys may determine):
(i) supplying the services again; or
(ii) paying the cost of having the services supplied again.

9. REMOVAL OF CONTENT RESPONSIBILITY
At its sole discretion, AGITSys reserves the right to:
(i) Remove or alter content, zone file data or other material from its servers provided by any person that violates
the provisions or requirements of this AUP;
(ii) re-delegate, redirect or otherwise divert traffic intended for any service;
(iii) notify operators of Internet security monitoring, virus scanning services and-or law enforcement authorities of any apparent breach of this AUP or .ISLAM TLD Policies; and-or
(iv) terminate access to the AGITSys Network by any person that AGITSys determines has violated the provisions or requirements of this AUP.
In any regard, AGITSys is not responsible for the content or message of any newsgroup posting, e-mail message, or web site regardless of whether access to such content or message was facilitated by the AGITSys Network. AGITSys does not have any duty to take any action with respect to such content or message by creating this AUP, and Users of the AGITSys Network are obliged and required to ensure that their use of a .ISLAM Domain name or the AGITSys Network is at all times in accordance with the requirements of this AUP and any applicable laws and-or regulation.

28.5 CoCCA CRS - Policies and Procedures

1. Statement of Purpose

1.1. This Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”) provides a transparent, efficient and cost effective way for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to have their concerns addressed regarding use of a TLD Managers network or services.

1.2. The Service provides a single framework in which cyber-crime, accessibility of prohibited Internet content via a member’s network or services and abuse of intellectual property rights are addressed. The framework relies on three tiers of review: immediate action to protect the public interest, amicable complaint resolution lead by an independent Ombudsman, and where applicable, adjudication by an Expert. The CRS provides an efficient and swift alternative to the Courts.

This document should be read in conjunction with the Acceptable Use Policy (“AUP”) applicable to the domain - TLD you are considering lodging a complaint against. If after having reviewed the applicable AUP Policy it is determined a violation has occurred, a complaint may be lodged by completing the CoCCA CRS Complaint form.

NOTE: IF YOU DO NOT LODGE THE SIGNED COMPLAINT FORM THAT FOLLOWS BELOW ON PAGES 8-13 OF THIS DOCUMENT, YOUR COMPLAINT WILL NOT BE REVIEWED.

Complaints will be reviewed in accordance with the following Steps:

Step One | Confirmation / Communication

A CoCCA Complaints Officer (“CCO”) will review all formally lodged complaints for compliance with the CRS and the applicable AUP. If the CCO considers that the Complaint does not address the matter covered by the AUP, or is unsigned or otherwise violates this Procedure, the Complainant will be promptly notified of the deficiencies identified.

The Complainant shall have five (5) Days from the receipt of notification within which to correct the deficiencies and return the Complaint, failing which the CCO will deem the Complaint to be withdrawn. This will not prevent the Complainant from submitting a different Complaint.

On receipt of the Complaint the CCO will lock domain and associated records until a period of ten (10) Days after the COO and Parties are notified of a Decision by the Ombudsman or and Expert, at which time the domain name may be
Step Two | Immediate Review of Request for Suspension in the Public Interest

On receipt of a properly lodged Complaint, the CCO will initiate a review. When specifically requested by the Complainant the CCO may initiate a Critical Issue Suspension (“CIS”).

A request for a CIS may be granted in cases where there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. A “critical issue suspension” does not terminate the registrant’s rights or their domain license; it simply modifies the NS records in the zone temporarily disabling resolution. All suspensions under the CRS, including a CIS, may be appealed to the Ombudsman’s office for amicable resolution, an Expert Panelist for binding arbitration or a court of competent jurisdiction.

Where the CCO has triggered a CIS, notice will be sent to the Registrant, Administrative Contact, Registrar and Ombudsman within 24 hours of triggering the CIS.

Step Three | Formal Notification

The CCO will send a copy of the Complaint to the Respondent (normally the Registrant and/or Administrative Contact) and the TLD Sponsors designated contact with an explanatory note within 5 days by:

a) Sending the Complaint by post, fax or e-mail to the Respondent at the contact details shown as the Registrant or any other contacts in the TLD Register for the Domain Name that is the subject of the Complaint.

b) The CCO may also, at their discretion send the complaint to any addresses provided to the CCO by the Complainant so far as this is practicable.

c) Except as set forth otherwise, all written communication to a Party or a party’s representative under the Policy or this Procedure shall be made by fax, post or e-mail.

d) Communication shall be made in English, E-mail communications (other than attachments) should be sent in plain text or PDF format so far as this is practicable.

During the course of the proceedings under the CRS, if either Party wishes to change its contact details it must notify the CCO of all changes. However, no change shall be made in the Registrant Information for the Domain Name without mutual agreement of the parties or unless a settlement is reached. Except as otherwise provided in this Procedure or as otherwise decided by the CCO or if appointed, the Expert, all communications provided for under this procedure shall be deemed to have been received:

a) if sent by courier, when signed for by the recipient;
b) if sent via the Internet, on the date that the communication was transmitted

Unless otherwise provided in this Procedure, the time periods provided for under the Policy and this Procedure shall be calculated based on the time zone of the CCO.

Any communication between:
a) the CCO and any Party shall be copied by the CCO to the other Party and if appointed, the Ombudsman or Expert;
b) a Party to another Party shall be copied by the sender to the CCO. The CCO will copy such correspondence to the
Ombudsman or Expert, if appointed.

Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service proceedings

The CCO will promptly notify the Parties by email of the date of the Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service
proceedings. The date
and time of transmission of such email in the time zone of the CCO according to the email header generated by the
CCO’s transmitting emails system will be the date of Commencement of CRS proceedings.

The Response

Within fifteen (15) Days of the date of Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service proceedings, the Respondent may
submit a Response.

The Respondent must send the Response to the CCO signed in electronic form at the addresses set out in the
explanatory coversheet. In determining whether a Response was submitted in a timely manner, the date and time of
receipt (as determined by the CCO’s receiving email server) shall be considered by the CCO as the date and time of
submission, provided that such email i) contains a scanned copy of documents which include signatures, ii) contains
all attachments, iii) is of a form and format which may be opened by the CCO. The Response shall:

a) include any grounds that the Respondent wishes to rely upon to rebut the Complainant’s assertions;
b) specify whether the Respondent wishes to be contacted directly or through an authorized representative, and set
out the e-mail address, telephone number, fax number, and postal address which should be used in communications with
the Respondent;
c) disclose to the CCO whether any legal proceedings have been commenced or terminated in connection with the Domain
Name(s) which is the subject of the Complaint;
d) conclude with the following statement followed by the signature of the Respondent or its authorized
representative:

“The information contained in the response is to the best of the respondent’s knowledge true and complete and the
matters stated in this response comply with the Policy and Procedure and applicable law.”

Within (3) Days following the receipt of a signed copy of the Response, the CCO will forward the Response to the
Complainant. If the Respondent does not submit a Response, the Domain will be suspended 15 days after the CRS
proceedings commence.

Reply by the Complainant

Within five (5) Days of receiving the Respondent’s Response from the CCO, the Complainant may submit a Reply to the
Respondent’s Response, which shall not exceed 2000 words (not including annexes). The Reply should be confined to
answering any new points raised in the Response not previously dealt with in the Complaint.
Step Four | Amicable Complaint Resolution | Ombudsman

No Amicable Complaint Resolution (“ACR”) will occur if the Respondent does not file a Response. Within three (3) Days of the receipt of the Complainant’s Reply (or the expiry of the deadline to do so), the CCO will arrange with the Ombudsman’s office for Amicable Complaint Resolution to be conducted. ACR will be conducted in a manner that the Ombudsman, at his or her sole discretion, considers appropriate.

Negotiations conducted between the Parties during ACR (including any information obtained from or in connection to negotiations) shall be confidential as between the Parties. Any such information will not be shown to an Expert, should one latter be appointed. Neither the Ombudsman nor any Party may reveal details of such negotiations to any third parties unless a decision-making body of competent jurisdiction orders disclosure. Neither Party shall use any information gained during mediation for any ulterior or collateral purpose or include it in any submission likely to be seen by any court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction in this Complaint or any later Complaint or litigation.

If the Parties reach a settlement during the ACR, then the existence, nature and terms of the settlement shall be confidential as between the Parties unless the Parties specifically agree otherwise, a court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction orders otherwise, or applicable laws or regulations require it.

No binding verbal agreements can be reached as part of the ACR: any settlement reached by the Parties must be in writing to be enforceable.

If the Parties did not achieve an acceptable resolution through ACR within ten (10) Days, the Ombudsman will send notice to the Parties that the Complainant has the option to request appointment of an Expert. The Complainant will have ten (10) Days upon receipt of the notice from the Ombudsman to pay the applicable fees to CoCCA if he or she wants to move forward with binding arbitration by an Expert.

Step Five | Appointment of the Expert and Timing of Decision (Optional)

If the Ombudsman does not receive the Complainant’s request to refer the matter to an Expert together with the applicable fees within ten (10) Days, the Complaint will be deemed to have been withdrawn. This will not prevent the Complainant submitting a different Complaint.

Within five (5) Days of the receipt of the applicable fees from the Complainant, the Ombudsman will appoint an Expert on a rotational basis from a list of Experts. An Expert may only be a person named in the CoCCA list of Experts, which the Ombudsman will maintain and publish along with the Experts’ qualifications. No Expert’s appointment will be challenged on the grounds that they are insufficiently qualified. Once the Expert has been appointed, the Parties will be notified of the name of the Expert appointed and the date by which the Expert will forward, except in the case of exceptional circumstances, his or her decision to the CCO and copy the Ombudsman. The Expert shall be both impartial and independent before accepting the appointment. During the proceedings the Expert will disclose to the Ombudsman any circumstances giving rise to the justifiable doubt as to their impartiality or independence. The Ombudsman will have the discretion to appoint a substitute Expert if necessary, in which case the timetable will be adjusted accordingly.

In addition to the Complaint, and if applicable the Response, the Reply, any appeal notice and appeal notice response, the Expert may request further statements or documents from the Parties. However, the Expert will not be
obliged to consider any statements or documents from the Parties which he or she has not received according to the Policy or this Procedure or which he or she has not requested. The Expert may request a further statement that will be limited to a defined topic but will not be obliged to consider any material beyond that requested.

Step Six | Expert Decision

The Expert will decide a Complaint on the basis of the Policy, the Procedure and the submissions made by the Party. If, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, a Party does not comply with any provision in the Policy, Procedure or any request by the Ombudsman or the Expert, the Expert may draw such inferences from the Party’s non-compliance, as he or she deems appropriate.

Unless exceptional circumstances apply, an Expert shall forward his or her Decision to the Ombudsman within ten (10) Days of his or her appointment. The Decision shall be in writing and signed by the Expert. It will provide the reasons on which the decision is based, indicate the date on which it was made, the place the Decision was made and identify the name of the Expert. Within three (3) Days of the receipt of a Decision from the Expert, the Ombudsman will communicate the full text of the Decision to each Party via email with the date for the implementation of the Decision in accordance with the Policy.

Effect of Court Proceedings

If, before or during the course of proceedings under the Complaint Resolution Service, the Ombudsman is made aware that legal proceedings have begun in or before an applicable court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction or an arbitral tribunal of competent jurisdiction, and that such legal proceedings relate to a Domain Name which is the subject of a Complaint, he or she will suspend the Complaint Resolution Service proceedings pending the outcome of the legal proceedings.

A Party must promptly notify the Ombudsman if it initiates or becomes aware of legal proceedings in a court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction, or arbitral tribunal of competent jurisdiction relating to a Domain Name that is the subject of a Complaint under the proceedings of the Complaint Resolution Service.

Either party may request, before or during the Complaint Resolution Service Proceedings, an interim measure of protection from a court.

Expert Fees

The applicable fees in respect of the referral of proceedings under the Complaint Resolution Service to an Expert are (in United States Dollars), for Complaints involving 1-5 Domain Names and only one Complainant, $2500 plus applicable taxes, such as goods and services taxes (“GST”). For Complaints involving 6 or more Domain Names, and/or or more than one Complainant, the Ombudsman will set a fee in consultation with the Complainant. Fees are calculated on a cost-recovery basis, and are passed on in their entirety to the Expert(s). CoCCA does not charge for its mediation or administration services in respect of the Complaint Resolution Service.

Exclusion of Liability

Neither CoCCA nor its councilors, officers, members, employees or servants nor any Expert, Mediator or any employee of any Expert or Mediator shall be liable to a Party for anything done or omitted, whether negligently or otherwise,
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 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 also include additional measures specific to rights protection, such as abusive use policies, takedown procedures, registrant pre-verification, or authentication procedures, or other covenants.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is fully aware of the importance of protecting the rights of others in the .islam gTLD and has made rights projections a core objective. The .islam TLD Rights Protection is something CoCCA has prioritized by necessity throughout its nine-year history. CoCCA currently complies with UDRP proceedings and will comply with URS proceedings as well with methods for handling Sunrise and Trademark Claims outlined below and guided by Specification requirements of the proposed Registry Agreement.

CoCCA also offers a wide range of services including, a wildcard registration program to block variants of a domain for Trademark holders as well as an “Alert” service that any interested party can subscribe to, alerting them if a specific string is registered in any CoCCA TLD. CoCCA recognizes that ICANN has not completed the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) program. While CoCCA cannot fully describe the details of implementation for this application based on incomplete work, CoCCA intends to comply and/or exceed the final ICANN program.

In particular, CoCCA offers the following procedures to help protect the rights of trademark owners:

Sunrise Services
Trademark Claims Service
Name Selection Policy
Acceptable Use Policy
Unqualified Registration Safeguards
Wildcard Registrations - Alert services
Clearinghouse of Intellectual Property API
Thick WHOIS
RPM Compliance auditing of Registrars
UDRP, URS, PDDRP and RRDRP and CRS
Limited License
Rapid Takedown & Suspension
Malware Mitigation
Fast Flux Mitigation
Phishing Mitigation
DNSSEC Deployment
Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

29.1 Registration Abuse Prevention Mechanisms – Pre Launch
To support Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s objectives, CoCCA will implement specific measures in compliance with ICANN’s Applicant Guide Book. At a minimum, ICANN states that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. must offer sunrise registration for a period of thirty days during pre-launch in conjunction with the Trademark Clearing House.

CoCCA’s RPM framework contains several levels of safeguards to deter unqualified registration and other malicious behaviors during pre-launch. This not only exceeds requirements, but also provides customers of the TLD predictably in service offerings and protections.

29.1.1 Sunrise & Land-rush
To meet the ICANN requirement of a 30-day Sunrise process for those with verifiable trademark rights or owners of exact matching strings in other TLDs, CoCCA shall implement for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. a Sunrise period for domain registrations. The validations of domains names that are an identical match will occur via the Trademark Clearinghouse via notice by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. or Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ approved Registrar.

During the Sunrise, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will be responsible for determining eligibility of the registration and it will require the Registrant to affirm that they meet Sunrise Eligibility Requirements (SERs) and incorporate a Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy (SDRP). The Sunrise will be followed by a 30 day Registration Land-rush for members of the community/business owners-residents-etc. The process will end in General Availability or Open Registration. Eligible Trademark holders may continue to register marks on an ongoing basis.

29.1.2 Trademark Claims Service
Per ICANN’s Applicant Guide Book, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is required to provide a Trademark Claims service during pre-launch phases and for at least 60 days from the date of open registration. During the Trademark Claims period, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. or the Registrar will provide notice to the prospective registrants where an identical match is identified in the Trademark Clearinghouse. The notice will include warranties that the prospective Registrant must understand and adhere that the domain will not infringe on the rights of the respective Trademark holder. A notice will also be sent to the designated Trademark holder of marks where an identical match has been identified.

29.1.3 Name Selection Policy
The .islam TLD will enforce a name selection policy that ensures that all names registered in the gTLD will be in compliance with ICANN mandated technical standards. These include restrictions on 2 character names, tagged names, and reserved names for Registry Operations. All names must also be in compliance with all applicable RFCs governing the composition of domain names. Registrations of Country, Geographical and Territory Names will only be allowed in compliance with the restrictions as outlined in the answer to Question 22.

Additionally, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. requires that domain names within the .islam TLD should consist of proper characters unique within top-level domain, followed by the characters ‘.islam’. Domain
names should meet the following technical requirements; They shall:
- contain no more than 63 characters;
- begin and end with a letter or a digit;
- contain no characters different from letters, figures and a hyphen (allowable characters are the letters of the Roman alphabet; capital and lowercase letters do not differ);
- contain no hyphens simultaneously in the third and forth positions.

Acceptable Use Policy
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has developed an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) that is referenced in the answer to Question 28. This AUP clearly defines what type of behavior is expressly prohibited in conjunction with the use of a .islam domain name. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will require, through both the Registry Registrar Agreement (RRA), and a Registry Registrant Agreement (RA) that this AUP be accepted by a registrant prior to Activation of a domain in the .islam TLD. See Life-Cyle and

29.2 Rights Protection Mechanisms – Post Launch
CoCCA offers a suite of post-launch Rights Protection Mechanisms. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., supported by CoCCA services, will promote the security and stability of the TLD with the following:

Unqualified Registration Safeguards
- Wildcard Registration / Alert services
- Clearinghouse of Intellectual Property API
- Thick WHOIS
- RPM Compliance auditing of Registrars
- UDRP, URS, PDDRP and RRDRP
- Limited License
- Rapid Takedown & Suspension
- Malware Mitigation
- Fast Flux Mitigation
- Phishing Mitigation
- DNSSEC Deployment
- Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

29.2.1 Unqualified Registration Safeguards
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. plans to adopt the CoCCA Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and Complaint Resolution Service Policy (CRS) as part of the operation of the .islam gTLD. See 28.X

The CoCCA model differs from the “classic” gTLD shared registry system in that Registrants are bound by a collateral agreement between themselves and the TLD Operator. This collateral agreement binds them to the TLD AUP policy, WHOIS policy and Complaint Resolution Service.

Although registrars are required to advise registrants of the TLD policies and conditions, with the prevalence of highly automated registration systems and expansive reseller networks it cannot be guaranteed that registrants have reviewed or agreed to the policy. An email reiterating these policies will be sent to each registrant to ensure that new applicants are made aware of and confirm their agreement to these policies.

The same process therefore allows the registry the opportunity to verify the accuracy of customer data supplied by the registrar, use dynamically generated images as a challenge-response verification to prevent automated processes activating domains and to directly collect and store additional identifying information about registrants, which can be utilized to control fraud.

29.2.2 Wildcard Defensive Registrations
CoCCA currently supports a Wildcard option, which will extend to all new gTLDs in which a brand owner/ trademark holder may register a Primary domain and then can upload evidence of the trademark or other rights via PDF in the
GUI.

The Registrant may then apply online to request a *.name or other wildcard block using Java regular expressions for that text string. CoCCA will manually review the request for approval, collisions with other strings etc. If approval is granted, any attempt to register any domain that triggers that string returns “not available for policy reasons” via EPP or GUI.

The domain must be kept current and up to date in order for the Wildcard Registration to be active if the Primary registration lapses, or is subject to a dispute or UDRP ruling and is transferred the Wildcard is removed.

29.2.3 Alert
Subscribers to the Premium WHOIS service may request email alerts if a domain matching a given string, or containing a specified string, is Registered.

29.2.3 Clearing House for Intellectual Property (CHIP)
CHIP is a new technology that is designed to allow trademark owners to efficiently and effectively safeguard and enforce their rights on the Internet, and in particular in the domain name space. CoCCA and IP Clearinghouse, the company that operates CHIP, have collaborated in the past to allow trademark owners to retroactively (or proactively) associate trademark information with specific domain names. This technology is available but may or may not be used depending on the outcome of developments in with gTLD clearinghouse.

29.2.4 Thick WHOIS
CoCCA will provide Thick WHOIS to enhance accessibility and stability and reduce malicious behavior thereby promoting increased rights protection mechanisms and investigations where applicable. All WHOIS services meet Specification 4 of the Registry Agreement in support of Thick WHOIS. The agreement between Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and its Registrars specifies that Registrant information should be complete and accurate and instances where incomplete information occurs will be investigated to prevent reoccurrence. Given the current state nature of WHOIS, CoCCA intends to adapt to new formats and protocols as they go into effect.

29.2.5 Registrar Relationship
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. views the protection of legal rights of a user’s domain name and that of trademark owners as a strategic imperative to operating a successful TLD. Therefore, ICANN accredited Registrars will only be used and be bound to the registry-registrar agreement. Certain components of the RPM framework will be administered on behalf of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.. To ensure compliance with designated RPMs, CoCCA will conduct annual reviews and enforce non-compliance where necessary. In cases where Registrars fail to meet Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ standards, the Registrar will lose its certification to register domains of the TLD until all issues are resolved.

29.2.6 Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)
The UDRP is a proven rights protection mechanism whereby complainants can object to a domain registration via a UDRP provider. The Registrant in question has the opportunity to respond to the complaint and defend its registration and use as good faith. The UDRP provider and assigned panel provide a decision based on the information submitted by both the complainant and the respondent. Where the complainant is successful in proving a bad faith registration ownership of the domain will be transferred accordingly and in line with ICANN policy. Conversely, where the complainant is unable to prove bad faith, the domain registration will remain with the assigned Registrant. Registrars of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ must implement and respond to UDRP policy where applicable. Penalties will apply where Registrars are found to be in breach.

29.2.7 Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS)
CoCCA is required to implement the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) per the Applicant Guidebook. If an infringement is discovered, the complainant may file an objection with a URS provider. The URS provider will investigate compliance via an administrative review. Upon a successful review, the URS provider will notify Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to place the domain in question in lock status within NEED A TIMEFRAME, meaning that no changes to registration data will occur, but the domain continues to resolve. Upon lock of the domain, the
Registrant will be notified and have an opportunity to respond. If the complainant proves the domain is used in an abusive manner, the domain name will be suspended for the remainder of the registration period and will resolve to an informational site provided by the URS provider. The complainant will have the opportunity to extend the registration for one additional year. Conversely, if the evidence does not result in a successful determination of abuse, the URS Provider will contact CoCCA and controls of the registered domain will be returned to the Registrant.

29.2.8 Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP)
Per the Applicant Guidebook, CoCCA is required to implement the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) that allows a complainant the right to object to Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ manner of operation or use of the gTLD. A PDDRP provider will accept objections and perform a threshold review. CoCCA will respond to the complaint as necessary to defend the operation and use Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ .islam gTLD.

29.2.9 Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP)
The Registration Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) outlines the resolution proceedings whereby the Complainant determines that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has failed to comply with its defined registration restrictions. The parties to the dispute will be the gTLD registry operator and the harmed established institution where proper standing has been reviewed and confirmed. A successful complaint proves that the complainant is a defined community and that a strong association exists between it and the gTLD string. Further proof must be submitted that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. violated its community-based restrictions and that measurable harm occurred. Upon administrative review of the complaint, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will file a response within 10 days of the filing.

If the complainant is determined to be the prevailing party, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will pay all Panel and Provider fees incurred, including filing fees. If Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is found to have violated its registration restrictions, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will implement all remedial measures outlined by the Expert Panel, including cases where registration suspension may occur. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. recognizes that this procedure does not preclude entities seeking remedies in courts of laws.

29.2.10 Limited License
Limited License- Registration policies and terms and conditions limit registrants’ rights to a limited license to use (but not to sub-license the use of any portion of) the allocated TLD, subject to continuing compliance with all policies in place during that time.

29.2.11 Rapid Takedown & Suspension
CoCCA, at Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ request, will comply with any takedown or suspension. Usually, these types of requests are based on court orders of competent jurisdiction, but not limited to such. Before any domain take down, CoCCA maintains an internal checklist that will be followed to ensure validation of the request. If for any reason the validation procedure fails, the CoCCA Ombudsman will be notified. Upon confirmation that the registered domain is to be suspended or removed from the zone, CoCCA will execute its auditable procedure documenting the incident number, date, time, domain name, threat level, description and reason for the take down, and any other evidence that may be necessary to properly document the take down. The Ombudsman, Registrar, and Registrant will be notified before and at the time of take down execution.

29.2.13 Malware Mitigation
Where commercially sensible, or a risk factor has been identified, CoCCA will perform automated and regular scanning for malware of all domains (or a subset of domains) in the registry. Often, Registrants are unaware and compromised by malware deployments. Scanning for malware reduces occurrences for this type of abusive behavior for registered domain names in the TLD.

29.2.14 Phishing Mitigation
CoCCA will establish and act upon the results of a regular poll against one or more trusted databases for phishing sites operating (in second level or subordinate domains) within the TLD. Phishing activity most often occurs through a subordinate domain, rather than a directly registered second level domain. For this reason the registry should
query for any wild-card occurrence of a domain that has been flagged as a phishing site or one that contains malware.

29.2.15 DNSSEC Deployment

As part of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ mission to maintain a highly secure and stable TLD, CoCCA will implement DNSSEC as part of its backend registry services. DNSSEC helps mitigate, for example, pharming attacks that use cache poisoning to redirect unsuspecting users to fraudulent websites or addresses. DNSSEC protects the DNS system from abuse threats in the following aspects:

- **Security of Domain Resolution** – DNSKEY/RRSIG provide authentication and integrity verification to ensure data will be compromised during transmission. The CoCCA credit name server trust anchor is signed by the public key and then delivered to the Interim Trust Anchor Repository (ITAR) for TLD verification. NSEC resource records will also be used to verify negative response messages of queried resource records to ensure deletion does not occur during transmission.

- **Security of Zone File Distribution** – TSIG allows communication among authentication servers to ensure that it is the correct server and that data is not compromised during transmission.

29.2.16 Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

CoCCA does and will continue to cooperate closely with anti-abuse communities, experts, and law enforcement in the mitigation and prevention of abuse behavior. Not only will best practice be shared, but also collaboration on the latest issues will remain a priority. In addition to collaboration instances may take the form of early notification by security agency of malicious content. Another form of cooperation may be the provision of user information (including historical and non-publicly available information, where available) to the security agency, to assist identification of wrongdoers. The existence of existing arrangements for dealings between security agencies and the registry operator facilitates the ability for both registry and law enforcement to react promptly to threats, promptly minimizing harm. With respect to suspensions, the registrant will be given an opportunity to remedy via automated processes, given the time sensitive nature of criminal activity automated suspension based on triggers – flags, or at the request of law enforcement should be enabled. Critical domains can be manually “Super Locked” in the registry to ensure they are not removed from the zone or suspended inadvertently by automated suspension technology. Automated suspensions will only be initiated when required to protect the public interest or network integrity. They should not be initiated to simply protect an entity’s or individuals intellectual or other property rights – those sorts of disputes should be dealt with via a formal complaint resolution service.

29.3 Resource Plans

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will dedicate 2 professionals to coordinate the operation of the .islam gTLD. At the same time, the technical professionals at CoCCA will be supporting the vast majority of the technical aspects of operating the .islam gTLD.

As the .islam gTLD is a community-supported effort, it is also expected that members of the community will help Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. develop policies and procedures that govern the operation of the gTLD.

The following Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. team members will be used to support the rights protection plan; CoCCA NOC Support, Ombudsman.

CoCCA acting as Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ registry services provider maintains a resource model to meet the demands of RPM implementation and on-going operation of the protection mechanisms. CoCCA maintains a qualified and experienced technical staff to support registry services that meet or exceed defined service levels.

The CoCCA workforce-staffing model is sized to provide the appropriate services for each managed TLD. Given the dynamic nature of technologies and innovation, the CoCCA staff model is constantly reviewed and adjusted to achieve optimization without sacrifice to customer satisfaction and service level requirements. In cases where growth dictates an increase in staff, CoCCA maintains a proven staffing process for acquiring qualified candidates. Details
of staffing resource plans can be found in response to questions of the Financial Projections section of the application.

There are eight CoCCA CRS Officers whose Role is to monitor registry services and review Complaints lodged online or from Law Enforcement / CERTs CoCCA has an established formal relationship with.

The complaints are dealt with in accordance with the CRS and AUP / Registrant Agreement, which allows the CRS officers discretion to suspend a domain instantly or send the complaint to the Ombudsman for amicable complaint resolution. CRS officers are available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and three hundred and sixty five days a year. CoCCA estimates it will require the following personnel to support the RPM implementation and operations for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.:

Complaint Resolution Service Officers: 8
Complaint Resolution Expert - Minimum of Eight
Ombudsman - One

30A. 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).

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and CoCCA desire to ensure the highest levels of security are applied and maintained for all elements in the chain that ultimately result in the resolution of a .islam TLD on the Internet. CoCCA, together with partners PCH and ISC will endeavor to ensure the secure operation of Registry Services for the .islam TLD as described below.

30.1 DNSSEC - Facility for Key Storage
For reasons of economies of scale and because CoCCA has a nearly decade long relationship with PCH, the .islam key is to be stored offline at a Singapore facility hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA), other DNSSEC key-store facilities that are part of PCH’s project are hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network and at a U.S. facility hosted by
Equinix in San Jose California. The PCH DNSSEC project facilities mirror the security and processes used by ICANN for maintenance of the root.

See Attachment PCH_SG_Backgrounder.pdf

30.1.1 Signature of the .islam

The .islam zones generated by the CoCCA SRS will include the DS records submitted by registrars, zones will be transferred from CoCCA’s hidden signing master DNS to four PCH inbound masters using AXFER / IXFER and TSIG. PCH will transfer the zones using IXFR / AXFRE and TSIG to their signer servers in Frankfurt and Palo Alto. The signed zone is then exported to PCH’s two outbound DNSSEC DNS for secure ASXFR / IXFR TSIG transfer back to CoCCA’s inbound DNSSEC master in Sydney. Key signing keys and zone signing keys are to be rolled out in accordance with best practices and ICANN requirements. CoCCA and PCH’s DNSSEC implementation fully adheres to applicable RFC’s and to the requirements of Specification 6, section 1.3.

30.1.2 Secure Distribution of the Signed Zones

CoCCA has employed the use of a double Anycast and Unicast network for the purpose of distributing signed zones across the DNS. Due to CoCCA’s desire to ensure that this process is not compromised, CoCCA logs and monitors the zone signing and distribution process, and also ensures that the management of signed zones is performed by CoCCA.

On receipt of the signed zones from PCH, CoCCA will perform some basic validation against the zones sent to PCH, and then transfer these zones onto a hidden distribution master DNS which will transfer zones via TSIG and IXAFR / AXFR to ISC’s SNC platform, PCH’s Anycast platform and CoCCA’s Unicast DNS servers. If a critical issue was found that was impacting both the primary and secondary SRS, and if instructed by CoCCA, PCH may distribute the zones to their own Anycast network, the ISC SNS Anycast network and the CoCCA Unicast nodes.

The procedures above have been tested by ccTLDs on CoCCA’s SRS platform.

30.2 Securing the .islam DNS infrastructure and Nodes

The .islam TLD will rely on ISC’s and PCH’s Anycast networks and CoCCA’s Unicast for resolution. ISC authors BIND and pioneered the use of DNSSEC and Anycast technology, PCH manages what is arguably the largest, most geographically dispersed Anycast network, CoCCA currently operates Unicast TLD servers for 12 TLDs. All three entities utilize best of class technology and have rigorous security policies in place to secure, monitor and respond to threats that may compromise the resolution of the .islam TLD.

Both PCH and ISC are members of NSP-Sec and have BGP sinkhole capabilities. Both organizations are well positioned and able to coordinate with ISPs that may be transiting or sourcing Denial of Service attacks (DoS) or other attack traffic to mitigate it closer to its source. The geographically diverse PCH and ISC Anycast services are extremely resilient against DoS attacks, if a node fails or is otherwise compromised, it will swiftly be taken out of the PCH or ISC Anycast cloud, causing traffic to flow to other nodes with minimal or no service disruption. The two independently operated and managed Anycast network’s total distributed capacity will allow the .islam to absorb even a coordinated DoS attack originating from multiple locations at once.

The geographically diverse Anycast network proposed for .islam necessitates locating dozens of nodes in a variety of co-location facilities varying from Tier 4 to Tier 2 - and each facility has different security policies for physical access. From a security and stability perspective, the critical issue is that all nodes be monitored in real time by
PCH, ISC and CoCCA and any node that experiences SLA issues (or is otherwise compromised) is swiftly taken offline or out of the Anycast network. Under CoCCA’s agreements with PCH and ISC, any SLA or security issues with any node in their respective Anycast networks is to be reported immediately so that CoCCA may advise registrars or take any other appropriate action.

30.3 CoCCA’s Sydney SRS Security Policy

30.3.1 CoCCA SYD NOC | SRS Physical Access
CoCCA’s primary NOC is located at Global Switch in the Sydney CBD, an enhanced Tier-3 facility and one of the largest carrier neutral data centers in the southern hemisphere. CoCCA’s SRS servers are housed in a dedicated, caged rack provided by PIPE networks, PIPE also provides CoCCA with the primary bandwidth used by the Sydney SRS.

In order to gain physical access to CoCCA’s servers, an individual must be pre-authorised by CoCCA, pipe and Global Switch - and have formally been inducted by Global Switch. Once approved to enter the facility, an individual must be inspected and be granted access by the Global Switch Security Operations Centre - which is manned 24x7 by security personnel. After passing security, physical access requires passing through a mantrap. Access to the floor, pipe co-location room and master cage is controlled by key-cards with strict access control lists.

Access to CoCCA’s cage and rack require a combination of key-cards and physical keys both of which are distributed by, and only available to, CoCCA staff. All spaces are under constant CCTV surveillance by global switch security and the PIPE Network’s NOC.

CoCCA’s policy is to severely restrict physical access to network appliances, currently only six individuals have physical access to the CoCCA SRS in Sydney and all access is logged. CoCCA’s security policy for physical access is collateral to the Global Switch and PIPE Networks.

30.3.2 CoCCA SYD NOC | SRS Admin Remote Access
The number of individuals with the ability to directly access and administer network appliances is very small - currently six, a number not expected to grow with additional gTLDs. Remote access is only accessible through VPN with the mandatory requirement to use one time passwords (OTP) for authentication purposes. SRS server command line logins use both OTP as well as traditional username and password authentication methods - enabling each login to be traced to an individual.

CoCCA NOC Support Staff, Registrar Support and Complaint / Abuse Officers and Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. staff may only access the SRS via port 443 with OTP from trusted IP addresses. CoCCA NOC Support Staff, Registrar Support and Complaint / Abuse Officers and Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. staff have no physical or remote administrative access to servers or network appliances.

30.3.3 CoCCA’s “pamoja” SRS Software Testing
In designing any security regime it is important to clearly identity potential threats and design the policy to address them. The SRS data is a compilation of publicly available data, and all information on Registrants, Registrars, and Resellers is available via WHOIS, RDDS services or Historical Abstracts. CoCCA does not store credit card or other commercially sensitive confidential information on registrants or registrars in the SRS (or elsewhere). The security threat is not theft of SRS data, it is loss of data or tampering with data.

Information relating to the management of the Data Escrow processes performed by NCC and CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ)
Limited, including information in relation to the backup policies are explained in response to question 38. The Data Escrow process ensures that data is protected against security breaches that result in the loss or unauthorized modification of SRS data, especially as the data can be recovered from several sources. The CoCCA security policy is designed to protect against un-authorized modification of production SRS data.

The only information stored in the SRS that could present a risk should the entire SRS be compromised, stolen and released “into the wild” are SRS credentials and AuthCodes. The credentials and AuthCodes are Hashed (MD5) and Encrypted in the DB. GUI access to CoCCA’s production systems is only granted from trusted IP’s with a requirement for OTP use. For EPP access to the production SRS, the registrar’s IP must be white-listed and they must connect with a CoCCA issued SSL certificate. Even if one were able to steal the SRS DB and de-crypt the login credentials or AuthCodes, other security measures such as IP address locking, OTP and CoCCA issued certificates ensure potential data thieves would not be able to use them to access CoCCA’s production SRS or modify data.

Securing the SRS largely requires ensuring the SRS software cannot be exploited by users. The SRS has four public facing websites, the WHOIS, RDDS, Historical Abstracts and Key Retrieval. The GUI login is not public facing.

CoCCA uses the same “pamoja” SRS database application that it distributes to over 20+ other TLD managers. While the application is tested internally by CoCCA and other TLD manager’s, developers and systems administrators, CoCCA has a policy that each major release also be tested by an independent software testing laboratory. Currently we have contracted with Yonita (http://yonita.com). Yonita tests / audits the pamoja SRS application (not CoCCA’s NOC) for:

* Security vulnerabilities
* Standard quality defects
* Performance anti-patterns
* Database and transaction misuses
* Concurrency issues
* Architectural bad practices

30.3.4 Monitoring and Detecting Threats

CoCCA monitors network traffic and activity through automated processes and seeks to detect threats that impact the SRS and more broadly CoCCA’s Registry Services.

PCH and ISC directly monitor and attempt to detect threats that impact the DNSSEC signing and storage facilities as well as PCH’s and ISC’s respective Anycast networks. Any incident that impacts the security and stability of the .islam TLD in either the PCH DNSSEC facilities or nodes on the ISC or PCH Anycast networks is logged and reported to the CoCCA NOC immediately. ISC and PCH have near-real time reporting for all the Anycast nodes in their clouds and make this information available to CoCCA.

30.3.5 CoCCA SRS NOC | Essential Services Policy

CoCCA’s Security Policy mandates that only essential SRS services (production EPP, WHOIS, RDDS, and SRS GUI with limited access) are to be hosted at the Sydney NOC.

Public facing policy websites, email servers, help-desk software, svn, GIT, team sites, OTE environments, and software development servers are all hosted externally using various commercial cloud - based services. None of these cloud-based servers are configured in such a way that they have access to any SRS services that are not normally available to the public.
30.3.6 CoCCA SRS NOC | Public Access Restrictions Policy

CoCCA’s security policy dictates that only the port 43 WHOIS server, port 443 web-based WHOIS, port 443 AuthCode retrieval site, and port 443 Historical Abstract Site and a single unicast DNS server for the .islam TLD are to be publicly accessible.

Registrars, CoCCA’s registrar support staff, law enforcement or CERTs may access the port 443 GUI interface only if their IP addresses have been white listed in advance and they authenticate using clientID, login and an OTP. CoCCA’s use of OTP tokens allows CoCCA to track activity in the SRS by individual not just loginID (username).

30.3.7 CoCCA SRS NOC | Intrusion Detection

CoCCA Security Policy requires that all SRS traffic originating from outside the NOC be subjected to automated intrusion detection. CoCCA’s firewalls (Watchgaurd XTM) are configured for intrusion detection and are able to inspect encrypted HTTPS traffic. CoCCA’s Barracuda load balancers provide an additional layer of firewall protection, DoS and automated intrusion detection. CoCCA’s NOC firewalls are configured in accordance with best practices with both port and application layer filtering. The load balancers are configured for NAT and are also configured for intrusion detection and DoS attacks.

30.3.8 CoCCA SRS NOC | Auditing an Logging

CoCCA’s Security Policy requires that all access to the SRS via the port 443 GUI is logged with originating IP, clientID, OTP (generated by security token), and that the sessions are time and date stamped. All EPP and WHOIS access logs are to be stored for seven days in the production SRS where they can be readily accessed before being archived. Firewall and VPN access is also logged.

30.3.9 CoCCA SRS NOC | Incident Response

CoCCA NOC Support staff are on hand 24-7-365 to monitor the Registry Services offered at the primary SRS in Sydney and the availability of the Failover and Escrow SRS facilities. NOC Staff perform three “roles”:

1) monitoring the CoCCA Sydney NOC and failover SRS’s – and a dozen or so other SRS’s that CoCCA supports;  
2) registrar support for the CoCCA NOC and four other locally hosted ccTLDs; and  
3) serve as front-line Complaint Resolution Service Officers able to trigger a CoCCA Critical Issue Suspension (CIS) or Uniform Rapid Suspension on a 24-7-365 basis.

The level of SRS access and skills required to perform all three roles are similar. CoCCA NOC support staff have no VPN access or other access to appliances at the CoCCA SRS. The GUI access they have is limited to Customer Service functions, and all the applications they use (helpdesk, monitoring, accounting, email) are hosted outside the primary NOC.

CoCCA’s NOC support is a virtual “function” performed by individuals in New Zealand, Guyana and France (additional NOC staff will be trained and other centers incorporated into the service in Q4 2012). If there is a failure in any of CoCCA’s Registry Services functions, the role of the NOC Support is to:

1) raise the alarm with CoCCA systems administrators or developers as conditions and events dictate;  
2) liaise with PIPE Networks, PCH, ISC, IANA - ICANN and registrars as required.
30.3.10 Provisioning against DNS Denial of Service attacks

A Denial of Service (DoS) attack on a network service floods it with fraudulent requests so that there is no capacity left for legitimate requests. CoCCA’s Anycast DNS service is outsourced to PCH and ISC’s Anycast networks, CoCCA’s managed Unicast DNS ensures Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has at least two “last resort” DNS nodes under direct management. Both PCH and ISC networks provide the .islam with substantial protection against DoS attacks, including anycasting, over provisioning, and network traffic shaping.

Both PCH and ISC utilize traffic shaping methods that rate limit the number of queries per IP address to help prevent abuse and to trigger an investigation of elevated traffic levels to see whether an attacker is testing resource limits or whether ISC or PCH should provision additional bandwidth-servers or remove the node temporarily. In cases of an active DoS against ISC, CoCCA or PCH each will make every effort to identify the offending traffic and its sources to squelch offending traffic at ISP borders before reaching the servers as well as augmenting capacity to handle any legitimate elevated traffic levels.

30.3.11 Provisioning against WHOIS and EPP Denial of Service attacks

CoCCA actively monitors all Registry Services to ensure they meet any required SLA. In the event of a DoS attack that threatens to lower the SLA for WHOIS or EPP services required in the ICANN Agreement, CoCCA will work with our upstream providers (who also monitor the traffic) and attempt to squelch offending traffic at the ISP borders before it reaches the CoCCA RDDS servers. In the event the traffic is found to be legitimate, the bandwidth can be swiftly increased as required.

30.3.12 Failover Routing

CoCCA currently has multiple links to the Internet but does not load balance across them all. The secondary (failover) link is used to replicate and transfer backup WAL and VM image data files to CoCCA’s Failover SRS infrastructure (currently located in Palo Alto) and Escrow NOC. If there is a critical infrastructure issue at PIPE Networks, BGP routing will be used to move our critical infrastructure on our IPV4 and IPV6 address blocks to the failover Telstra link or to one of the two SRS instances outside of Australia. A forth node will be added in Paris (France) in early 2013.

If the issue relates to an SLA problem, changing the A record and CNAME for RDDS services may be sufficient to resolve such an issue in a timely manner. If required by a pro-longed outage BGP routing may be used to re-rout the entire ranges to a failover facility.

30.3.13 Commitments to Registrants

Taken from the .islam WHOIS and Privacy Policy

“6. DATA SECURITY

6.1 CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to protect the Personal Information it holds from misuse and loss and from unauthorized access, modification or disclosure.

7. OPENNESS
7.1 This Policy sets out CoCCA’s policies on its management of Personal Information. CoCCA shall make this document available to anyone who asks for it."
7.2 On request by any person, CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to let the person know, generally, what sort of Personal Information CoCCA holds, for what purposes, and how it collects, holds, uses and discloses that information.

8. ACCESS AND CORRECTION
8.1 All Registrant information lodged by a registrar that is maintained in the CoCCA SRS is publicly available from CoCCA’s RRDS services - WHOIS, Premium WHOIS, and Historical Abstracts.

See the .islam RRDS Policy (Attached) for more information.

8.2 If CoCCA holds Personal Information about a Registrant and the Registrant is able to establish that the information is not true, accurate, and complete and/or up-to-date, CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to facilitate corrections to the information so that current information is accurate, complete and up-to-date – except where the data is contained in an historical record or archive.”

30.3.14 Independent Security Assessments

In addition to software and source security Audits, CoCCA has engaged the services of Connell Wagner Pty Ltd (now known as Aurecon Group Brand (Pte) Ltd) for the purpose of performing independent security audits of the primary data center.

On the condition that a gTLD is approved, CoCCA will engage the services of Aurecon to perform independent security audits to ensure the CoCCA system fully complies with all published security requirements set forth by ICANN. Such reports will be provided to ICANN on request. With new IT infrastructure planned for deployment in 2012 and early 2013, CoCCA will contract further independent assessments with third parties.

© Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

Application Downloaded On: 13 Oct 2015

String: halal

Application ID: 1-2131-60793

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

2. Address of the principal place of business
No.11, 4th Floor, Block D, Metrocity Shopping Mall, Kirgulu St., Buyukdere Ave., 34394, Levent, Istanbul, TR

3. Phone number
+90 212 319 38 87

4. Fax number
+90 212 319 38 02

5. If applicable, website or URL
http://www.agitsys.com
**Primary Contact**

6(a). Name  
*Mehdi Abbasnia*

6(b). Title  
*Managing Director & Member of the Board*

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number  
Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number  
Contact Information Redacted

6(f). Email Address  
Contact Information Redacted

**Secondary Contact**

7(a). Name  
*Tolga Kaprol*

7(b). Title  
*The Head of Technical Dept.*

7(c). Address

7(d). Phone Number  
Contact Information Redacted

7(e). Fax Number  
Contact Information Redacted
Proof of Legal Establishment

8(a). Legal form of the Applicant
Limited Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Trade Registration Office (Ticaret Sicili Memurlugundan)

8(c). Attach evidence of the applicant’s establishment.
Attachments are not displayed on this form.

9(a). If applying company is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.

9(c). If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.

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>Ali Zarinbakhsh</td>
<td>Member of the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Name(s) and position(s) of all officers and partners
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>Ali Zarinbakhsh</td>
<td>Member of the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(d). For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders: Name(s) and position(s) of all individuals having legal or executive responsibility

**Applied-for gTLD string**

13. Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If an IDN, provide the U-label.

**halal**

14A. If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with "xn--").

14B. 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.

14C1. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (in English).

14C2. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (as referenced by ISO-639-1).
14D1. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (in English).

14D2. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (as referenced by ISO 15924).

14E. If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.

15A. 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.

15B. Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and sources used.

15C. List any variants to the applied-for gTLD string according to the relevant IDN tables.

16. Describe the applicant’s efforts to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string. If such issues are known, describe steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in software and other applications.

The team behind Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has been involved in the development of
various IDN scripts for over ten years. Through this work, we have become aware of some issues that may cause rendering problems for certain new gTLDs. We have reviewed the string that will be used with this application and based upon our expertise, we see no issues with operational or rendering problems concerning the applied for gTLD string.

17. OPTIONAL.
Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/).

18A. Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. They are a group whose origins are found some 1400 years in the past, their ethnicity often inextricably linked with their faith. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .HALAL gTLD will change this. As Halal is one of the concepts of the Islam religion, the .HALAL gTLD is the perfect way to easily and simply tie together online the peoples of various nations connected religiously to the Muslim community which was first established more that 1400 years ago. The .HALAL gTLD will be a community application with open to those who embrace the concept and requirements of Halal. Islam is the monotheistic religion articulated by the Qur’an, a text considered by its adherents to be the verbatim word of God (Arabic: ١٠٠٠ Allāh ), and by the teaching and normative example (called the Sunnah and composed of Hadith) of Muhammad, considered by them to be the last prophet of God. An adherent of Islam is called a Muslim. The majority of Muslims are Sunni, being 75–90% of all Muslims. The second largest sect, Shia, makes up 10–20%. About 13% of Muslims live in Indonesia, the largest Muslim country, 25% in South Asia, 20% in the Middle East, 2% in Central Asia, 4% in the remaining South East Asian countries, and 15% in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sizable communities are also found in China, Russia, and parts of Europe. With over 1.5 billion followers or over 22% of earth’s population, Islam is the second-largest and one of the fastest-growing religions in the world.

Halal (Arabic: ﻣ١٠٠٠ ﺑُдержива ﺛُرَّا, “lawful”) is a term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law. The term is used to designate food seen as permissible according to Islamic law. The terms Halal is also applied to many other facets of life; and one of the most common uses of these term is in reference to meat products, food contact materials, and pharmaceuticals. In Islam there are many things that must clearly be defined as halal. The concept of Halal has slowly become accepted as a consumer lifestyle choice encompassing not only religious practices and food, but also finance, non-food products and logistics. Halal provides a set of laws and guiding principles, and separates out those animals that are prohibited (‘haram’) and permitted (‘Halal’). As well as outlining methods of slaughtering, Halal prohibits consuming blood or blood products and intoxicants (e.g. alcohol) etc. The common understanding of Halal is still limited to religious needs and only applicable to Muslims. It is considered a given in Turkey and the Middle East, although consumers in this region generally do not place much importance on specific Halal branding, certification or country of origin. A robust gTLD has the power to bring together Muslims across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. There is not a .COM or .ORG equivalent of .HALAL—a domain that has universal appeal across a common religion.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) was founded in (as is headquartered in) Turkey (an
Islamic nation that straddles Europe and the Middle East) by Muslim people with great affinity with their religion, which manifests itself in both pride and honor. Because of this, and their devotion to creating a quality online space for the Muslim faithful amongst others, AGITSys’ founders have gathered together a highly experienced team with a variety of Internet-based expertise, a daunting but critical task. The team behind AGITSys has taken a leading role in working toward dedicated Muslim domain names for more than 8 years. No entity is better suited to manage the .HALAL gTLD, nor more dedicated to providing new online tools and services to facilitate the unification of the .HALAL community online. The .HALAL gTLD will increasingly open up the vast resources of the Internet and the interconnectedness it brings to the Muslims community, while stimulating the introduction of more information and resources among Muslims online. The .HALAL gTLD is designed to accommodate a global community, and AGITSys’ team’s work with ICANN has always looked not just to serving Muslim people but all users of the internet – thus serving Muslims and those interested in the Muslim faith all around the world – whilst simultaneously achieving ICANN’s goal of creating greater competition in the gTLD space.

18B. How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?

The benefits of the .HALAL gTLD will be manifold, not just to registrants but also to tens of millions of Muslim internet users, as well as many others with an interest in or curiosity regarding Islam. The presence of a Muslim-specific gTLD will increase the volume of online Islamic resources, as the emergence of .HALAL second-level domains sees a network effect kick in. This network effect will create an additional incentive for the digitization of existing Islamic materials, so as to facilitate their posting online as the demand for such material grows. Consequently, the new .HALAL gTLD will also increase access to online resources as the tens of millions of people that read Islamic and Islam-related materials are able, for the first time, to find the material they seek within the sites operating under the .HALAL gTLD. Existing website registrants will be able to extend their presence to that audience with new .HALAL sites, while new registrants will emerge from those Muslim populations brought together by the .HALAL gTLD, adding to the value of the Internet in ways not currently possible.

As the global population expands, more people become willing Internet users and seek out second-level domains. The .HALAL gTLD is flexible, and is thus capable of being used for sites focused on ecommerce, information dissemination, charitable endeavors and many more functions among Muslims. A transformation in competition is anticipated for web sites within .HALAL, to depart from conventional methods of attracting new customers in this expanding market. This is because it will encourage competitors, targeting the extensive and diverse collection of global Islamic Internet users. This incentive doesn’t currently exist in an online space devoid of the .HALAL gTLD, where competition amongst the already saturated existing TLDs is stagnant.

In terms of goals in the areas of specialty, service levels, and reputation for the proposed .HALAL gTLD, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) is committed to offering choice in top level domain extensions among the Islamic community. AGITSys recognizes many new gTLDs will naturally have a relatively narrow appeal and audience. The .HALAL gTLD is different, as it not only targets a distinct online community, but one that spans the globe. AGITSys is prepared to utilize its home market of Turkey as a leading source of registrants and sites, while incorporating the power of the web to connect with myriad other registrants and Internet users beyond Turkey. Further, we intend to adopt and follow the highest standards in registry operations exceeding service levels and expectations thus producing a consistent reputation.

AGITSys has been at the forefront of the ICANN community effort in working to bring the Global Muslim community together through a dedicated gTLD, as well as bringing Muslims in to the larger online community. No organization has a greater understanding both of the opportunities a .HALAL gTLD will afford as well as the challenges that its adoption and spread will bring. AGITSys is prepared to ensure the success of .HALAL, such that it is a shining example of ICANN’s wisdom in granting the gTLD.
The company is committed to bringing top-level domain registration services to registrants. To this end, AGITSys has contracted CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited ("CoCCA") to provide hosted Registry Services for the .HALAL gTLD. CoCCA has over nine years experience authoring open source registry software systems and providing TLD registry support services. CoCCA was originally incorporated in Australia in 2003 as CoCCA Registry Services Limited, in January 2009 CoCCA re-located to New Zealand and trades as CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited. CoCCA is a privately held NZ company.

CoCCA’s clients are managers of county code top level domains (ccTLDs) as of 31 March 2012, 33 national country code top level domains ("ccTLDs") are have selected CoCCA’s SRS technology or services to manage their critical infrastructure. Several other ccTLDs have committed to migration to CoCCA’s “pamoja” EPP Shared Registry System ("SRS") in 2012 pending the outcome of re-delegations. CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. CoCCA’s SRS is a mature product that has grown organically over the past decade as new standards have been developed and published. It is doubtful any other Registry Services provider has accumulated CoCCA’s level of experience operating multiple small to medium sized TLDs efficiently and securely.

AGITSys’ team is also well-known in the ICANN community as a selfless champion of the interests of Muslims around the world, including communities tied to the Islamic heritage. We also have a long history of advising the Turkish internet industry. Our reputation is solid, and we have every incentive to maintain that reputation as we roll out the .HALAL gTLD.

Under the shepherding of AGITSys, the .HALAL gTLD will increase competition, provide more online differentiation for customers and consumers, while driving digital innovation. The addition of the .HALAL gTLD will create new competition for names within the domain name space. Not only will the offering of .HALAL domains create competition within content providers for users of Islamic content, but it is expected that competition will be enhanced among the varying service providers that users require to deploy said content.

As it is rolled out, the .HALAL gTLD will rapidly develop as the gTLD of choice among Muslims in all countries. The demand for Islamic content from this group isn’t and won’t be satisfied by .COM or .ORG offerings within the current gTLDs and in fact has hampered collaboration and innovation. The Islamic people demand content that is tailored to their own unique needs and wants, under the umbrella of a dedicated gTLD. As stated in 18(a) above, as Islamic-content sites increasingly seek to differentiate themselves to consumers, and registrants seek to differentiate themselves to acquirers of second-level domains, the power to differentiate will come from innovative approaches to customer service and the creation of a trusted online environment.

It is AGITSys’ mission that competition and differentiation of the .HALAL gTLD will be coupled with a user experience online that is reliable and predictable. To make this as likely as possible, AGITSys will work both with existing registrars seeking to reach new audiences, as well as new registrars that may emerge from within the global Muslim community, thereby supporting ICANN’s mission to create more capacity in developing countries. AGITSys feels it can foster more competition at the registrar level by offering assistance and encouragement to new registrars in this way. We also believe that this should and will be coupled with a positive experience for Internet users. Indeed, this is critical to the success of the .HALAL gTLD. By working with the right registrars (who maintain the right, stringent) standards for adoption and use by their own customers, AGITSys can reach its goal of having the .HALAL gTLD become synonymous with a safe and trusted online experience.

As a part of this, since the .HALAL gTLD is community based and designed to serve those of Muslim faith, as well as to protect its good name, AGITSys intends to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith, or those with a clear interest in serving the Muslim community and faith beneficially. Such a designation is almost impossible to police, because faith is a highly personal thing requiring no proof beyond belief, and to restrict, for example, registrations to those geographically located in predominantly Muslim nations would alienate the myriad Muslims in other nations. Thus, these limitations will mostly be self-imposed, with registrants agreeing themselves that they are either of Muslim faith, or have a clear interest in ameliorating the community. Equally, AGITSys will not tolerate radical content, nor will it tolerate content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promulgating either, and a black list will be created in an attempt
to pre-empt any such attempts. Once content is registered, the community will be to an extent self-policing, with facilities to report abusive, irrelevant or anti-Muslim registrations available on the Registry website. Because of its dedication to the Muslim community and the .HALAL gTLD which is intended to serve it, AGITSys will implement protection measures for registrations to ensure an abuse free environment whilst maintaining choice. This will be accomplished with Registration safeguards, wildcard alerts, name selection polices, all governed by an Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections via Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy and Uniform Rapid Suspension. More details on these policies can be found in answer to Questions 28 and 29. The privacy offered will be total, within the rules and procedures provided by ICANN. These policies will be transparent and rigorous, modeled after successful policies implemented by currently delegated TLDs and accompanied by vigilant processes and technologies to prevent unauthorized access to information. This is a manifestation of the larger goal of the .HALAL gTLD, that of a trusted source of safe online transactions, as stipulated in 18(a). Privacy and security will be key elements of our Acceptable Use Policy (AUP). The AUP will govern how a registrant may use its registered name, with a specific focus on protecting Internet users. AUP language would specifically address privacy by prohibiting a registrant from using a domain for any activity that violates the privacy or publicity rights of another person or entity, or breaches any duty of confidentiality owed to any other person or entity. The AUP also would prohibit spam or other unsolicited bulk email, or computer or network hacking or cracking, as well as the installation of any viruses, worms, bugs, Trojan horses or other code, files or programs designed to, or capable of, disrupting, damaging or limiting the functionality of any software or hardware. We would maintain complete enforcement rights over the use of the domain name. Should a registrant find itself in breach of the AUP, we would reserve the right to revoke, suspend, terminate, cancel or otherwise modify their rights to the domain name. In terms of community outreach by the .HALAL gTLD, it is expected that the momentum around .HALAL will build quickly, given the pent-up demand that has been building for years within the ranks of the Muslim faithful and associated community. AGITSys, as its champion in gTLD discussions, knows full well how popular this service will be. As more sites offer information, services, and opportunities for interconnection to the .HALAL community as a whole, more members of the community will navigate to those sites. Many of those will provide their own content, and their activity there will spark further growth of second-level .HALAL domains. At some point, Islamic information and service providers currently not offering sites, will see the demand for .HALAL-related content and will migrate their offerings to .HALAL sites as well, furthering the offerings to the community and further driving community members to .HALAL sites. The future benefits of interlinking this diverse and global community are incalculable but immense. Augmenting this, AGITSys is also active in the business community within Turkey and Middle Eastern countries and interconnected across the spectrum of the Muslim community due to its promotional efforts with ICANN and elsewhere. It will leverage that network to spread the word of the .HALAL gTLD in order to promote adoption. The best steps AGITSys can take to ensure the gTLD’s adoption and growth, however, are to ensure a system encouraging robust, safe and dynamic second-level domain sites. At that point, the word will spread through the network effect.

18C. 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?

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) will endeavor to the utmost in order to minimize the social costs to registrants of a .HALAL second-level domain, not least because AGITSys has every incentive to encourage the adoption and growth of the .HALAL domain. AGITSys has chosen to adopt CoCCA’s tested acceptable use based policy matrix, recommendations for minimizing harm in TLDs, and subject the TLD to the CoCCA Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”). The CoCCA Best practice policy matrix has been developed over a decade and has currently been adopted by 16 TLDs. It
was developed for (and by) ccTLDs managers that desired to operate an efficient standards–based SRS system complemented by a policy environment that addressed a registrants use of a string as well as the more traditional gTLD emphasis rights to string.

A key element of CoCCA’s policy matrix is that it provides for registry-level suspensions where there is evidence of AUP violations. The TLD will join other TLDs that utilize the CoCCA’s single-desk CRS. The CRS provides a framework for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to swiftly address concerns regarding the use of domains, and the CoCCA network. The AUP can be used to address concerns regarding a domain or any other resource record that appears in the zone.

The CRS procedure provides an effective alternative to the court system while allowing for Complaints against domains to be handled in a way treats each complaint in a fair and equal manor and allows for all affected parties to present evidence and arguments in a constructive forum.

AGITSys is also currently developing procedures for competition resolution regarding multiple registrations for the same second-level domain in addition to offering the required Sunrise offerings through general availability. AGITSys will model these procedures after the techniques and approaches that have succeeded best to date. The history of .COM will be of interest here, because .HALAL should grow quickly and face demand as high among the Muslim community as .COM has in the English-language online community.

In terms of cost, benefits, and incentives to registrants of the Islamic community, AGITSys will offer fair and competitive pricing campaigns for tens of millions of people, introducing them to the wonders of the Internet and the Muslim faith therein. Competitive pricing and/or discounts will be used and adjusted accordingly to ensure the right incentive matches the phase of operation and business goals. AGITSys’ business plan increases our confidence in offerings that will encourage growing adoption of the .HALAL gTLD.

Each year, AGITSys will review its financial goals versus actual performance of registry operations. Output from the analysis will include the consideration of pricing versus demand for registrations. As with any for-profit entity, adequate cash flow and predictable revenue streams are essential to successful operations. As such, AGITSys may adjust pricing of domain registrations to align with evolving business goals. Adjustments can include not only price increases, but perhaps price decreases, but only current market analysis will dictate change. Therefore, AGITSys will document in the Registrant Agreement domain price change procedures and how they can be expect to learn about changes through our communications platform. In the end, serving the Islamic community through Internet technologies remains our first priority.

19. Is the application for a community-based TLD?

Yes

20A. 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.

The word “HALAL”:
HALAL is one of the most fundamental concepts of the Islam religion.
Halal (Arabic: ﷼ َِّ ﻷ، "lawful") is used to designate any object or an action which is permissible under to Islamic
law. The term halal is therefore applied to many facets of Muslim life; one of the most common being in reference to meat products, food contact materials, and pharmaceuticals. The halal concept has slowly become accepted as a consumer lifestyle choice encompassing not only religious practices and food, but also finance, non-food products and logistics and this is a trend has gathered significant momentum recently. However, the common understanding of halal is still limited to religious needs and only applicable to Muslims. It is considered a given in Turkey and the Middle East, although consumers in this region generally do not place much importance on specific halal branding, certification or country of origin.

The HALAL industry service providers Community:

Halal industry service providers are the community that the .Halal gTLD is designated for.
The Halal industry service providers’ community consists of all those who do engage in:
1. Research, Development, Monitoring and Certifying of Halal materials,
2. Production of Halal Materials
3. Distribution of Halal Materials
4. Sales and Marketing of Halal Materials
This will consist of a huge amount of industry role players which basically serve the 1.2 Billion Muslim population in the word, but the community’s services is not just limited to Muslims, rather many non-Muslims nowadays who has accepted the halal concept as a healthy life style. Considering this, we can estimate the size of the community, and also the wide distribution of the community in the world. Since wherever a Muslim lives, there is a place for the Halal service providers to be active. It means that the Halal community is spread all over the world, and it’s not necessary to describe that the community remains forever.

Now, in the globalization age, the development of Halal standards sponsoring by standing monitoring centers in all aspects of life is a must, so that all products would be presented by special brands to guarantee the consumers’ tranquility of mind at the global level especially in non-Islamic Countries. This certification brings an identity to the members of the Halal community as described later.

The Halal Food Industry

Halal Food industry can be named as the most important portion of the Halal service providers’ community.
In Muslim countries, the food industry is almost 100 percent based on the Halal food preparation methods, but Halal foods are becoming more and more popular even in non-Islamic countries every day. In South Africa most chicken products have a halal stamp. The South African National Halal Authority issues halal-approved certificates and products bearing this is logo range from meat to water, snacks, and even other meat free products (which may ordinarily contain non-halal ingredients). The South African National Halal Authority (SANHA) also licenses the usage of the Halal logo in restaurants where the food is halal and no alcohol or pork products can be served. Similar movements in the US, UK, China, Malaysia, Singapore and many other non-Muslim majority countries are equally, or ever better, established.

One of the first halal food companies in the USA is Midamar Corporation, established in 1974. It is also one of the first companies in the USA to sell USDA approved and Halal certified US protein products to the Middle East and South East Asia. The Certification Agency Islamic Services of America was established in 2004 and located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Islamic Services of America certifications are recognized by some Islamic Countries.

In Dearborn, Michigan, U.S.A (the home of one of the largest Muslim and Arab populations in the United States), and some fast food restaurant chains such as the McDonald’s Corporation have introduced halal chicken nuggets and other halal offerings. In a similar light, McDonald’s, Pizza Hut, and Kentucky Fried Chicken have been declared to be halal in Sri Lanka by the Jamiyathul Ulama, the only authority able to give out the certification there. In the United Kingdom, China, Malaysia or Singapore, halal fried chicken restaurants having thousands of outlets serve halal foods, such as the Chicking Fried Chicken, Kentucky Fried Chicken, Brown’s Chicken, and Crown Fried Chicken companies. As of February 2009, Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurants in the U.K. began to sell halal meals in several restaurants. Also, in New York City there are numerous halal food carts in business which serve gyros, chicken platters, and other
halal fast foods, whereas in Europe, there are many of the Muslim-owned Döner kebab shops. Thailand also has a noticeable population of Muslims and Halal-meat shops country-wide. Within the People’s Republic of China, which has a sizable Hui Muslim minority population, halal food is known as "Qingzhen" (pinyin: qīngzhēn; literally "pure truth"). Halal restaurants run by Hui Chinese resemble typical Chinese food, except that they do not serve pork. Dishes specific to Hui Chinese are known as Chinese Islamic cuisine.

Halal Certificates:
Since the turn of the 21st century, there have been efforts to create organizations that certify food products as halal for Muslim consumers. Since 1991, mainstream manufacturers of soups, grains, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, prepared foods, and other products, as well as hotels, restaurants, airlines, hospitals, and other service providers have pursued the halal market. These companies purchase halal-certified products. Halal certification tells Muslims that their ingredients and production methods have been tested and declared permissible by a certification body. It also allows companies to export products to most Middle Eastern countries and South East Asian Countries. The oldest and most well-known halal certifier in the United States is called the “Islamic Services of America”. Something that companies which intend to export halal products must keep in mind, when choosing a certifier, is whether or not the certifier is recognized by foreign governmental bodies.

In 1986, the “Islamic Meat & Poultry Company” was founded in Stockton, California. Islamic Meat & Poultry is a halal-only, U.S. Department of Agriculture-inspected, hand-slaughtering and meat-processing facility. This company follows the principles of slaughtering and meat-processing according to the Islamic Shariah.

In 2011, Halal Products Certification Institute was established in California, United States of America and became the first worldwide corporation that Certified Halal Consumer Products such as Cosmetics, Personal Care Products, Perfumes & Fragrances, The institute was established by renowned Islamic intellectual scholars and top Muslim scientists in the world to assure the dissemination of halal consumer products.

Also in Europe, several organizations have been created over the past 20 years in order to certify the halal products. A survey recently published by a French association of Muslim Consumers (ASIDCOM) shows that the market of halal products has been developed in a chaotic way.

Islamic Chamber research & Information Center (ICRIC), affiliated to Islamic Chamber of Commerce & Industry (ICCI) and a member of the family of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) has embarked to study and research on the subject to meet the need in Muslim World. ICRIC has also embarked to adopt a monitoring system in “Halal Product” including “Halal Food” and proceeded to research, development, information and support in this ground. The .HALAL gTLD will allow—the Halal industry service providers community to unite online as a full and robust community, enjoying the connection and exchange of information empowered by faith, and community in beliefs.

20B. Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified in 20(a).

Relations to any community organizations.

AGITSYS is founded, owned and managed by Muslim people. AGITSys uses the expertise of the Muslim technical men, and it is incorporated in Turkey, one of the countries with the majority of Muslim people (98% Muslims).

AGITSys team is all from Middle East where Islam is the major religion, and the heart of Islam. AGITSys’s location in Turkey, thanks to the close communication of Turkey with both Islamic and western courtiers, brings a brilliant opportunity to promote the .HALAL TLD both in the countries where Islam, is the main religion, and countries where Islam is not dominant, but many Muslims leave in to the main consumers of the .HALAL gTLD: the members of the Halal service providers community
• Relations to the community and its constituent parts/groups.

As stated above, AGITSYS has come from the heart of the Muslim community as defined both by geography and the nationality of the team members and as a result, the Halal service providers community as the adherent of the Muslim community, AGITSys has enough technical knowledge and expertise to run the .HALAL TLD and at the same time is supported by important well-known men of the Islam world, meaning that there would be trust and support from the Muslim community.

• Accountability mechanisms of applicant to the community.

AGITSys will oversee the formation of a .HALAL Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) populated by members of the .HALAL industry service providers community. AGITSys intends that the PAC be representative of the entire broad spectrum of the halal industry service providers’ community. It therefore intends to engage religious figures, certification institutes and halal product manufacturers, distributors, retailers and service providers. The PAC would serve as a conduit for the community to weigh in on any policy matters that impact the operation of the gTLD. These can range from abuse prevention and mitigation to registration policies and the maintenance and structure of the .HALAL community. This advisory Board will also be critical for our continued outreach across the community as we spread the word about the .HALAL gTLD. It will serve as a key channel of communication with, and anchor to, the community which this effort hopes to serve.

20C. Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

• Intended registrants in the TLD.

A .HALAL registrant maybe of one of manufacturers of soups, grains, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, prepared foods, and other products, as well as hotels, restaurants, airlines, hospitals, and other service providers, many of whom are not currently represented on the internet but would feel a newfound affiliation with a .HALAL gTLD. We can foster more competition at the registrar level through assistance and encouragement with new registrars.

• Intended end-users of the TLD.

For a fifth of the world’s population, Islam is both a religion and a complete way of life. Muslims follow a religion of peace, mercy, and forgiveness, and the majority have nothing to do with the extremely grave events which have come to be associated with their faith. Every Muslim or even non-Muslim man or woman in the world can benefit from .HALAL websites to catch the information and services offered by them. The spread of .HALAL TLD would be wide enough to cover all types of audiences and their needs, considering that all .HALAL websites in any case will be promoting HALAL concept and industry in different ways. Within all of these populations, the intended end users of the .HALAL gTLD are manifold:

People with ties to the Islamic heritage: This would include a significant percentage of the population of Muslim Community along with other nations.
Individual Muslims: As demonstrated above, this includes hundreds of millions of individuals around the world. Students: Those learning about different aspects of Islam, its concept, its laws, its culture and heritage, etc... would benefit from increased resources online that would help them learn and grow in their new studying. Islamic businesses: as like as every community, Muslims has also doing business among themselves as well as doing business with other communities. Muslim business men will the word “HALAL” as a symbol of honor and trust, and the witness of belonging to Muslim community. The word “HALAL” is used widely among Muslims’ websites. A simple search for the word “HALAL” results more than 500 million web pages, showing the popularity of the word “HALAL”. Halal industry role players: those businesses who serve the Muslim community by providing Halal goods would benefit .HALAL domain names as a symbol of trust and their Halal Certification.

It is hoped that not only will these intended users derive individual benefit from the existence of a .HALAL community, but that they will also contribute in turn. This should create a group benefit, which will in turn feed back in to individual benefits – establishing a beneficial cycle.

- Related activities the applicant has carried out or intends to carry out in service of this purpose.

Anticipating the diversification of TLDs now being realized, and the consequent introduction of a halal-specific online space, AGITSys has been working with a wide variety of related parties for several years in preparation, and will continue to do so going forward. A key element for the success of the .HALAL gTLD is a strong and interactive community, which members of the community would be proud to associate with and keen to contribute to. To ensure this, AGITSys will sponsor community outreach and marketing, in order to raise awareness of the forthcoming possibilities. These possibilities are also highly appealing for Islamic businesses, and as such AGITSys will engage in dialogue with those businesses, and industry chiefs, regarding their ideas for how the .HALAL gTLD will take shape, and what they intend to subsequently give back to it.

As this is a community directed effort, one of the first steps AGITSys would take would be to establish the .HALAL Policy Advisory Committee. AGITSys would recruit representatives from around the globe to ensure that a variety of interests and perspectives are represented. The PAC will not only serve as a key partner in the development of policies governing the operation of the gTLD, but they will be critical to our ongoing community outreach and marketing efforts. One key function for the PAC would be to aid in developing a list of reserved names which for a variety of reasons would be deemed of limits for registration. This list will ensure that key cultural icons, religious organizations and other entities of importance to the community could not be used in a way that is contrary to their wishes and desires.

The PAC will be integral to our launch efforts and much of the initial marketing of the .HALAL gTLD will need to come from community related activities. Outreach would also include religious figures, community leaders, celebrities and any other prominent organizations or individuals who embrace the halal lifestyle. Quality content will also be fundamental to a thriving .HALAL community, especially because AGITSys is committed to ensuring that .HALAL is populated by quality second-level domain offerings. With this in mind, AGITSys will be talking with those most likely to contribute quality content, from news and media agencies to academics and others about how they can and will contribute, and what AGITSys can do to facilitate this process.

Ultimately, however, religion will always be the most important element for a successful .HALAL community online. The entire gTLD concept is designed as a place of online respect; almost worship, for those who embrace the halal concept. As such, the involvement, blessing and feedback of the Islamic religious community are fundamentally important. Aware of this, AGITSys has been in prolonged and continued contact with important religious figures – asking them what they want to see and how they would like to see it done, whilst also encouraging them to spread the word and prepare themselves.

- Explanation of how the purpose is of a lasting nature.
The community that will be served by .HALAL—growing as it has out of the Muslims community—has thrived and grown for more than a millennium. Remarkably, it has done so largely without the level of connection online found with Islamic cultures. This existing community interconnection speaks to the cultural staying power of the community and the many ways it enriches world culture. With the adoption of a .HALAL community, this robust group will be further empowered to interconnect and grow, allowing it to take its equal place on the Internet stage. The community thrives now, but will reach new heights with a .HALAL gTLD.

As more sites offer information, services, and opportunities for interconnection to the .HALAL community as a whole, more members of the community will navigate to those sites. Many of those will provide their own content, and their activity there will spark further growth of second-level .HALAL domains. At some point, information and service providers currently not offering sites will see the demand for .HALAL-related content and will migrate their offerings to .HALAL sites as well, furthering the offerings to the community and further driving community members to .HALAL sites. The future benefits of interlinking this diverse and global community are incalculable but immense.

20D. Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a).

- relationship to the established name, if any, of the community.

The word “HALAL” is the core fundamental of the Halal service providers community. Without the philosophy of “Halal”, no such a community would be shaped.

- relationship to the identification of community members.

As stated above, community members will feel an affinity and self-identification with the .HALAL TLD. As adoption of .HALAL grows, use of domains using this community TLD will grow exponentially, helping to cement the obvious connection between the string and the community. Our community members are the producers or service providers of the halal products.

- any connotations the string may have beyond the community.

AGITSYS knows of no other connotations the .HALAL string might have outside of this community.

20E. 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.

- Eligibility: who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined.

As mentioned above, the primary goal of the .HALAL gTLD is the protection and promulgation of the Halal concept. To this end, In order to register a .HALAL Domain Name, you declare that you are part of the Halal service providers
Community.
Registrations in the .HALAL will be restricted to 1) those who can produce a copy of a halal certificate demonstrating that the goods and services they provide meet the generally accepted halal standard and/or 2) all goods and service providers headquartered and operating in Islamic countries as they are deemed halal by their ability to operate in an Islamic country.
Our policies may permit registrations in .HALAL gTLD to the following:
Universities, schools, research institutions and other academic entities performing academic activities or teach-promote aspects of halal concept.
Individuals, groups, businesses, organizations, entities or initiatives affirming their belonging to the Community.
The .HALAL TLD is intended for people who wish to promote, participate or learn about HALAL and its different aspects, its affect on the daily life of the people around the world, its history, Law and jurisprudence, etc belonging to the Muslim community.
All .HALAL gTLD registrants must comply with AGITSys Acceptable Use Policy (AUP), .HALAL registration policies and with ICANN guidelines.

- Name selection: what types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD.
AGITSYS will follow ICANN guidelines regarding potential restrictions of second-level domains. The names selected to be registered under .HALAL TLD must not have any conflict with the cultural, traditional and historical values of the Muslim community. This restriction can be controlled by creating the list of prohibited names managed by the .HALAL Policy Advisory Committee described above.

- Content/Use: what restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name.
AGITSYS will have an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and registration policies that will govern how a registrant may use its registered name. We will ask all members to honor the Islamic Culture, Heritage and rules.
Registrants must accept and abide by the following:
a. No denigration of The Prophet Mohammad will be propagated within any site content of the .HALAL TLD
b. No denigration of the halal concept will be propagated within any site content of the .HALAL TLD
c. Messaging about Islam or the Quran will not criticize Islam and the Muslim faith
d. Registrants and Users will refrain from activities that runs contrary to general Islamic principles
e. Not use the .HALAL TLD or site content as a communications and coordination vehicle of radical or terrorist activities
f. Will not establish third level DNS management of a second level .HALAL domains
These requirements will be enforced through the AUP and contracts registrants must sign with their registrars prior to the registration of a domain 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?
As part of the AUP and registration polices, AGITSys will have complete enforcement rights over registrants’ use of .HALAL domain names. AGITSys will randomly audit registrants in the .HALAL gTLD to ensure that they can provide evidence of their halal certificate which ensures the goods and services they are providing have been reviewed by recognized authorities in the halal community as are surely being halal. If a violation is discovered, an investigation will begin immediately to rectify said violation. Penalties for violation range from suspension of a domain, to removal of the domain name from the TLD and blacklisting of the registrant, preventing them from being able to register any other names in the .HALAL TLD. From time to time the .HALAL PAC may need to be engaged to consult on potential enforcement activities.
20F. 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.

21A. Is the application for a geographic name?

No

22. 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.

Protection of Geographic Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has chosen CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited (CoCCA) as their registry services provider. CoCCA has over 12 years of experience in authoring registry software and providing registry support services. With 35 national TLDs relying on CoCCA’s technology to manage critical infrastructure, the CoCCA EPP Shared Registry System (SRS) is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. In many respects new niche market gTLDs are predicted to more closely resemble existing ccTLD name spaces than the current gTLD ones. CoCCA’s commercial model and technology enables TLD Sponsoring Organizations to focus on operating the front end portion of the registry including sales, marketing and community relations while leaving the operational aspects to the proven team at CoCCA.
In addition to technology CoCCA has a considered and tested set of leading – practice policies designed to address security, stability, rights protection, abuse mitigation, privacy and other issues, CoCCA is a trusted partner for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to operate the .halal in a manner that is fully compliant with all ICANN rules and regulations.
CoCCA, on behalf of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., intends to implement the following measures to protect geographical names at the second and at all other levels within the TLD:

Reservation Measures for Geographical Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adhere to Specification 5 of the proposed Registry Agreement, “Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries” – section 5 titled “Country and Territory Names.” The geographic names listed in the following internationally approved documents will be reserved at the second level within the TLD and at all other levels where registrations occur:
(1.i.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
(1.i.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
Potential Release of Geographical Names
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is committed to working with governments and other stakeholders that may have a concern regarding the registration of names with national or geographic significance at the second level. If Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. decides to release reserved geographical names, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will abide by the process outlined in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement by seeking agreement from the applicable government(s). Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. understands that any release of the geographical names may be subject to Governmental Advisory Committee review and approval by ICANN.

Review, Audit, and Updates to Policies
Policy management is dynamic in nature requiring continual management. The Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. in conjunction with CoCCA’s assistance will be engaged in policy development efforts in general and with respect to protections of geographical domain names. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will review and consider suggestions or concerns from government, public authorities or IGO’s regarding this policy. And as with all required policies, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will perform openly and transparently to updating existing policy or the creation of new policy be required. Further, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ internal process continually reviews and manages its reserve lists as one part of the abuse prevention mechanisms described in greater detail within question 28, “Abuse Prevention and Mitigation.”

23. 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:

A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers.
B. Dissemination of TLD zone files.
C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois service).
D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered.
E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC). The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Additional proposed registry services that are unique to the registry must also be described.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has contracted CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited (“CoCCA”) to provide hosted Registry Services for the .halal TLD. The .halal TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing production Shared Registry System (“SRS”). CoCCA will ensure redundant geographically diverse DNS resolution through propagation of the .halal zones on the Internet Software Consortium (“ISC”), Packet Clearing House (“PCH”) anycast networks - and on CoCCA unicast servers.

CoCCA authors the internet’s most widely used SRS registry system (which has been branded “pamoja” for gTLD name spaces). ISC authors BIND and pioneered anycast technology, PCH has one of the internet’s largest and longest running anycast networks. DNSSEC key storage and and signature will take place on the PCH DNSSEC platform, a platform
developed for ccTLD’s that mirrors the security and processes used by ICANN to secure the root.

The .halal TLD SRS data will be escrowed with both NCC Group and CoCCA subsidiary CoCCA Data Escrow Services (NZ) Limited.

23.1 About CoCCA
CoCCA has over nine years experience authoring open source registry software systems and providing TLD registry support services. CoCCA was originally incorporated in Australia in 2003 as CoCCA Registry Services Limited, in January 2009 CoCCA re-located to New Zealand and trades as CoCCA Registry Services (NZ) Limited. CoCCA is a privately held NZ company.

CoCCA’s existing clients are governments and other managers of county code top level domains (ccTLDs). As of 31 March 2012, 33 national ccTLDs have selected CoCCA’s SRS technology and/or services to help them manage their critical infrastructure. Several additional ccTLDs have committed to migrate to CoCCA’s “pamoja” SRS in 2012 (pending the outcome of re-delegations). As many as 40 ccTLDs are thought to be using the pamoja SRS application, while CoCCA has formal relationships and support contracts with 33 TLDs, the exact number of users is hard to determine as the pamoja software is freely available for download from the internet. CoCCA’s offers ccTLDs a perpetual royalty-free license to use and deploy the SRS software.

CoCCA’s commercial model is based on delivering significant economies of scale to TLD managers, CoCCA’s dominant market position in the ccTLD ecosystem - where the TLD string is generally considered critical infrastructure, ensures CoCCA’s commercial viability and ongoing funding of R&D regardless of the success of a particular gTLD string (or group of gTLD strings) that select CoCCA as the Registry Services provider. CoCCA’s technology is mature, field tested and their commercial model is solid and not dependent on new gTLD’s.

The pamoja SRS can be used several ways, the application can be downloaded and installed locally by a TLD Sponsoring Organization (“SO”), or the SO can contract CoCCA to host either the primary or failover SRS at the CoCCA Network Operations Centre (“NOC”).

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is a freely available gTLD-compliant TLD database application based on the “CoCCA Tools” open source ccTLD EPP registry system. The SRS licensing simplifies failover and transition planning as the source, data, and daily virtual machine images are to be placed into escrow enabling them to be migrated or re-deployed by a different entity without any SRS licensing issues. CoCCA’s SRS is a ‘shrink-wrapped’ application that can be installed on a single server in minutes or deployed in a High Availability (HA) configuration.

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is the most widely deployed, field-tested SRS in use today. CoCCA’s SRS is a mature product that has grown organically over the past decade as new standards have been developed and published. It is doubtful any other Registry Services provider has accumulated CoCCA’s level of experience operating multiple small to medium sized TLDs efficiently and securely.

CoCCA’s pamoja SRS is currently used to run three (3) Arabic (IDN) TLDs and was selected by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority in Egypt to launch the Internet’s first IDN TLD (.masr) in 2010. The flexible package supports ASCII and IDN - including variants and folding where required.

23.2 Current pamoja SRS deployments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.af</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Ministry of Communications and IT</td>
<td>[P] [F] [E]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has confirmed with CoCCA their production experience and the availability of the Registry Services described briefly in sections 23.4-23.18 below - and in greater detail in the responses to questions 24-43. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and CoCCA understand elements of ICANN’s TLD requirements will most likely be modified in the future. CoCCA’s Registry Services will comply with future ICANN requirements or mandates.

23.4 Receipt of Data via the SRS EPP interface
Data from Registrars concerning the insertion and maintenance of records in the SRS may be processed either via the CoCCA EPP interface (XML over SSL on port 700) or manually via CoCCA’s port 443 SSL web interface. CoCCA was an early adopter of the EPP standard and has operated an EPP based SRS for almost seven years.
The .halal TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing production SRS, which currently has 203 registrars connected. CoCCA’s SRS has a single EPP interface for all hosted TLDs allowing registrars to share the same contact and host objects across multiple TLDs. The .halal TLD will only be made accessible to ICANN accredited registrars, many of which are currently connected to CoCCA for ccTLDs and using the EPP and GUI interface that the .halal TLD will be accessed via when launched.

CoCCA’s pamoja EPP interface currently complies the IETF RFC’s required by ICANN (5730-5734 and 3735) and is explained in more detail in the response to Question 25.

23.5 Receipt of Data via the SRS Graphical User Interface ("GUI")

Registrars may insert and manage domain, contact and host records as well as the SRS accounting functions via a port 443 GUI. Registrars do not have to use the EPP interface on port 700. Records managed via the GUI connect to the SRS EPP engine on port 700 via background processes; this ensures rigorous conformity with the RFC’s and consistency in auditing and maintenance of historical records.

23.6 Registrar Data Restrictions (Reserved Names)

Restrictions on what domains may be inserted and maintained by registrars is to be controlled by configuration of java regular expressions. In order to comply with the requirements set out in Specification 5 and any Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. policy. the .halal TLD will use three of pamoja’s features as described below.

23.6.1 Prohibited Patterns. Domains that match patterns will be rejected with an EPP 2306 - Parameter Value Policy error, letting the registrar know that these domain names do not fit in with the registry policy for this zone.

23.6.2 Syntax Patterns. Certain strings, such as all-numeric names or single character names may be restricted. An EPP 2005 error - “Parameter Value Syntax error” will be returned to the EPP client, indicating that the name is invalid.

23.6.3 Approval Patterns. Names that match these patterns will not be rejected, but will be registered pending approval. Until they are approved, the name will not appear in the .halal zone files, and will not be able to be transferred, renewed or modified in any way by the registrar.

23.6.4 Both ASCII and non-ASCII contact details can stored and displayed via web-based WHOIS and command line WHOIS.

23.7 SRS GUI, Role-Based Access

The pamoja SRS GUI has numerous role-based logins described below. Several of these have been recently developed by CoCCA in response to ICANN’s proposed gTLD requirements and are currently being used numerous ccTLD production environments.

Administrative Roles

* SRS Systems Administrator - Able to administer and configure the entire SRS system
* CERT / Law Enforcement - Able to view and query the SRS, but not alter records.
* TLD Administrator - Able to administer a TLD or group of TLDs
* TLD Viewer - Able to view but not alter records for a TLD or group of TLDs
* Zone Administrator - Able to administer a Stub Zone, or group of Stub Zones
* Zone Viewer - Able to view but not alter a Stub Zone, or group of Stub Zones
* Customer Service - Can perform tasks on behalf of a number of registrars
* Name Approver - Can approve names matching the Zone Approval Patterns
* CHIP Approver - Can approve domains registered with CHIP codes or other Trademarks.

Registrar Roles

* Registrar Master Account - Able to perform all registrar functions and create subordinate logins
* Registrar Technical - Able to modify domain details
* Registrar Helpdesk - Able to view domains and make various minor changes
* Registrar Finance - Able to view domains financial transactions and also edit financial data
* Registrar Finance - (Read Only) Same as above but view only.

Other Access Roles

* Premium WHOIS - Able to perform various queries in a SRS GUI and extract and save data to a CSV, also able to connect via the SRS EPP API for read-only query.
* Zone File Only - Able to login and request Zone Files

23.8 Zone File Dissemination ⁄ Resolution

The .halal will be resolved by a minimum of 80 geographically distributed resolvers, all of which run ISC’s BIND and are configured such that they comply with relevant RFC’s including 1034,1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3266, 3596, 3597, 3901, 4343 and 4472.

The PCH and ISC name servers employ IP-anycast technology for scalable geographic redundancy, strong defense from Denial of Service attacks, high quality of service, and give excellent (fast) responses to geographically diverse Internet users. DNSSEC and IPv6 are already fully integrated into the PCH and ISC networks.

Registrars will be able to continuously inspect the availability and status of each TLD server instance via the SRS GUI and other CoCCA WEB Sites. Should a TLD server be unreachable registrars are to be automatically notified (via email) and EPP polling messages. More detailed information is available in the responses to Questions 24-43.

23.9 Dissemination of Domain Related Information

The SRS public WHOIS server will answer for the .halal TLD on port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912 and the requirements set out Specification Four (4), 1.1-1.7 and Specification Ten (10), Section 4.

The CoCCA SRS features a public port 443, web-based RDDS interface that enables internet users to query and extract information which is at a minimum identical to that which is provided via the port 43 server but using technology that may be more convenient or accessible to many internet users than a port 43 command line query.

The CoCCA SRS also allows any Internet user (or any user with a login to the SRS) to order a complete Historical
Individuals may optionally subscribe to CoCCA’s Premium WHOIS service, which provides them with:

* secure access to the SRS (via both a web-based port 443 GUI and read only EPP on port 700).
* the ability to perform a variety of boolean queries online in real-time and save the output to a CSV
* the ability to create “interest lists” using java regular expressions where they receive EPP polling messages and emails if a domain is registered that contains a string of interest to them.

Established CERT’s and law enforcement agencies may request, and will generally be granted, read only GUI and EPP access to the CoCCA SRS free of charge. Currently this access is granted to the Australian Government CERT, who under an MOU may share information with other CERT’s and national and international law enforcement agencies.

23.10 DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC)

CoCCA’s SRS DNSSEC implementation allows registrars to provision public key material via EPP and the GUI. Under an agreement between CoCCA and PCH, .halal TLD Keys are to be stored offline and signed using PCH’s DNSSEC platform that replicates the security process, mechanisms and standards employed by ICANN in securing the ROOT of the DNS.

The CoCCA-PCH key storage implementation deviates from the ICANN model only by diversifying the locations of the secure sites such that two (2) of the three (3) sites are outside the United States. The Singapore facility is hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA). The Swiss facility is hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network. The U.S. facility is hosted by PCH Equinix in San Jose.

The CoCCA SRS DNSSEC implementation complies with RFC’s 4033, 4034, 4035, 5910, 4509, 4641 and 5155. Additional information on the DNSSEC implementation is available in the response to question 43.

23.11 Escrow Deposits

CoCCA’s Registry Services include deposit of escrow data in the format and following the protocols set out in Specification Two. CoCCA currently deposits ccTLD data daily (in both the native CoCCA format and the draft arias-noguchi format) with both NCC group and CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ) Limited. CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ) Limited is a subsidiary and was established in 2009 to provide Failover Registry and escrow services to users of the CoCCA SRS who run the software locally on their own infrastructure.

As part of CoCCA’s Registry Services and to ensure continuity of operations, CoCCA deposits all updates to the pamoja SRS source code with NCC, and daily VMware images of the production SRS with CoCCA Data Escrow Services (NZ) Limited. These same practices will be adopted for the .halal TLD when launched.

.halal SRS data will be deposited with NCC Group, CoCCA Data Escrow and ICANN. Additional information on Escrow is available the response to question 38.

23.12 Document Management

CoCCA’s Registry Services include maintenance of documents related to intellectual property rights, complaints, identification of contacts, court orders etc. These documents are maintained in the SRS and become part of a domain’s (or contacts) permanent history.
23.13 Support for Various Zone States

CoCCA’s Registry Services support Sunrise, Rolling Sunrise, Land-rush and Open Registrations for a given zone. Each “State” can be configured to match common policy options.

23.14 Accounting

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s includes a variety of standardized and add-hoc reports accessible to TLD administrators via the GUI. Standardized reports include one that complies with the requirements set out in Specification Three “Format and Content for Registry Operator Monthly Reporting”.

23.15 Audit Trail

All SRS activity is logged and permanently archived, it can be easily retrieved via the GUI for law enforcement or complaint resolution. A “time-machine” feature allows a user with appropriate rights to view the domain information as it existed on any given date and time. Information is never purged from the SRS, information on deleted domains, hosts, contacts can be easily extracted.

23.16 Monitoring

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include statistics on and real-time monitoring of the primary NOC, CoCCA’s DNS Servers, Escrow NOC (NZ) and failover NOC in Palo Alto California. Additional information is available in the answers to questions 24-42. Monitoring of the ISC and PCH anycast networks is done internally by those entities, with statistics and notices made available to CoCCA in near-real time. Where applicable and relevant monitoring information is made available to registrars by CoCCA via the SRS.

23.17 Maintenance of Failover Facilities

CoCCA Registry Services include maintenance of their geographically dispersed Escrow and Failover SRS facilities (Auckland and Palo Alto, a third is planned for Paris in early 2013).

23.18 Complaint Resolution Service (CRS)

CoCCA’s Registry Services include operating a “single desk” CRS to help resolve complaints, trigger Critical Issue Suspensions (“CIS”) and enforce a Uniform Rapid Suspension (“URS”) request. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will bind all registrants in the .halal to the CoCCA CRS, Acceptable Use Policy and Privacy and RDDS Policy via the .halal Registrant Agreement (“RA”). CoCCA’s front-line CRS services are a “role” performed by CoCCA’s 24/7/365 NOC Support.

23.19 Registrar Support

CoCCA Registry Services provides registrars with 24/7/365 support via email and their virtual manned Network Operations Center (NOC). The CoCCA NOC Support has staff Auckland, Sydney, Jonestown (Guyana) and Paris for around the clock coverage. CoCCA NOC Support all have access to the same cloud hosted monitoring and customer service applications as well as the SRS.

23.20 Security and Stability Audit

The pamoja SRS application is used to mange critical TLD infrastructure, each release is tested prior to release or...
deployment by CoCCA developers, developers and systems administrators at registries that deploy the application locally. Each major release is tested and audited by Yonita (http://yonita.com).

CoCCA constantly reviews its SRS software and sites to ensure they meet or exceed best practices in the industry, regular external audits of the security policy and CoCCA NOC are planned commencing 2013. The CoCCA NOC and failover facilities will be independently tested twice a year to ensure compliance with the CoCCA security policy, where applicable recommendations included in a security audit will be swiftly implemented.

23.21 Operational Testing and Evaluation (OT&E) Environment

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include the operation of an OT&E SRS that enables registrars to evaluate new versions and features of the SRS software before they are deployed by CoCCA in production. Any ICANN accredited registrar will be granted access to OT&E. Registrars not currently connected to the CoCCA SRS will be required by CoCCA to demonstrate competency in EPP and the .halal policies before being granted EPP or GUI access to CoCCA’s production SRS.

23.22 Authorization Key Retrieval

CoCCA’s Registry Service’s include automated public retrieval of domain AuthCodes by the administrative contact via a port 443 web page. The Authorization Key facilitates expedited transfers from one registrar to another.

23.23 Public Drop - List

CoCCA’s Registry Services include publication of drop-lists of domains that are pending purge via a port 443 web page and email reports to registrars.

23.24 Wildcard Brand Registrations

A mechanism thought to be unique to the CoCCA SRS that allows blocking registration of a domain’s “variants” using java regular expressions. This requires approval and manual intervention on the part of CoCCA.

23.25 Co-operation with Law Enforcement and CERTs

CoCCA works with Law Enforcement, CERTs and researchers and will generally grant registry continuous access free of charge to facilitate two-way data exchanges aimed at preventing and mitigating abuse in the DNS.

There are no known security or stability issues with the CoCCA’s SRS, PCH’s DNSSEC platform or ISC’s and PCH’s anycast networks at this time. Should any be identified resources are available internally at CoCCA, PCH and ISC to swiftly address and resolve security or stability issues as they arise.

24. 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
The .halal TLD will be added to CoCCA’s existing SRS, which currently has its primary Network Operations Centre (NOC) in Sydney Australia. The Sydney primary SRS is a single SRS instance currently hosting a dozen ccTLDs. CoCCA’s Sydney SRS runs the latest versions of their “pamoja” TLD software application in a High Availability (HA) configuration. The Sydney SRS registry that will host .halal currently complies with the requirements Specifications 4, 6 and 10 and will be scaled or modified to meet SLA requirements or any future ICANN gTLD specifications. Because of CoCCA’s commercial model and technology the primary SRS can be moved from one data center to another with only a few minutes outage.

From an Internet user’s perspective trusted, secure and responsive DNS implementations are the ultimate objective of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. To ensure this CoCCA will use PCH’s DNSSEC and anycast infrastructure for offline storage, signing and resolving the .halal TLD, additional DNS resolution will be provided by the ISC SNS anycast platform and two CoCCA unicast DNS servers. Additional information and technical details on the DNSSEC and anycast DNS services can be found in the answers to questions 34, 35 and 43.

24.1 Scale of Operations
A decade of operational experience with TLDs that have implemented policies to discourage tasting or otherwise incentivize add-drop registrations confirms the widely held belief that SRS registry databases are largely static. Once registered data associated with a domain is not frequently modified. More than 99% of the queries seen by CoCCA on a daily basis are WHOIS, EPP Domain:Info or Domain:Check queries (read queries) and do not tax a SRS’s resources excessively. Direct experience and anecdotal evidence from other small and mid-sized registries suggest that between 2% and 5% of the records in the register change daily through db “write” operations - new registrations, renewals, name server changes, contact updates automated changes of status, transfers etc.

For a theoretical registry of 1 million domains this equates to roughly 50,000 “write” transactions a day - or an average of 35 a min (50,000 ÷ 1440 min⁄day). A recent test of CoCCA’s SRS software on an single 8GB cloud server revealed that the pamoja software was able to process 4 million unique EPP registrations in a little over 5 hours. Performance tests can be designed in any number of ways, real world performance depends on a variety of factors- the specific policy and account settings for a given zone.

In terms of both transactional capability and storage, todays “off the rack” hardware and the open source PostgreSQL database used by CoCCA can easily cope with demands that a small to medium sized registry is ever likely to make on an SRS system. While the CoCCA SRS EPP and WHOIS infrastructure and platform may seem comparatively modest, a decade of experience confirms it is more than capable of meeting the ICANN’s gTLD SLA requirements and comply with the required RFC’s.
If future demands require it, CoCCA’s SRS can easily (and affordably) be scaled by adding additional load balanced application servers and bandwidth.

24.1 SRS | High Level Description

Comprehensive information on and descriptions of the CoCCA SRS and NOC may be found the answers to questions 25-42 that follow.

24.1.1 SRS Infrastructure / Architecture

The following describes the key features of CoCCA’s current production SRS that will be utilized for the .halal:

* Primary SRS is operated from Global Switch, a tier 3+ facility and one of the largest carrier-neutral data centers in the Southern Hemisphere.

* Redundant links to the Internet through PIPE networks and Telstra
  http://www.pipenetworks.com/

* DNSSEC Key storage (offline) in Singapore at a PCH facility hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA). Failover storage at a facility is hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network and in the U.S. at facility is hosted by Equinix in San Jose.

* .halal zones signed by PCH in Frankfurt or Palo Alto

* SRS Escrow at tier three co-location facility (Maxnet) in Auckland NZ and Failover a tier four facility (Equnix) supported by PCH in Palo Alto, CA US. A fourth SRS “instance” is planned for Paris in early 2013.

* Dedicated, routable CoCCA Critical Infrastructure IPv4 and IPv6 address blocks.
  IPv4 resources: 203.119.84.0/24 (crit-infra)
  IPv6 resources: 2001:dd8:3::/48 (crit-infra)

* Routers, Firewalls, Switches and Load balancers all configured for failover.

* CoCCA’s pamoja SRS application load balanced and configured for failover.

* PostgresSQL 9.1.3 database replicated synchronously to two secondary DB servers.

* DS Keys lodged by registrars via EPP or the CoCCA SRS GUI

* Servers Virtualized (VMware vsphere v5)

* VM image-based replication for high availability and off-site disaster recovery http://www.veeam.com/vmware-esx-backup.html

* Critical Data continuously replicated asynchronously to two off-site SRS instances – PCH, Equinix Palo Alto CA
OT&E Environment for Registrars

* Primary and Secondary hidden master DNS (failover masters).
* CoCCA operated unicast DNS in Sydney Australia and Auckland New Zealand.
* Two anycast solutions operated by PCH and ISC – over 80 DNS nodes.

24.1.2 Specification 6, Section 1.2 Compliance.

The .halal TLD will be added to CoCCA’s production SRS that currently hosts 12 ccTLDs under a single RFC 5730-5743, RFC 5910 and 3915 compliant EPP interface.

A list of the Registrars that currently connect to the CoCCA SRS for one or more ccTLDs follows below.

24.2 EPP Interface

The port 700 EPP interface for .halal will listen on the same IP and port as the EPP server for the other TLDs hosted by CoCCA – currently “production.coccaregistry.net:700”, on launch the production EPP interface for .halal will be branded as epp.nic.halal.

24.3 WHOIS Interface (port 43 and 443)

The WHOIS Interface(s) for .halal will listen on the same IP and port as the WHOIS server for the ccTLDs and prospective gTLDs to be hosted by CoCCA – currently “whois.coccaregistry.net:43-443” on launch the interface for .halal will be branded as “whois.nic.halal”. Each TLD (ccTLD/gTLD) in the CoCCA SRS may have different WHOIS disclosure settings based on the TLD policy. The .halal will comply with the ICANN gTLD disclosure requirements.

24.4 GUI Interface (port 443)

The GUI Interface for .halal will listen on the same IP and port as the GUI server for ccTLDs and prospective gTLDs to be hosted by CoCCA – currently https://production.coccaregistry.net:443. On launch, the interface for .halal will be branded as “registry.nic.halal”.

24.5 Hidden Master DNS(s) (port 53)

The there are two hidden master servers. CoCCA will transfer the .halal zone from the “signature master” to PCH for DNSSEC signature using TSIG IXFR/AXFR and IP restrictions at the OS and firewall level. PCH will sign the Zone and transfers it back to CoCCA using TSIG and IXFER/AXFER, CoCCA will then loads the zone on a second “distribution master” which allows distribution to the PCH and ISC anycast transfer points and the CoCCA unicast DNS servers.

24.6 CoCCA Public Unicast DNS

DNS servers on virtual machines running BIND in the Sydney NOC and NZ SRS will pull and resolve the .halal TLD zones.

24.7 Public anycast DNS
CoCCA’s distribution master notifies the anycast providers (PCH and ISC) and .halal TLD zones are transferred to the respective provider’s transfer point IPs (hidden IPS for DNS transfers only) using TSIG IXFER / AXFR and then propagated by PCH and ISC across their respective anycast networks.

24.8 ftp Server
Server to distribute zone files as required under Specification 4 Section 2.

24.9 Escrow Server
Server used to deposit TLD data with NCC and transfer data to CoCCA’s Failover and Escrow SRS. Uses Secondary IP range.

24.10 Number of Servers
There are seven physical server appliances in Sydney NOC configured such that they host 17 virtual machines.

24.11 High Availability (HA) Configuration
The Sydney NOC’s network appliances are configured for failover and HA in either hot or warm standby mode. The PostgreSQL databases are locally replicated using 9.1.3’s synchronous replication and asynchronously over the WAN to the failover facilities. The status of the local and off-site replication is continuously monitored by the CoCCA NOC. CoCCA also ships WAL files so that in the event of an extend WAN outage the offsite SRS can be updated using Point in Time Recovery (PITR).

RDDS and EPP services are load balanced between two different application servers at the primary SRS (more application servers can easily be added). Public read-only RDDS may also load balanced by simply having the nagios monitoring software automatically modify the resource records and send WHOIS traffic to either of the secondary failover SRS’s for near-real time WHOIS, When the primary becomes available or SLA issues (DoS etc) are resolved, RDDS services are automatically switched back to the primary SRS.

The public IPs at the NOC used for EPP, WHOIS and GUI are on routable critical infrastructure ranges assigned to CoCCA by APNIC. In the event of an issue with the primary Internet link at the Sydney NOC (PIPE networks) CoCCA may either modify A and AAA records for GUI / RDDS and EPP services to the local failover link, or the entire IP range can be re-routed using BGP routing to a CoCCA failover SRS. If the entire Sydney NOC suffers an extended outage the traffic can be routed to the failover SRS (Palo Alto) or Escrow SRS (Auckland) as conditions dictate by either modification of resource records (A, cname) or BGP of the CoCCA AS.

VMware images of all virtual machines are made daily using Veeam Backup & Replication software.

In addition to streaming replication, SRS data is sent to CoCCA’s failover SRS and Escrow sites every 10 minutes (or sooner depending on activity) via SCP in the form of postgresql PITR files, and daily in the form of compressed database dumps and VMware images.

24.12 List of Registrars Connected to the CoCCA SRS in Sydney AU as of March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12idn Limited</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1API GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3w Media GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abayard</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB NameISP</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active24 .CZ</td>
<td>CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGNIC Registrar</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGJ Times</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Communications Network</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascio Technologies</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantis North Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automattic Inc</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainReg</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamik Network Information</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBCWYSE Technology Co. Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB Online UK Limited</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing Guoxu Network</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizcn.com, Inc.</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biz.Vi Networks Ltd.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacknight Internet Solutions</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brights Consulting Inc.</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Domain Services</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cctldnames</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogent IPC</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Laude</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communigal Communication Ltd</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect-Ireland</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Council of Registrars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS-Datensysteme GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronon AG</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Service Company</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium For Success, Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybernaptics Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Domains</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANILOU.COM</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Technology</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinahosting SL</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipcon AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentdata anstalt</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainClub.com</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaine.fr</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaininfo AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DomainKeep</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain The Net Technologies</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominiendo IT</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Network Services</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-advert Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Line Host</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easyspace Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encirca</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enet Corporation</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enom</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawing Chiu</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiichi SHIGA (old: Keiichi dot business)</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key-Systems</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klute-Thiemann GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knipp</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen Data</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legekko Info Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexsynergy Limited</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGLovells</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MailClub (France)</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcaria.com</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Cake</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIDAN InterNET GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MarkMonitor</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maudeline Auguste</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWars CO LTD</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne IT CBS AB</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domainbox</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROCIS</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moniker Online Services, LLC</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius Domains</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naikbeen_NCP</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVING BY BLUE CO., LTD</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameAction</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name.com LLC</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nameshield</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameWeb BVBA</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATCOM S.A</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Computer Board</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesys Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nessus GmbH</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetAccess / AccessHaiti S.A</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetNames Ltd</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-Chinese Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETCOM S.A.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETLINKS</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking4all</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius.biz Hosting</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexus</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE S.r.l. d/b/a niceweb.eu</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island Data Services</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novagroup</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novutec Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE DE MANAGEMENT ET DE RESSOURCES HUMAINES</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB OPTIMAL SYSTEMS LTD</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Telekom</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVH</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXWELL CC</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilink S.A</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peweb Ltda</td>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PlanA Corp</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pointcruz.com</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro.vider.de</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Net</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redspider.biz</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register_com</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register.it spa</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register.mu</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register.eu</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Name Registration Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg.Net.Ua</td>
<td>UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101Domain, Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWGUSA</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safenames</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Telekom</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions S.A.</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpeedPartner GmbH</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studio28</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunnyNames LLP</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TainoSystems</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Authority of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Plus Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TierraNet Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Hosting</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TradeMark Unlimited, Inc</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todaynic.com, Inc.</td>
<td>HK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP Domains Pty Ltd</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.S. Trabia-Network S.R.L.</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSNET S.A</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSVERSAL</td>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Telecom</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucows</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugcit</td>
<td>GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICART Ltd.</td>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>united-domains AG</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variomedia AG</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne IT DBS, Inc.</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-Trade Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiant Outsourcing S.r.l.</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Commerce Communications WebCC</td>
<td>MY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB Development and Hosting Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB Ltd</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Solutions ApS</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebWorkers Internet Consultants cc</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NamIT cc Namibia</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSR Corporation</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. 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.

CoCCA was among the first registry providers to embrace the EPP standard seven years ago. CoCCA’s traditional clients have been small to medium sized ccTLD operators un-encumbered by the legal, contractual and governance issues that often result in protracted delays in rolling out new policy, technology or standards in larger ccTLDs or in the gTLD environment. CoCCA and the users of its SRS software have been historically free to trial and introduce innovative technology policy.

The CoCCA SRS is an “all in one” software package (RDDS/EPP/GUI/Accounting) however this does not prevent it from being deployed in a clustered environment where multiple instances answer for a specific protocol under a load balanced, high availability environment. Using a load balance appliance EPP traffic can be sent to one or more servers which are in turn connected to the same database. In all small to medium sized deployments tested to date load balancing the EPP service is not required - the load balancer is simply configured to provide failover and HA.

An aggressive three-year development program commenced in January 2009 with the objective of ensuring CoCCA’s software was compliant with ICANN’s new gTLD requirements - as well as the meeting needs of new and existing users in the ccTLD community.

25.1 Current EPP RFC Compliance:

RFC 5730 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)

This RFC is a base protocol document for EPP. EPP is an XML-text object based client-server protocol, atomic in its transactions, and developed to support multiple transports and lower level security protocols. There are no partial failures; all commands either succeed or fail definitively. Object-to-object associations are standard with limited application of parent-child relationships where delegate relationships are necessary for affected functionality, such as internal host data and its relationship to domain objects. The pamoja SRS fully implements the service discovery, commands, responses, and the extension framework described.

RFC 5730

This RFC is a base protocol document for EPP. EPP is an XML-text object based client-server protocol, atomic in its transactions, and developed to support multiple transports and lower level security protocols. There are no partial failures; all commands either succeed or fail definitively. Object-to-object associations are standard with limited application of parent-child relationships where delegate relationships are necessary for affected functionality, such
as internal host data and its relationship to domain objects. The pamoja SRS fully implements the service discovery, commands, responses, and the extension framework described.

RFC 5731

This RFC explains the mapping of the primary EPP registry object, the domain object. It reviews associated attributes and states of the domain object as well as child object relationships (hosts). It also details associations with other contact objects. The pamoja SRS complies with the full XML examples and descriptions and applies flexibility where permitted. For example, 5731 allows operators to implement the info command with different responses for a “sponsoring registrar” and a “non-sponsoring registrar” in regards to many domain object attributes. The pamoja SRS implements this as a base protocol document for EPP.

RFC 5732

The pamoja SRS implements this as a base protocol document for EPP. The pamoja SRS notes this RFC describes the mapping of relationships to host objects, which are by definition subordinate to the superordinate domain name object. Host objects that are defined as internal or in the namespace of the registry must be related to a superordinate domain object to be created. Internal hosts, as full child objects, face restrictions associated with the management of their superordinate domain object. External hosts are hosts belonging to another domain namespace and as such are not subordinate in the present namespace. Internal hosts can have a glue or an A record associated with them, external hosts refer to another namespace or zone for the associated A record.

RFC 5733

Another RFC implemented in the The pamoja SRS server, this RFC describes the contact object mappings in EPP. Contact objects are used to contain related data surrounding the standardized contacts types in TLD registries including attributes such as contact type, country, telephone numbers, email addresses, etc. As a standalone object, a contact object can be created and associated with no domain objects or with any number of domain objects available in the registry. This is used commonly by registrars to update common contact information associated across large numbers of domains in a single transaction. Like the domain object, it can be secured with a passphrase or “authinfo” code. Contact object data represents the definitive data source for authoritative RDDS (WHOIS) in new TLDs.

RFC 5734

The pamoja SRS implements this RFC as the preferred industry transport and in compliance with ICANN’s requirements. This RFC describes a standard implementation of TCP incorporating TLS. The transport of choice for the EPP registry community has been TCP. Implementers are encouraged to take precautions against denial of service attacks through the use of standard technologies such as firewall and border router filters.

RFC 5735

The pamoja SRS implements this RFC as applicable to any extensions it utilizes as this RFC provides specific and detailed guidance on EPP extensions. An important principle in creating extensions to, as opposed to modifying, the EPP protocol was to fully preserve the integrity of the existing protocol schema. Additionally, a valid extension itself should be extensible. Another important requirement in the RFC is to include announcements of all available extensions in the EPP server greeting element before establishing an interactive client session.

RFC 3915
The pamoja SRS supports this extension since this all CoCCA managed TLDs implement the grace period implementation known as the Redemption Grace Period or “RGP”. When RGP is in use, domains are deleted into the RGP where Registrars may request a restoration of the domain. This is a billable event and requires a three-step process: placement of the domain into a pending restore state, submission of a restore report explaining why the domain is being restored, and finally the restoration of the domain. The RFC extends the domain update command, adds related domain statuses, such as “redemptionPeriod” and “pendingRestore,” and extends the responses of domain info and other details. The RFC provides a lifecycle description of the RGP and defines the format and content for client to server submission of the associated restore reports.

RFC 5910

The pamoja SRS will support DNSSEC and therefore will also support this extension from initiation of the registration process. DNSSEC is a mechanism for cryptographically verifying that each delegate zone in the DNS hierarchy has been referred to or is referring to its genuine parent or child zone respectively. Since TLD zone files are generated from authoritative registry data, this extension specifically provides the ability to add elements to the domain-create and domain-update functions and to the domain-info responses, allowing registrars to submit associated delegated signer (DS) information of the child zone indicating it is digitally signed and that the parent zone recognizes the indicated key as a valid zone key for the child zone.

SRS General

The pamoja SRS Session Management - pamoja listens on port 700 for client requests. The pamoja SRS Message Exchange - pamoja complies with the EPP message exchange rules The pamoja SRS Data Unit Format - pamoja uses the prescribed packet formats

25.2 EPP Security:

CoCCA’s SRS performs username-clid-password-ssl certificate checks and also contains application level code to restrict connections to a set of IP addresses for each client and login.

Additional security is provided by firewall IP restrictions that restrict port 700 access to the SRS to trusted IP’s and the use of stateful firewalls and load balancing devices to mitigate DoS attacks or other malicious activity.

25.3 EPP - Demonstrating Capability

CoCCA authors the most widely deployed EPP SRS solution and has a long history of both development of and production experience operating an EPP SRS. The CoCCA NOC currently has 12 TLDs on it’s production EPP SRS, over 20 TLD managers have deployed the CoCCA EPP solution locally for production use.

In order to demonstrate capability and compliance with the RFC’s in 24.1 and CoCCA’s Extensions in 25.3. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has instructed CoCCA to make available to evaluators an Operational and Testing and Evaluation (OTE) EPP interface should they desire to evaluate CoCCA’s RFC compliance. Alternatively, evaluators may download CoCCA’s pamoja SRS, install locally and contact CoCCA for configuration advice.

The URL to download pamoja is https://downloads.coccaregistry.net. Installers are available for Linux64x (Centos - Ubuntu ), OSX (10.6+) and WIN7+ servers.
25.3 EPP Extensions

The CoCCA SRS currently provides several extensions to EPP, using the practices defined in RFC-3735. The CoCCA greeting currently defines the following four extensions:
...

25.3.1 Registry Grace Period Extension

Implemented as defined in RFC-3915 - http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3915.txt

25.3.2 Reseller Mapping Extension

This extension tags a domain as being registered via one of registrars’ resellers. The reseller reference is provided in the reference section, and is recorded against the domain as it is registered or updated. The reseller list must be maintained by the Registrar through the CoCCA Registry web interface.

If a registrar decides to load reseller information and map domains, the .halal WHOIS server (port 43 and 443), Historical Abstracts, and Premium WHOIS will display the reseller contact information as well as the Registrar information. If ICANN advises that display of reseller information in the port 43 WHOIS is inconsistent with the response format required in Specification 4, 1.4.2 then CoCCA will disable port 43 and or port 443 display of reseller data for the .halal TLD. Reseller information would still be stored and available for Historical Abstracts and users of the CoCCA’s Premium WHOIS service.

"xml version=“1.0” encoding=“UTF-8“"

xs:schema targetNamespace=“https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-reseller-1.0”
xmlns=“https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-reseller-1.0”
xmlns:xs=“http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema”
elementFormDefault=“qualified”

xs:element name=“extension”
  
  xs:complexType
    
      xs:sequence
        
          xs:element name=“reference“ type=“xs:string“/>
25.3.3 Clearinghouse for Intellectual Property Extension

Extension to connect to an external database to validate IP rights.

<extURI>https://.../coccaregistry.net/cocca-ip-verification-1.1</extURI>

Extension for Domain:Create

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://.../cocca-ip-verification-1.1"
    xmlns="https://.../cocca-ip-verification-1.1"
    xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    elementFormDefault="qualified">

    <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
    Extensible Provisioning Protocol v1.0
    Extension for providing IP Verification to CoCCA Registries
    v1.1 adds extra fields for trademark verification
    </xs:documentation>
    </xs:annotation>

    <xs:element name="extension">
    <xs:complexType>
    <xs:choice>
    <xs:element name="chip" type="chipType"/>
    <xs:element name="trademarks" type="trademarkType"/>
    </xs:choice>
    <xs:complexType name="chipType">
    <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="code">
    </xs:complexType>
    </xs:schema>
This extension allows registrars to provide proof of their Intellectual Property claim for a name, when registering. It can be used to specify Clearing House for IP codes, or Trademarks. A CHIP request XML is as follows:

```xml
<extension>
  <coccaip:extension xmlns:coccaip="https://..//cocca-ip-verification-1.1">
    <coccaip:chip>
      <coccaip:code>XXXXXXXX</coccaip:code>
    </coccaip:chip>
  </coccaip:extension>
</extension>
```

An extension containing trademark information is as follows:

```xml
<extension>
  <coccaip:extension xmlns:coccaip="https://..//cocca-ip-verification-1.1">
    <coccaip:trademarks>
      <coccaip:trademark>
        <coccaip:registeredMark>CoCCA</coccaip:registeredMark>
        <coccaip:registrationNumber>12345</coccaip:registrationNumber>
        <coccaip:registrationLocality>NZ</coccaip:registrationLocality>
        <coccaip:capacity>OWNER</coccaip:capacity>
        <coccaip:companyNumber>1234</coccaip:companyNumber>
      </coccaip:trademark>
      <coccaip:trademarks>
      </coccaip:trademarks>
  </coccaip:trademarks>
  <coccaip:extension>
  </coccaip:extension>
</extension>
```

At the time of application it is not envisioned that this extension will be used for the .halal TLD. However it demonstrates an existing technical capacity to query and synchronize data with external databases in order to validate IP or other rights.

25.3.4 Contact Proxy Extension

```xml
<extURI>https://epp.ote.halal.coccaregistry.net//cocca-contact-proxy-1.0</extURI>
```

Extension to allow registrars to lodge several sets of contact details for a given domain and select which one is
displayed in the port WHOIS.

https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0 and https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0 - extensions for Contact:Create and Contact:Update.

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
    xmlns="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
    xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
    xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
    xsi:schemaLocation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0 cocca-contact-proxy-1.0.xsd"
    elementFormDefault="qualified"/>

<xs:import namespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0" schemaLocation="cocca-contact-proxy-1.0.xsd"/>

<xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
    Extensible Provisioning Protocol v1.0
    
    Extension for creating or updating a contact, with proxy information. This proxy information is provided as a WHOIS response, instead of the contact’s real information if zone settings allow. Proxy information may be specified in full, by providing all the details or by using a reference to a previous contact proxy info. If you want to clear a contact’s proxy info, send an existingProxy type request with an empty reference string.
    </xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>

<xs:element name="extension">
    <xs:complexType>
        <xs:choice>
            <xs:element name="newProxy" type="proxyType"/>
            <xs:element name="existingProxy">
                <xs:complexType>
                    <xs:sequence>
                        <xs:element name="reference" type="proxy:referenceType"/>
                    </xs:sequence>
                </xs:complexType>
            </xs:element>
        </xs:choice>
    </xs:complexType>
</xs:element>

<xs:complexType name="proxyType">
    <xs:sequence/>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="proxyDetails">
  <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="reference" minOccurs="0" type="proxy:referenceType"/>
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>
          This is an optional field you can use to give this proxy info a particular reference. Each reference must be unique, so if you have an existing contact proxy info record with this reference value, you will UPDATE that record, changing the proxy info for any existing contact referencing that proxy.
        </xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:element>
    <xs:element name="email">
      <xs:simpleType>
        <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
          <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
          <xs:minLength value="1"/>
        </xs:restriction>
      </xs:simpleType>
    </xs:element>
    <xs:element name="voice" type="proxy:phoneNumberType"/>
    <xs:element name="fax" minOccurs="0" type="proxy:phoneNumberType"/>
    <xs:element name="internationalAddress" type="proxy:addressType"/>
    <xs:element name="localAddress" type="proxy:addressType" minOccurs="0"/>
  </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:element name="resData">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      If a contact is created or updated with contact proxy information specified, or if the registrar creating the contact has a default proxy specified, then the reference value identifying the proxy is returned in the response, in the extension-resData field described here. If the contact was updated to clear the reference field (i.e. setting the contact’s proxy using the existingProxy type, but leaving the reference field empty) then the reference value will be empty, confirming the update.
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:element name="reference" type="proxy:referenceType"/>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:schema targetNamespace="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
  xmlns="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0"
  xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
  elementFormDefault="qualified">
  <xs:simpleType name="referenceType">
    <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
      <xs:maxLength value="40"/>
      <xs:minLength value="0"/>
    </xs:restriction>
  </xs:simpleType>
  <xs:complexType name="phoneNumberType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="number">
        <xs:simpleType>
          <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
            <xs:maxLength value="64"/>
            <xs:minLength value="1"/>
          </xs:restriction>
        </xs:simpleType>
      </xs:element>
      <xs:element name="extension" minOccurs="0">
        <xs:simpleType>
          <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
            <xs:maxLength value="64"/>
            <xs:minLength value="1"/>
          </xs:restriction>
        </xs:simpleType>
      </xs:element>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
  <xs:complexType name="addressType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="street1">
        <xs:simpleType>
          <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
            <xs:maxLength value="255"/>
            <xs:minLength value="1"/>
          </xs:restriction>
        </xs:simpleType>
      </xs:element>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
</xs:schema>
<xs:simpleType>
  <xs:element>
    <xs:element name="street2" minOccurs="0"/>
  </xs:element>
  <xs:element name="street3" minOccurs="0"/>
  <xs:element name="city">
    <xs:element name="stateProvince" minOccurs="0"/>
    <xs:element name="postcode" minOccurs="0"/>
    <xs:element name="countryCode">
      <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
        <xs:pattern value="[A-Z]{2}"/>
      </xs:restriction>
    </xs:element>
  </xs:element>
</xs:simpleType>
This extension allows the association of a contact proxy with a contact.

The contact:create and contact:update extensions can specify an existing proxy contact by ID. or create a new proxy contact. To associate a contact with an existing contact proxy, use this form:

```xml
<extension>
  <proxyupdate:extension xmlns:proxyupdate="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0">
    <proxyupdate:existingProxy>
      <proxy:reference xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0" XXXXX</proxy:reference>
    </proxyupdate:existingProxy>
  </extension>
```

where XXXXX is the ID of the proxy contact you wish to use. To create a new contact and associate it with a contact, use this form of the create or update extension:

```xml
<extension>
  <proxyupdate:extension xmlns:proxyupdate="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-create-update-1.0"
xmlns:proxy="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-contact-proxy-1.0">
    <proxyupdate:newProxy>
      <proxyupdate:proxyDetails>
        <proxy:reference>XXXX</proxy:reference>
        <proxy:email>XXXX</proxy:email>
        <proxy:voice>
          <proxy:number>XXXX</proxy:number>
        </proxy:voice>
        <proxy:extension>XXXX</proxy:extension>
      </proxyupdate:proxyDetails>
      <proxy:internationalAddress>
        <proxy:street1>XXXX</proxy:street1>
        <proxy:street2>XXXX</proxy:street2>
        <proxy:city>XXXX</proxy:city>
        <proxy:stateProvince>XXXX</proxy:stateProvince>
        <proxy:postcode>XXXX</proxy:postcode>
        <proxy:countryCode>XXXX</proxy:countryCode>
      </proxy:internationalAddress>
    </proxyupdate:newProxy>
  </extension>
```

At the time of application it is not envisioned that this extension will be used for the .halal TLD.
In addition to the above statuses, the CoCCA Registry provides additional lifecycle statuses over and above those defined in RFC-5731. The CoCCA Activation statuses are provided using namespaced status elements in the Domain:Create and Domain:Info responses, and are accompanied by an RFC-3735 compliant extension section. A Domain:Create response for a newly registered domain would appear as follows:

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"?>
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="229" id="21192"/>
    <resData>
      <domain:infData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
        <domain:name>info.confirm.test</domain:name>
        <domain:roid>234511-CoCCA</domain:roid>
        <domain:status s="inactive">Delegation information has not been supplied</domain:status>
        <activation:status xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0" s="pendingActivation">
          This domain requires acceptance of AUP and registrant agreement by 2012-02-29 10:19
        </activation:status>
        <domain:registrant>regis-80ESbqGtje</domain:registrant>
        <domain:clID>registrar</domain:clID>
        <domain:crID>registrar</domain:crID>
        <domain:crDate>2012-02-21T21:19:32.887Z</domain:crDate>
        <domain:exDate>2013-02-21T21:19:33.006Z</domain:exDate>
        <domain:pw>Hh7Wz3c9dC</domain:pw>
        <extension>
          <rgp:infData xmlns:rgp="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rgp-1.0 rgp-1.0.xsd">
            <activation:extension xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0">
              <activation:url>https://registry-adam-activate.jsp?activationCode=ITIhilkma8SmbCsYeYi8uEajkwoXKNL0MLu0HHXkXjZUynrDZ2Uh6SB2h8h1D8</activation:url>
              <activation:link>activate.jsp?activationCode=ITIhilkma8SmbCsYeYi8uEajkwoXKNL0MLu0HHXkXjZUynrDZ2Uh6SB2h8h1D8</activation:link>
            </activation:extension>
            <trID>CR-4</trID>
          </rgp:infData>
        </extension>
      </domain:infData>
    </resData>
  </response>
</epp>
```
25.4 EPP Access Requirements

1. IP Address white listing (firewall and application layer)
2. Signed registry issued SSL certificates
3. Username-Password

Authentication requires that the IP address the connection is made from be white listed IP, that the entity connecting use a CoCCA-issued SSL certificate and that correct clientID and passwords be used. By default registrars have only GUI access to the SRS, EPP is enabled by request and only after a Registrar has been certified on CoCCA’s OT&E platform.

25.5 CoCCA GUI Environment

In addition to providing the standard implementation of EPP that runs on Port 700, CoCCA also provides a secure web based Graphical User Interface running on Port 443 that allows Registrars to register and manage domains in their portfolio without connecting by EPP.

25.6 EPP Via the GUI

In cases where a registrar uses the SRS GUI, all domain, host and contact operations supported by the RFC’s are executed by pamoja’s internal EPP engine to ensure that GUI and port 700 EPP interfaces behave identically.

These methods of authentication include:
1. IP Address white listing
2. Using a one-time password (“OTP”) delivered via hardware token, soft token or SMS is issued by CoCCA.
3. The use of a Username-Password

25.7 Registrars

A list of registrars that have already successfully integrated and connected to CoCCA’s SYD SRS is attached. CoCCA’s SYD SRS is used by 200+ Registrars, many of which currently utilize the XML based EPP protocol for the purpose of providing automated services to their clients.

25.8 Resourcing and Continuous Development

CoCCA’s software development team and systems administrators support both their own in-house SRS and that of over 23 other TLD managers who have deployed the pamoja SRS software locally on their own infrastructure. Development is ongoing and active. The CoCCA SRS has been developed over the past 9 years, the bulk of the development on the EPP platform has been completed, however two full time developers are employed by CoCCA to customize, maintain and improve the software for the TLD’s that use it.

Because of the co-operative nature of the development process CoCCA works closely with over a dozen developers and network engineers employed by users of CoCCA’s TLD software to resolve bugs, continuously improve pamoja’s performance and add new features.
26. Whois: describe

- how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookups 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:

- A high-level Whois system description;
- Relevant network diagram(s);
- IT and infrastructure resources (e.g., servers, switches, routers and other components);
- Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems; and
- Frequency of synchronization between servers.

To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:

- Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and
- A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

CoCCA currently delivers proven, innovative WHOIS and Registration Data Directory Services (“RDDS”) technology to the TLDs hosted by CoCCA and to the TLDs that deploy the pamoja SRS on their own infrastructure. CoCCA’s Specification Four compliant WHOIS and RDDS technology will be utilized by CoCCA for the .halal TLD. Under CoCCA’s SRS Architecture one WHOIS server will answer for all the TLDs in the SRS. Each TLD Sponsor can configure the WHOIS such that it serves different results depending on the wishes of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and applicable ICANN requirements.

26.1  WHOIS Architecture and Infrastructure Overview

CoCCA’s flexible WHOIS architecture is designed for high availability, complies with RFC 3912 and surpasses the requirements in Specifications 4 and 10. The flexible pamoja WHOIS server may be configured to provide a variety of information, and in a variety of formats that supplements ICANN’s proposed gTLD requirements.

As registrations appear (or are modified) in the registration database, changes are committed to a replicated read only secondary database utilized by CoCCA’s WHOIS server. Because the replication is synchronous WHOIS data is presented in real time. If at a future date WHOIS query response times becomes an SLA issue, WHOIS responses may be cached using “infinite cache” horizontal caching technology, which has been tested and can readily scale to meet future demand, alternatively RDDS services may be answered by a SRS instance off-site (one of the CoCCA
secondary-failover SRS’s) for near real-time WHOIS and RDDS.

26.2 Port 43 WHOIS (command line)

CoCCA has confirmed that the format of the domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state-province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses can and will be configured to conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFC’s 5730-5734. The originating IP address and date time of all WHOIS queries are logged and will be stored for a minimum of 28 days in the production SRS.

GUI configuration and command line flags allow a client to request output in ASCII, Unicode, ASCII and Unicode or HTML output (with tables). For IDN TLDs, a variety of command line WHOIS options have been tested in conjunction with the Arabic TLDs that use the CoCCA SRS. CoCCA supports all the current IETF standards and several developed for current IDN users. CoCCA’s SRS can be readily modified should ICANN mandate a particular technology in the future.

26.2.1 Domain Name Data:
* Proposed Production Query format: whois “h -whois.nic.〈TLD〉 domain
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.4.2 (pages 40-41).

26.2.2 Registrar Data:
* Proposed Production query format: whois “h -whois.nic.halal registrar
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.5.2 (pages 41-42) -- with the exception of the registrar ”WHOIS Server” object (p. 42), under the proposed .halal thick registry model registrars will not operate their own WHOIS servers.

Inclusion of this object seems redundant and may cause confusion regarding the authoritative WHOIS server for the .halal. If required by ICANN the registrar WHOIS object data will be collected and displayed by CoCCA.

26.2.3 Name Server Data:
* Proposed Production Query format: whois “h -whois.nic.〈TLD〉 (Host or IP)
* Response format: Currently compliant with Specification 4, Section 1.6.2 (p. 42)

26.3 Public WHOIS service via a secure port 443 web-based interface:
CoCCA’s pamoja software has a publicly accessible port 443 GUI service that allows individuals to query the SRS for registration data for individual domain, registrar or host records.

CoCCA has confirmed that the format of the domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state-province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses can and will be configured to conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFC’s 5730-5734.

To prevent abuse, CoCCA implements rate limiting via CAPTCHA for each individual transaction. The procedure would follow as per below.

1) An individual would navigate in a browser to https:⁄⁄whois.nic.〈TLD〉
2) Click on the appropriate button (Domain, Registrar, or Name Server)
3) Enter the applicable parameter:
   ----Domain name, including the TLD (e.g., EXAMPLE.TLD)
   ----Full name of the registrar, including punctuation (e.g., Example Registrar, Inc.)
   ----Full host name or the IP address (e.g., NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD or 198.41.3.39)
4) Enter the CAPTCHA phrase or symbols
5) Click on the Submit button

Possible Outcomes from the query:
* If an exact match for the domain, host, or registrar exists in the SRS, the Port 443 WHOIS will display the same information and with the same formatting, as the port 43 WHOIS (see above and Specification 4, Sections 1.4 "1.6").
* If there is no exact match but a super-ordinate domain exists the SRS data for the super-ordinate name is to be displayed. By way of example if an individual searches for abc.domain.halal and abc.domain.halal does not exist then the SRS would display the information on domain.halal and advise the individual accordingly.

26.4 WHOIS and RDDS | Demonstrating Capability

CoCCA has almost a decade of experience running multiple TLDs and providing WHOIS services. WHOIS and RDDS are integrated into CoCCA’s pamoja software. In order to demonstrate capability and compliance with the Specification Four, Section One, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has instructed CoCCA to make available to evaluators an Operational and Testing and Evaluation (OTE) WHOIS and RDDS interface on request. Alternatively, evaluators may download CoCCA’s pamoja SRS, install locally and contact CoCCA for configuration advice.

The URL to download pamoja is https://downloads.coccaregistry.net. Installers are available for Linux64x (Centos - Ubuntu), OSX (10.6+) and WIN7+ servers.

26.5 Network Diagrams

CoCCA’s RDDS services serve data directly from the SRS, there is no separate WHOIS database. If performance becomes an issue pamoja’s RDDS read-only services can be configured to extract data from a replicated copy of the SRS.

Individuals or entities that desire to run multiple queries against the SRS for law enforcement purposes, IP protection or to mitigate cyber-crimes need simply subscribe to CoCCA’s Premium RDDS Service and may query the SRS via EPP as well as port 43 and the 443 GUI. Premium RDDS users are granted EPP read-only access (on request) and need not be ICANN Accredited registrars. In many cases EPP may be a better tool for automation of multiple queries than port 43 WHOIS.

The systems supporting WHOIS are fully redundant with hardware and software that can easily scale to meet the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s growth projections of the TLD. For comprehensive description of the SYD NOC see questions 31 and 32.

The WHOIS server at the CoCCA Data Centre in Sydney currently answers for 12 TLDs and processes on average fewer than 8000 WHOIS requests per hour. The current WHOIS server and database has been tested and can answer in excess of 9,000 TPS as currently configured - network latency may impact real world results depending on the origin of the query.

26.6 Synchronization Frequency Between Servers

CoCCA’s WHOIS architecture is designed to ensure WHOIS data is current, accurate and reliable. CoCCA’s RDDS services serve data directly from the SRS, in the default configuration there is no separate WHOIS database. CoCCA uses PostgreSQL and synchronous replication data is committed to the production SRS master database and a secondary database (read only) server configured to serve WHOIS data, so that at all times the SRS and CoCCAs WHOIS servers serve the same data.
CoCCA streams SRS data off-site asynchronously (and by log file shipping as a failover) to their SRS servers in Palo Alto and Auckland to enable those SRS’s to serve near-real time WHOIS data if the primary SRS experiences an issue that negatively impacts CoCCA’s ability to meet SLA’s for the .halal TLD.

If WHOIS caching is required as the .halal TLD grows, compliance with the SLA requirements in the ICANN agreement may necessitate that Failover SRS or Escrow SRS answer RDDS queries or that cache servers be deployed, in such a circumstance, the WHOIS response would be near real-time (accurate to within a min or two of the primary SRS).

26.7 Compliance with Specification 4

CoCCA will provide free RDDS Services via both port 43 and a web-based port 443 site in accordance with RFC 3912.

Additionally, the CoCA will also provide fee-based Premium RDDS service described in further detail below. CoCCA and the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. acknowledge that ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols and if such change were to occur; CoCCA will implement specification changes as soon as practical.

CoCCA and the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will provide bulk access of thin RDDS data to ICANN to verify and ensure operational stability of registry services, as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars. Access will be provided to ICANN on a weekly basis and the format will be based on section 3 of Specification 4. Further, exceptional access to thick RDDS will be provided to ICANN per Specification 2.

Should ICANN request it CoCCA will provide ICANN with a Premium RDDS login at no charge which will provide them with continuous access to the SRS to extract thick SRS data for the .halal at its leisure.

The proposed format of the data objects for domains, name servers, and the registrar output are provided below:

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 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
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: johngreek@example-registrar.tld

Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z

1.6. Nameserver 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

26.8 Supplemental Data
Subject to ICANN Approval, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will ensure the SRS is configured to display the following Supplemental RDDS data (objects only displayed if applicable).

Activation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Contact Confirmation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Contact Confirmation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
Registration Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Registration MIN Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Redemption Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Purge Date: 2011-12-31
Renewal Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
Transfer Grace Expiry Date: 2011-12-31

Reseller ID: 4261797-ERL
Reseller Name: ACME Reseller A
Reseller Street: 123 RESELLER STREET
Reseller City: RESELLER VILLE
Reseller State/Province: RS
Reseller Postal Code: 12345
Reseller Country: US
Reseller Phone: +1.5555551219
Reseller Phone Ext: 1239
Reseller Fax: +1.5555551219
Reseller Fax Ext: 4329
Reseller Support Email: helpdesk@reseller.<TLD>
26.9 Compliance with Specification 10

CoCCA’s WHOIS service will comply and/or exceed the Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS) performance specifications outlined in Specification 10 of the proposed Registry agreement. For the existing TLDs supported by CoCCA, all service levels already exceed the Specification 10 Requirements:

* RDDS Availability › 98%
* RDDS Query › 95%
* RDDS Update › 95%

CoCCA’s current RDDS availability statistics are available online at http://stats.coccaregistry.net

RDDS services that are near real time can be provided from the failover or escrow SRS’s by simply changing the IP-CNAME for the whois.nic.[TLD] if there are SLA related or loading issues. This has been tested and is being done automatically at any time by CoCCA’s monitoring software with near immediate effect < 30 seconds.

26.10 Historical Abstracts

In addition to CoCCA’s RDDS services, detailed Historical Abstracts for individual domains are also made readily available to the general public, law enforcement and rights owners.

Historical Abstracts are a compilation of all information available on a domain (including deleted - archived domains) that are held in the registry. This includes the time and date of all changes in contacts, hosts, registrars, resellers, status’s as well as all registration, activation, confirmation, renewal, restore or commercial transactions related to the maintenance of domain in the SRS.

A representative sample of a Historical Abstract detailing the full history of a domain is attached.

26.11 Premium RDDS (port 443 and port 700 EPP)

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., with the service support of CoCCA, intends to offer Boolean partial and exact match search capability of all Domain, Contact, Host, Registrar data in the SRS within the Directory Service via a web interface. This Premium service will be billed at a monthly rate depending on the number of queries.

ICANN’s requirement that thin SRS data be made available in bulk makes it trivial for any entity who has thin data provided by the Centralized Zone Data Access Provider to run automated queries against the .halal WHOIS public WHOIS server and extract thick SRS data - for all the domains in a zone. CoCCA’s Premium RDDS makes access to registration data by IP Owners, Law Enforcement and CERT’s efficient (EPP and GUI) and timely (real-time). Premium RDDS does not expose any information that ICANN’s gTLD policy does not effectively require Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to otherwise make publicly available to the public via WHOIS and the services of CZDA Provider.

Because experience has demonstrated that entities often attempt to use the WHOIS for a variety of purposes, rights protection, research etc., and because WHOIS is a rather blunt instrument which does not provide always provide the most useful advice on reserved domains, wildcard string registrations etc. entities with a Premium RDDS Service will, on request, be granted read-only EPP access to retrieve domain information.

In order to make it unnecessary for IP owners or others to continuously query the SRS via EPP or command line WHOIS
subscribers to the Premium RDDS may create lists that use regular java expressions and boolean operations that will notify them by email and if applicable EPP polling messages when a domain that matches a given string is registered.

To mitigate abuse of this feature, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will implement the following measures to ensure legitimate authorized users and ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies:

* Premium RDDS subscribers must agree, as a condition of access to comply with Section 2.1.5 of Specification 4. To monitor that RDDS services are not being abused and used to “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” CoCCA will seed the SRS with unique records and that enable them to track reported abuse back to an individual RDDS subscriber.

* Because this is only offered as a premium and paid service, the request must follow the CoCCA application process to confirm the user identification and process the financial transaction. Thus, the typical end-user will not have access to this service.

* All GUI searches are conducted via authenticated user access using a combination of username and password and OTP tokens.

* CoCCA will monitor for out of band usage patterns of the Premium RDDS service and take appropriate action if policy thresholds are exceeded.

26.12 Zone File Access

Subscribers to the Premium RDDS may download .halal zone files via the port 43 GUI up to six (6) times in any 24 hour period.

CoCCA will comply all the requirements set out in Specification 4, Sections 2.1-2.1.7. Specifically, CoCCA will operate a dedicated server supporting FTP, and or other data transport access protocols in a manner specified by ICANN and the Centralized Zone Data Access Provider.

26.13 Resource Plans

The .halal TLD will be added to CoCCA’s SRS at their primary data center in Sydney which currently supports the features noted above.

The Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will dedicate 2 professionals to coordinate the operation of the .halal TLD. At the same time, the technical professionals at CoCCA will be supporting the vast majority of the technical aspects of operating the .halal TLD.

27. Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD. The description must:
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adopt the CoCCA harmonized life cycle currently adopted by a dozen ccTLDs. The .halal life-cycle described below builds on the CoCCA technology and policy launched in November 2011 that sought to increase the accuracy of WHOIS data, minimize harm and increase consumer trust in TLDs. The life-cycle for the .halal TLD builds on the traditional gTLD life-cycle by adding direct Registrant-Registry interaction.

The proposed .halal life-cycle ensures key elements of the .halal TLD abuse prevention and mitigation framework are adhered to by delaying mapping of the Registrant’s desired NS delegation information until the registrant has Activated a domain. All .halal registrations are provisional until Activated. Activation requires that the registrant confirm (with CoCCA) the accuracy of the contact information lodged by the registrar and reads agrees to the .halal Registrant Agreement (RA), AUP and Privacy RDDS Policy.

Activation takes place via automated processes that store the time: date and IP address of the Activation as part of the domains history.

Registrants will also be required to confirm (with CoCCA) the accuracy of the contact details and agreement with the .halal RA, AUP and Privacy RDDS Policy at a) the time of renewal, b) on transfer and c) on the anniversary of registration. The following Life-Cycle describes the CoCCA SRS EPP and WHOIS behavior at various stages in the Life-Cycle.

27.1 Registration | Initial Registration

Not Registered
SRS EPP domain:check response

```xml
<"xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"">
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="309" id="21153"/>
  </response>
</epp>
```
SRS WHOIS response
$ whois no-exist.example
Domain Name: no-exist.example
Domain Status: Available

TERMS OF USE: (Legal Notice)

Note if a string cannot be registered for policy reasons the following the SRS will return the following. EPP domain:check Status

"xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"">
xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:epp-1.0 epp-1.0.xsd">
  <response>
    <result code="1000">
      <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
    </result>
    <msgQ count="309" id="21153"/>
    <resData>
      <domain:chkData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0"
xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
        <domain:cd>
          <domain:name avail="0">profanity.example</domain:name>
          <domain:reason>Registry policy</domain:reason>
        </domain:cd>
      </domain:chkData>
    </resData>
  </response>
</epp>
WHOIS Status Display

$ whois profanity.example
Domain Name: profanity.example
Domain Status: Not Registered
Notes: This name is not allowed by the policy of this registry, and cannot be registered


----------------------------------------
Registered | Status “Pending Activation”

The Activation and Confirmation requirements run in parallel to Grace, MIN, Pending Delete, Pending Purge and other SRS states. As soon the application is lodged via the SRS EPP and WHOIS servers will return the following.

EPP domain:info Status

```xml
<response>
    <response>
      <result code="1000">
        <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
      </result>
      <msgQ count="309" id="21153"/>
      <resData>
        <domain:infData xmlns:domain="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:domain-1.0 domain-1.0.xsd">
          <domain:name>pending.example</domain:name>
          <domain:roid>1234-CCCA</domain:roid>
          <domain:status s="inactive">Delegation information has not been mapped</domain:status>
          <activation:status xmlns:activation="https://production.coccaregistry.net/cocca-activation-1.0" s="pendingActivation">This domain requires acceptance of AUP and registrant agreement by 2012-04-09 15:39</activation:status>
          <domain:registrant>example</domain:registrant>
          <domain:c1ID>adam</domain:c1ID>
          <domain:crID>adam</domain:crID>
          <domain:crDate>2012-04-02T03:39:55.925Z</domain:crDate>
          <domain:exDate>2013-04-02T03:39:55.942Z</domain:exDate>
          <domain:authInfo>
            <domain:pw>example</domain:pw>
          </domain:authInfo>
        </domain:infData>
      </resData>
    </response>
  </epp>
</response>
```
WHOIS Status Display Example

$ whois pending.example
Domain Name: pending.example
Domain ID: 12345-CoCCA
WHOIS Server: whois.example
Referral URL:
Updated Date: 2012-02-07T03:51:17.543Z
Creation Date: 2010-03-04T04:15:10.423Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2015-07-04T04:15:10.434Z
Sponsoring Registrar: Example Registrar
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 1234
Domain Status: pendingActivation

Registrant ID: 12345-CoCCA
Registrant Name: Example Registrant
Registrant Organization: Example Org
Registrant Street: 1 Example Rd
Registrant City: Exampleville
Registrant State-Province: EX
Registrant Postal Code: 1234
Registrant Country: EX

Name Server: ns1.example.com
Name Server: ns2.example.com

DNSSEC: unsigned

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and an EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.
27.1.1 Contractual Considerations:

Under the .halal TLD policy all registrations are considered provisional by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. until the Registrant accepts the .halal RA and confirms the accuracy of the contact details lodged by the Registrar.

27.1.2 Behavior:

Until such time as the domain is Activated it is parked on a Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. controlled website that displays the domains port 43 WHOIS information. The SRS ignores the registrar-submitted Name Server (“NS”) delegation information for all domains with a status of "Pending Activation" and replaces them with the CoCCA parking servers.

27.1.3 Duration:

A provisional application may be Activated by the Registrant or Administrative Contact at any time during the first 28 days after the Registration request is lodged in the SRS. On the 29th day after registration if a domain has not already been deleted by the Registrar, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. deems the application to have been withdrawn by the registrant and the Status is changed to "Pending Purge " Restore Not Possible".

```xml
<response>
  <result code="2303">
    <msg>Object does not exist</msg>
  </result>
  <trID>
    <clTRID>TR-2</clTRID>
    <svTRID>1333583795929</svTRID>
  </trID>
</response>
</epp>
```

EPP domain:check Status

```xml
<response>
  <result code="1000">
    <msg>Command completed successfully</msg>
  </result>
  <trID>
    <clTRID>TR-2</clTRID>
    <svTRID>1333583795929</svTRID>
  </trID>
</response>
</epp>
```
WHOIS Status Display  (Domain Status: Excluded – Pending Purge). The Registrant and their Registrar are sent an email and EPP Polling message indicating the Status change.

On the 31st day after Registration, a domain that has not been Activated is purged from the SRS and instantly available for registration. Registrars are sent a polling message and email informing them that the domain application has been rejected and the domain has been deleted.

27.1.4 Commercial Considerations:

Funds are debited from the Registrars account instantly and refunded in full after 31 days if a domain is not activated and where Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has deemed the application to register to have been withdrawn. Names that are not Activated are not delegated in accordance with the Registrants wishes and cannot be used for tasting.

27.2 Registered Activated

Once Activated the EPP Domain:info Status is automatically changed to “Active - Delegated” and the WHOIS display to “Active - Delegated”.

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

> Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
> Contact Confirmation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
> Registration Grace Expiry Date: [Activation Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z]

Note: [Grace Period expires as soon as a name is activated]
>
Registration MIN Expiry Date: 2011-12-31

27.3 Registration Grace

A one (1) day Grace period applies to all registrations, Provisional (pending activation) registrations. If a name is Activated the Grace Period is instantly expired. This policy effectively mitigates the prospect of abuse of the .halal TLD or CoCCA’s SRS for domain tasting, kiting or other similar activity, while allowing a registrar 24 hours
to reverse a registration that included a typographical error or was found to be fraudulent without incurring a commercial penalty.

EPP domain:info Status

```xml
<"xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"">
  <response>
    <result code="1000"> Command completed successfully </result>
  </response>
</epp>
```

WHOIS Status Display

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following values - after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

> Activation Expiry Date: 2011-12-31T11:11:11Z
27.3.1 Registration Grace | Behavior
Domains deleted during Grace do NOT go into redemption and are instantly available. Domains may NOT be transferred during GRACE. The Domain Status shown in a WHOIS and EPP query during grace is “clientTransferProhibited”.

27.3.2 Registration Grace | Commercial Considerations
A full refund equal to 100% of the registration value is applied to a registrars account for domains that are not activated in the first 24 hours. If a domain is Activated in the first 24 hours then deleted it is considered to have been deleted during the “MIN” period as Grace expires on Activation. See Section 28 bellow for explanation of “MIN”.

27.4 MIN Period
The MIN period is a life-cycle element that is probably unique to the CoCCA SRS – and mostly commercial in nature. The MIN period for the .halal is 14 days, the MIN period starts when a name is registered.

Unless ICANN objects, the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) and EPP Domain:info query will also display the following value – after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.

27.4.1 Registration MIN | Behavior
Domains deleted by a registrar during the MIN period do NOT go into redemption. Domains may not be transferred during MIN. (the Domain Status shown in a WHOIS and EPP query is “clientTransferProhibited”). An EPP polling message is sent when the MIN period expires.

27.4.2 Registration MIN | Commercial Considerations
Since the Grace period is only one day – and only for domains that are not activated, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will give registrars a partial refund (80% of the annual registration fee) for Activated names that are deleted in the first 14 days after registration.

27.5 Renewals
Under the .halal TLD RA registrants are required to confirm the accuracy of the contact details and accept the .halal TLD RA, AUP and Privacy Policy with the registry within 28 days of renewal or the domain is suspended until such time as the RA is accepted and contact details confirmed.

27.6 Expiry
The SRS supports “registrar configurable auto renew”, registrars may custom configure the auto-renew behavior via CoCCA’s GUI. Some registrars may wish to auto renew domains on expiry while others may not. If a registrar has configured auto renew the SRS, and they have available credit, the SRS will renew the domain for the period selected by the registrar (up to the maximum allowable) on the day it expires. If a name expires the following would apply.

Unless ICANN objects, the SRS will automatically update the domain record so that a query of the WHOIS server (port 43 and 443) or EPP Domain:info query will also display the following value – after display of the values required in the EPP RFC’s and in Specification 4 Section 1.4.
27.6.1 Expiry Grace | Suspension
On Expiry a domain automatically enters a seven day Expiry Grace period in which the domain is Suspended by the SRS and parked on a Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. parking page.

An expired and suspended name is not locked and may be renewed without a restore fee in the first seven (7) days after expiration. Suspended domains may NOT be transferred.
27.6.2 Expiry | Pending Delete - Restorable (Redemption)

On the eighth day after expiration the SRS will change the domain’s Status to “Pending Delete Restorable” for a period of 28 days. Suspended and Pending Delete domains may NOT be transferred. At any point between after day seven (7) and before day 29 a registrar may Restore a domain via EPP (RFC-3915) after restoration a domain must be renewed.

The SRS will automatically update the domain record so that a query of the WHOIS or EPP will also display the following values.

› Redemption Expiry Date: 2011-12-31
› Purge Date: 2011-12-31

27.6.3 Expiry | Pending Purge (No longer Restorable)

On the 29th day after expiry the SRS will change the status of the domain to “Pending - Purge” and apply a registry lock. The WHOIS status and EPP Domain:info query would be displayed as Pending Purge. The domain would stay in this state for seven (7) days until purged from the SRS 35 days after Expiry. Once purged it is available - subject to any restrictions or policies in effect at the time.

See Attached Life - Cycle Diagram

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 described below.

- 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;
- Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (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:
  - Requiring multi-factor authentication (i.e., strong passwords, tokens, one-time passwords) from registrants to process update, transfers, and deletion requests;
  - Requiring multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests; and
  - Requiring the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 20 pages.

28.1 Policy Matrix
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has chosen to adopt CoCCA’s tested acceptable use-based policy matrix, recommendations for minimising harm in TLDs, and subject the .halal TLD to the CoCCA Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”). Any individual who has a concern regarding abuse involving a .halal domain, glue record, or the CoCCA PCH or ISC’s network services as they relate to .halal needs to lodge a complaint via the CRS. CoCCA’s policy regarding glue records is quite simple, Registrars cannot create or use a host if the super-ordinate domain does not exist. When a domain is purged from the SRS CoCCA automatically deletes any glue records. All other glue record related issues can be dealt with via the CRS.

The CoCCA Best practice policy matrix has been developed over a decade and has currently been adopted by 16 TLDs. It was developed for (and by) ccTLDs managers that desired to operate an efficient standards-based SRS system complemented by a policy environment that addressed a registrants use of a string as well as the more traditional gTLD emphasis rights to string.

A key element of CoCCA’s policy matrix is that it provides for registry-level suspensions where there is evidence of AUP violations. The .halal TLD will join other TLDs that utilize the CoCCA’s single-desk CRS. The CRS provides a framework for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to swiftly address concerns regarding the use of .halal domains, and the CoCCA network. The AUP can be used to address concerns regarding a domain or any other resource record that appears in the .halal zone.

The CRS procedure provides an effective alternative to the court system while allowing for Complaints against domains to be handled in a way treats each complaint in a fair and equal manner and allows for all affected parties to present evidence and arguments in a constructive forum.
In certain cases, it may be necessary for the CRS to trigger a Critical Issue Suspension, which suspends service of a domain, or removes a host record, when there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. The intent of any CIS is to minimize any abuse that may occur in a timely manner. Any CIS may be appealed through the CoCCA ombudsman’s Amicable Complaint Resolution service.

28.1 Contractual Framework
Under the proposed framework Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will bind registrants to a .halal TLD Registrant Agreement (“RA”). This RA is a collateral agreement that supersedes any Registrar – Registrant agreement and binds all Registrants to the .halal AUP, Privacy and WHOIS policy, CoCCA CRS and any other requirements or dispute mechanisms mandated by ICANN.

The draft .halal AUP follows below in sections 28.4. The RA and WHOIS and Privacy Policy may be viewed at http://coccaregistry.net/.halal-policy

28.2 Minimizing Harm, Pro-active Measures
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will adopt the following five (5) key provisions of CoCCA’s already field-tested policies and technology aimed at preventing and mitigating abuse.

28.2.1 “Trust but Verify”
Applicants for .halal registrations must confirm to the registry that they agree to be bound by the registrant agreement and confirm the accuracy of contact details lodged by the Registrar with the registry. Until the Registrant or Administrative contact confirm their contact details with the Registry directly, and view accept the Registrant Agreement .halal domains are excluded from the zone. See Life-Cycle Policy.

Automated Activation processes are already in place for 12 TLD currently using the CoCCA SRS. The process involves direct registry – registrant communication using email details provided to the registry by the Registrar. An automated email is sent to the Registrant and Admin contact that contains a link. The recipient must click on the link where they are directed to a web page that 1) displays the contact information the Registrar provided, 2) displays the .halal RA and AUP policy.

All responses (positive or negative) are lodged against the domains permanent history in the SRS and the time: date / IP address stored.

The process also allows the registry the opportunity to independently verify the accuracy of contact data supplied by the registrar, or at least that there is a functioning email – improving WHOIS accuracy. The SRS uses dynamically generated images as a challenge-response verification to prevent automated processes activating domains and to directly collect and store additional identifying information about individuals Activating a domain, which can be utilised to control fraud or investigate cyber crimes.

Although registrars are required to advise registrants of the TLD policies and conditions, with the prevalence of highly automated registration systems and expansive reseller networks it cannot be guaranteed that registrants have reviewed or agreed to the policy.

The registrant or administrative contact must confirm the accuracy of the WHOIS data on not only on Registration but also the anniversary of Registration and Renewal. On any change of Registrant or Transfer the new Registrant must also agree to the RA and AUP directly with the Registry before the changes to the contacts are committed in the registry.

These procedures and the underlying technology are in use now and undergoing constant refinement in response to Registrar and Registrant suggestions.
28.2.2 Registrants’ rights to a limited license
The .halal RA and AUP limit a registrants’ rights to a limited license to use but not to sub-license the use of any portion of the allocated SLD, subject to continuing compliance with all policies in place during that time. Registrants must warrant they will not assign the licence or sub-license any sub-domain without:

(a) securing the sub-licensee’s agreement to the RA, AUP and all other applicable policies; and
(b) obtaining the registry’s consent in writing.

Rationale: It has occurred that registrants have registered a second level domain in order to set up what amounts to a third level registry, effectively sub-licensing to third parties the use of portions of their allocated second level domain. Most abuse seems to occur in lower level domains created by Registrants or third parties.

The .halal TLD policy is recursive, however combating abusive activity in a TLD is complicated if the registry has no information as to the user of the subordinate domain or any way to suspend a single domain created by a registrant at a subordinate level.

28.2.3 Fast flux mitigation
Fast flux mitigation - queue for manual intervention by SRS admins all DNS delegation modifications that exceed four (4) requests in any 28 day period or three (3) in a one week period.

Rationale: This minimizes a registrant’s ability to frequently redelegate a domain, in order to overcome service limitations imposed by Internet service providers. Frequent redelegation may also assist a malicious user to obscure their identity. Limiting frequent redelegations enhances the effectiveness of service termination as a sanction by an Internet service provider.

28.2.4 Anycast Resiliency
A denial of service attack from, say, a single ISP will usually only affect a single node. All other nodes in the world will not notice anything about the attack and the rest of the Internet will thus not notice it either. A local attack is therefore only affecting the local neighborhood. Distributed denial of service attacks usually affects a few nodes only, but because the attack is spread out between nodes, so is the amount of traffic flowing to each node. With 80+ noes and two Anycast networks, the .halal TLD is well protected against abuse targeting the .halal DNS resolvers.

28.2.5 High Risk Strings
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will require manual intervention by the registry operator before domains that contain various strings such as “bank”, “secure”, “PayPal” etc., go into the zone. A comprehensive list of high-risk strings

28.2.6 Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. CERT Law Enforcement Collaboration
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will provide CERT, Law Enforcement and other interested parties direct read-only Access to the SRS on application for research and other activities related to identifying and mitigating abuse. The CoCCA already provides direct access to the Australian Government CERT.

The CoCCA SRS contains a variety of login types with various permissions, one such type is “Cert ⁄ Law Enforcement” which allows GUI-based query as well as EPP and Zone Access.

28.3 COCCA Complaint Resolution Service
The Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”) provides a transparent, efficient and cost effective way for the public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to have their concerns addressed regarding use of a TLD managers network or SRS services. The CRS provides a single framework in which cyber-crime, accessibility of prohibited Internet content and abuse of intellectual property rights are addressed. The framework relies on three tiers of review: immediate action to protect the public interest, amicable complaint resolution lead by an independent Ombudsman, and where applicable, adjudication by an Expert. The CRS provides an efficient and swift
alternative to the Courts.

All complaints made against a domain to CoCCA are referred through the CRS protocol. When a complaint is filed, a CoCCA Complaints Officer (CCO) ensures that it meets the necessary criteria. If it does, notice is sent to involved parties and CRS Proceedings begin. If a Registrant responds to the complaint, it may be referred to an Ombudsman for Amicable Complaint Resolution (ACR). If ACR does not achieve acceptable resolution, binding arbitration by an Expert be requested by the Complainant.

In some cases, a Critical Issue Suspension (CIS) may become necessary. If a CIS has been determined to be necessary, the domain, or other resource record in a zone will be disabled until a resolution is found using the CRS protocol. A CIS is triggered in cases where there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. A CIS does not terminate the license to a domain, and cannot be used to trigger the transfer a domain - it simply suspends resolution.

CRS Overview Diagram – cocca-crs1.pdf

28.4 .HALAL Acceptable Use Policy

This Acceptable Use Policy (“AUP”) sets out the actions prohibited to users of the Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGITSys) (“applicant”) network. “Users” are defined as anyone who uses or accesses the .HALAL domain SRS, who has responsibility for one or more host records in the .HALAL zone files generated from the .HALAL SRS, registrants of a .HALAL Top Level (“TLD”) Domain name (“.HALAL Domain name”), and/or users of hardware, name servers, bandwidth, telecommunications transport, zone files or e-mail routing services or of any other domain name resolution systems and services in the .HALAL SRS and zone. Exceptions for use will be made for sites that denigrate the Islamic Principles, Culture and History.

This AUP policy applies recursively to all Domain names (which end in the suffix .HALAL), including second-level .HALAL Domain names (such as 〈nic.HALAL〉) and sub second-level domains (such as 〈example.nic.HALAL〉) which are maintained in the authoritative .HALAL register (managed by AGITSys); and those that are created outside the AGITSys TLD register and resolve as a result of sub-delegation by a Registrant.

No reference in this document constitutes a license to sub-delegate or otherwise sub-license any right obtained under the .HALAL Registrant Agreement, this AUP or other applicable .HALAL TLD Policies.

This AUP is in addition to rules governing qualifications for registration. Use of a .HALAL Domain name or the AGITSys Network in a manner that contravenes this AUP, may result in the suspension or revocation of a registrant’s right to use a .HALAL Domain name or to continue to be recognized as the registrant of a .HALAL Domain name. Suspension or revocation may apply to one or more .HALAL Domain names for which User is a registrant in addition to a particular .HALAL Domain name which may have given rise to a particular complaint.

AGITSys reserves the right to modify or update this AUP at any time and any such modifications or restatements shall be posted on AGITSys’ website at http://registry.HALAL-legal-aup.htm from time to time. AGITSys will use reasonable commercial efforts to inform designated contacts in the event of changes to this AUP. Such efforts may include posting the revised AUP on AGITSys’ website and/or sending email notice that this AUP has been modified or updated.

INTRODUCTION

AGITSys supports the free flow of information and ideas over the Internet. However, AGITSys protects the .HALAL TLD with rigorous acceptable use certification program in addition to a robust enforcement platform.

AGITSys may discontinue, suspend, or modify the services provided to the registrant of an .HALAL Domain name (for example, through modification of .HALAL zone files), to address alleged violations of this AUP (described further below). AGITSys may determine in its sole discretion whether use of the AGITSys network or a .HALAL Domain name is prima facie violation of this AUP. AGITSys or affected parties may utilize the AGITSys AUP CRS and/or the courts in the jurisdiction and venue specified in the Registrant Agreement to resolve disputes over interpretation and
implementation of this AUP, as described more fully in the AGITSys AUP CRS. Users of the AGITSys Network are obliged and required to ensure that their use of a .HALAL Domain name or the AGITSys Network is at all times lawful and in accordance with the requirements of this AUP and applicable laws and regulations of Turkey. This AUP should be read in conjunction with the AGITSys Registrant Agreement, Complaint Resolution Policy, Privacy Policy, Acceptable Use Policy, and other applicable agreements, policies, laws and regulations. By way of example, and without limitation, the Registrant Agreement sets forth representations and warranties and other terms and conditions, breach of which may constitute non-compliance with this AUP.

PROHIBITED USE

A “Prohibited use” of the AGITSys Network or a .HALAL Domain name is a use which is expressly prohibited by provisions of this AUP. The non-exhaustive list of restrictions pertaining to use of the AGITSys Network and .HALAL Domain names in relation to various purposes and activities are as follows. Registration of one or more .HALAL Domain names or access to services provided by AGITSys may be cancelled or suspended for any breach of, or non-compliance with this AUP:

1. COMPLIANCE WITH AGITSys AUP

1.1 The AGITSys Network and .HALAL Domain names must be used for lawful purposes and comply with this AUP. The creation, transmission, distribution, storage of, or linking to any material in violation of applicable law or regulation or this AUP is prohibited. This may include, but is not limited to, the following:

   (1.1) Communication, publication or distribution of material (including through links or framing) that infringes upon the intellectual and/or industrial property rights of another person. Intellectual and/or industrial property rights include, but are not limited to: copyrights (including future copyright), design rights, patents, patent applications, trademarks, rights of personality, and trade secret information.

   (1.2) Communication, publication or distribution of material (including through links or framing) that denigrates the Islamic Principles, Culture and History.

   (1.3) Registration or use of a .HALAL Domain name in circumstances in which, in the sole discretion of the AGITSys:

       (1.3.a) The .HALAL Domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a personal name, company, business or other legal or trading name as registered with the relevant Turkish agency, or a trade or service mark in which a third party complainant has uncontested rights, including without limitation in circumstances in which:

           (1.3.a.i) The use deceives or confuses others in relation to goods or services for which a trade mark is registered in Turkey, or in respect of similar goods or closely related services, against the wishes of the registered proprietor of the trade mark; or

           (1.3.a.ii) The use deceives or confuses others in relation to goods or services in respect of which an unregistered trade mark or service mark has become distinctive of the goods or services of a third party complainant, and in which the third party complainant has established a sufficient reputation in Turkey, against the wishes of the third party complainant; or

           (1.3.a.iii) The use trades on or passes-off a .HALAL Domain name or a website or other content or services accessed through resolution of a .HALAL Domain as being the same as or endorsed, authorized, associated or affiliated with the established business, name or reputation of another; or

           (1.3.a.iv) The use constitutes intentionally misleading or deceptive conduct in breach of AGITSys policy, or the laws of Turkey; or

       (1.3.b) The .HALAL Domain name has been used in bad faith, including without limitation the following:

           (1.3.b.i) The User has used the .HALAL Domain name primarily for the purpose of unlawfully disrupting the business or activities of another person; or

           (1.3.b.ii) By using the .HALAL Domain name, the User has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with respect to the third party complainant’s intellectual or industrial property rights and the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of website(s), email, or other online locations or services or of a product or service available on or through resolution of a .HALAL Domain name;

           (1.3.b.iii) For the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the Domain name to an entity or to a
commercial competitor of an entity, for valuable consideration in excess of a User's documented out-of-pocket costs directly associated with acquiring the Domain Name;

(1.3.b.iv) As a blocking registration against a name or mark in which a third party has superior intellectual or industrial property rights.

(1.4) A .HALAL Domain name registration which is part of a pattern of registrations where the User has registered domain names which correspond to well-known names or trademarks in which the User has no apparent rights, and the .HALAL Domain name is part of that pattern;

(1.5) The .HALAL Domain name was registered arising out of a relationship between two parties, and it was mutually agreed, as evidenced in writing, that the Registrant would be an entity other than that currently in the register.

(1.6) Unlawful communication, publication or distribution of registered and unregistered know-how, confidential information and trade secrets.

(1.7) Publication or distribution of content which, in the opinion of the AGITSys:

(1.7.a) is capable of disruption of systems in use by other Internet users or service providers (e.g. viruses or malware);

(1.7.b) seeks or apparently seeks authentication or login details used by operators of other Internet sites (e.g. phishing); or

(1.7.c) may mislead or deceive visitors to the site that the site has an affiliation with the operator of another Internet site (e.g. phishing).

(1.8) Communication, publication or distribution, either directly or by way of embedded links, of images or materials (including, but not limited to pornographic material and images or materials that a reasonable person as a member of the Muslim community would consider to be obscene or indecent) where such communication, publication or distribution is prohibited by or constitutes an offence under the laws of Turkey, whether incorporated directly into or linked from a web site, email, posting to a news group, internet forum, instant messaging notice which makes use of domain name resolution services in the .HALAL TLD.

Material that a reasonable member of the Muslim community would consider pornographic, indecent, and/or obscene or which is otherwise prohibited includes, by way of example and without limitation, real or manipulated images depicting child pornography, bestiality, excessively violent or sexually violent material, sexual activity, and material containing detailed instructions regarding how to commit a crime, an act of violence, or how to prepare and/or use illegal drugs.

(1.9) Communication, publication or distribution of defamatory material or material that constitutes racial vilification.

(1.10) Communication, publication or distribution of material that constitutes an illegal threat or encourages conduct that may constitute a criminal offence.

(1.11) Communication, publication or distribution of material that is in contempt of the orders of a court or another authoritative government actor within Turkey.

(1.12) Use, communication, publication or distribution of software, technical information or other data that violates Turkey’s export control laws.

(1.13) Use, communication, publication or distribution of confidential or personal information or data including confidential or personal information about persons that collected without their knowledge or consent.

1.2 Acceptable Use Certification Program

Use being deemed “Acceptable“ begins with certifications in the registration and renewal process. Certification constitutes a series of acknowledgements that the Registrant is either of Muslim faith, or has a clear interest in ameliorating the community. Acceptable Use Certification contains the following:

1. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God.”, as a Muslim.

2. Registrants must accept and abide by the following:

a. No denegation of The Prophet Mohammad will be propagated within any site content of the .HALAL TLD
b. Messaging about HALAL or the Quran will not criticize HALAL and the Muslim faith
c. Registrants and Users will refrain from activities that runs contrary to Islamic principles
d. Not use the .HALAL TLD or site content as a communications and coordination vehicle of radical or terrorist activities
e. Will not establish third level DNS management of a second level .HALAL domains

2. ELECTRONIC MAIL

2.1 AGITSys expressly prohibits Users of the AGITSys Network from engaging in the following activities:
(1.1) Communicating, transmitting or sending unsolicited bulk e-mail messages or other electronic communications ("junk mail" or "Spam") of any kind including, but not limited to, unsolicited commercial advertising, informational announcements, and political or religious tracts. Such messages or material may be sent only to those who have expressly requested it. If a recipient asks a User to stop sending such e-mails, then any further e-mail messages or other electronic communications would in such event constitute Spam and violate the provisions and requirements of this AUP.
(1.2) Communicating, transmitting or sending any material by e-mail or otherwise that harasses, or has the effect of harassing, another person or that threatens or encourages bodily harm or destruction of property including, but not limited to, malicious e-mail and flooding a User, site, or server with very large or numerous pieces of e-mail or illegitimate service requests.
(1.3) Communicating, transmitting, sending, creating, or forwarding fraudulent offers to sell or buy products, unsolicited offers of employment, messages about “Make-Money Fast”, “Pyramid” or “Ponzi” type schemes or similar schemes, and “chain letters” whether or not the recipient wishes to receive such messages.
(1.4) Adding, removing, modifying or forging AGITSys Network or other network header information with the effect of misleading or deceiving another person or attempting to impersonate another person by using forged headers or other identifying information (“Spoofing”).
(1.5) Causing or permitting the advertisement of a .HALAL Domain name in an unsolicited email communication.

3. DISRUPTION OF AGITSys NETWORK

3.1 No-one may use the AGITSys Network or a .HALAL Domain name for the purpose of:
(1.1) Restricting or inhibiting any person in their use or enjoyment of the AGITSys Network or a .HALAL Domain name or any service or product of AGITSys.
(1.2) Actually or purportedly reselling AGITSys services and products without the prior written consent of AGITSys.
(1.3) Transmitting any communications or activity, which may involve deceptive marketing practices such as the fraudulent offering of products, items, or services to any other party.
(1.4) Providing false or misleading information to AGITSys or to any other party through the AGITSys Network.
(1.5) Facilitating or aiding the transmission of confidential information, private, or stolen data such as credit card information (without the owner’s or cardholder’s consent).

4. NETWORK INTEGRITY AND SECURITY

4.1 Users are prohibited from circumventing or attempting to circumvent the security of any host, network or accounts ("cracking" or "hacking") on, related to, or accessed through the AGITSys Network. This includes, but is not limited to:
(1.1) accessing data not intended for such user;
(1.2) logging into a server or account which such user is not expressly authorized to access;
(1.3) using, attempting to use, or attempting to ascertain a username or password without the express written consent of the operator of the service in relation to which the username or password is intended to function;
(1.4) probing the security of other networks;
(1.5) executing any form of network monitoring which is likely to intercept data not intended for such user.

4.2 Users are prohibited from effecting any network security breach or disruption of any Internet communications including, but not limited to:
(2.1) accessing data of which such User is not an intended recipient; or
(2.2) logging onto a server or account, which such User is not expressly authorized to access.

For the purposes of this section 4.2, "disruption" includes, but is not limited to:

- port scans, TCP-UDP floods, packet spoofing;
- forged routing information;
- deliberate attempts to overload or disrupt a service or host;
- using the AGITSys Network in connection with the use of any program, script, command, or sending messages with the intention or likelihood of interfering with another user's terminal session by any means, locally or by the Internet.

4.3 Users who compromise or disrupt AGITSys Network systems or security may incur criminal or civil liability. AGITSys will investigate any such incidents and will cooperate with law enforcement agencies if a crime is suspected to have taken place.

5. NON-EXCLUSIVE, NON-EXHAUSTIVE

This AUP is intended to provide guidance as to what constitutes acceptable use of the AGITSys Network and of .HALAL Domain names. However, the AUP is neither exhaustive nor exclusive.

6. COMPLAINTS

Persons who wish to notify AGITSys of abusive conduct in violation of this AUP may report the same pursuant to the AGITSys Acceptable Use Policy Enforcement Procedure, which is instituted by submitting to AGITSys a completed AGITSys Acceptable Use Policy Violation Complaint Form.

7. ENFORCEMENT

AGITSys may, in its sole discretion, suspend or terminate a User's service for violation of any of the requirements or provisions of the AUP on receipt of a complaint if AGITSys believes:

(1.1.a) a violation of the AUP has or may have occurred; or
(1.1.b) suspension and/or termination may be in the public interest.

AGITSys may delegate its right to take any action to an Internet security agency or may act upon any report from an Internet security agency without prior notification to the User.

If AGITSys elects not to take immediate action, AGITSys may require Registrants and a complainant to utilise the AUP Complaint Resolution Service and Policy to ensure compliance with this AUP and remedy any violation or suspected violation within a reasonable time prior to suspension or terminating service.

Enforcement Techniques:

- Scan of Zone for Content
- Scan of Zone for Registered names that fail to meet registration requirements
- Scan of zone for third level DNS and domain registration activity
- Acceptable Use Recertification at registration and renewal via online registration systems
- Review of Registrant contact information against international terrorist watch lists, and collaboration with counter-terrorism organizations
- User and/or Registrant self-policing and notification of abusive content or activity

8. LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

In no event shall AGITSys be liable to any User of the AGITSys Network, any customer, nor any third party for any direct, indirect, special or consequential damages for actions taken pursuant to this AUP, including, but not limited to, any lost profits, business interruption, loss of programs or other data, or otherwise, even if AGITSys was advised of the possibility of such damages. AGITSys' liability for any breach of a condition or warranty implied by the Registrant Agreement or this AUP shall be limited to the maximum extent possible to one of the following (as AGITSys may determine):

(i) supplying the services again; or
(ii) paying the cost of having the services supplied again.

9. REMOVAL OF CONTENT RESPONSIBILITY

At its sole discretion, AGITSys reserves the right to:

(i) Remove or alter content, zone file data or other material from its servers provided by any person that violates
the provisions or requirements of this AUP; 
   (ii) re-delegate, redirect or otherwise divert traffic intended for any service; 
   (iii) notify operators of Internet security monitoring, virus scanning services and/or law enforcement authorities 
   of any apparent breach of this AUP or .HALAL TLD Policies; and/or 
   (iv) terminate access to the AGITSys Network by any person that AGITSys determines has violated the provisions 
   or requirements of this AUP. 
In any regard, AGITSys is not responsible for the content or message of any newsgroup posting, e-mail message, or web 
site regardless of whether access to such content or message was facilitated by the AGITSys Network. AGITSys does 
not have any duty to take any action with respect to such content or message by creating this AUP, and Users of the 
AGITSys Network are obliged and required to ensure that their use of a .HALAL Domain name or the AGITSys Network is 
at all times in accordance with the requirements of this AUP and any applicable laws and/or regulation.

28.5 CoCCA CRS - Policies and Procedures

1. Statement of Purpose

1.1. This Complaint Resolution Service (“CRS”) provides a transparent, efficient and cost effective way for the 
   public, law enforcement, regulatory bodies and intellectual property owners to have their concerns addressed 
   regarding use of a TLD Managers network or services.

1.2. The Service provides a single framework in which cyber-crime, accessibility of prohibited Internet content 
   via a member’s network or services and abuse of intellectual property rights are addressed. The framework relies on 
   three tiers of review: immediate action to protect the public interest, amicable complaint resolution lead by an 
   independent Ombudsman, and where applicable, adjudication by an Expert. The CRS provides an efficient and swift 
   alternative to the Courts.

This document should be read in conjunction with the Acceptable Use Policy (“AUP”) applicable to the domain - TLD you 
are considering lodging a complaint against. If after having reviewed the applicable AUP Policy it is determined a 
violation has occurred, a complaint may be lodged by completing the CoCCA CRS Complaint form.

NOTE: IF YOU DO NOT LODGE THE SIGNED COMPLAINT FORM THAT FOLLOWS BELOW ON PAGES 8- 13 OF THIS DOCUMENT, YOUR 
COMPLAINT WILL NOT BE REVIEWED.

Complaints will be reviewed in accordance with the following Steps:

Step One | Confirmation / Communication

A CoCCA Complaints Officer (“CCO”) will review all formally lodged complaints for compliance with the CRS and the 
applicable AUP. If the CCO considers that the Complaint does not address the matter covered by the AUP, or is 
unsigned or otherwise violates this Procedure, the Complainant will be promptly notified of the deficiencies 
identified.

The Complainant shall have five (5) Days from the receipt of notification within which to correct the deficiencies 
and return the Complaint, failing which the CCO will deem the Complaint to be withdrawn. This will not prevent the 
Complainant from submitting a different Complaint.

On receipt of the Complaint the CCO will lock domain and associated records until a period of ten (10) Days after the 
COO and Parties are notified of a Decision by the Ombudsman or and Expert, at which time the domain name may be
unlocked.

Step Two | Immediate Review of Request for Suspension in the Public Interest

On receipt of a properly lodged Complaint, the CCO will initiate a review. When specifically requested by the Complainant the CCO may initiate a Critical Issue Suspension (“CIS”).

A request for a CIS may be granted in cases where there is a compelling and demonstrable threat to the stability of the Internet, critical infrastructure or public safety. A “critical issue suspension” does not terminate the registrant’s rights or their domain license; it simply modifies the NS records in the zone temporarily disabling resolution. All suspensions under the CRS, including a CIS, may be appealed to the Ombudsman’s office for amicable resolution, an Expert Panelist for binding arbitration or a court of competent jurisdiction.

Where the CCO has triggered a CIS, notice will be sent to the Registrant, Administrative Contact, Registrar and Ombudsman within 24 hours of triggering the CIS.

Step Three | Formal Notification

The CCO will send a copy of the Complaint to the Respondent (normally the Registrant and/or Administrative Contact) and the TLD Sponsors designated contact with an explanatory note within 5 days by:

a) Sending the Complaint by post, fax or e-mail to the Respondent at the contact details shown as the Registrant or any other contacts in the TLD Register for the Domain Name that is the subject of the Complaint.

b) The CCO may also, at their discretion send the complaint to any addresses provided to the CCO by the Complainant so far as this is practicable.

c) Except as set forth otherwise, all written communication to a Party or a party’s representative under the Policy or this Procedure shall be made by fax, post or e-mail.

d) Communication shall be made in English, E-mail communications (other than attachments) should be sent in plain text or PDF format so far as this is practicable.

During the course of the proceedings under the CRS, if either Party wishes to change its contact details it must notify the CCO of all changes. However, no change shall be made in the Registrant Information for the Domain Name without mutual agreement of the parties or unless a settlement is reached. Except as otherwise provided in this Procedure or as otherwise decided by the CCO or if appointed, the Expert, all communications provided for under this procedure shall be deemed to have been received:

a) if sent by courier, when signed for by the recipient;
b) if sent via the Internet, on the date that the communication was transmitted

Unless otherwise provided in this Procedure, the time periods provided for under the Policy and this Procedure shall be calculated based on the time zone of the CCO.

Any communication between:
a) the CCO and any Party shall be copied by the CCO to the other Party and if appointed, the Ombudsman or Expert;
b) a Party to another Party shall be copied by the sender to the CCO. The CCO will copy such correspondence to the Ombudsman or Expert, if appointed.

Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service proceedings

The CCO will promptly notify the Parties by email of the date of the Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service proceedings. The date and time of transmission of such email in the time zone of the CCO according to the email header generated by the CCO’s transmitting emails system will be the date of Commencement of CRS proceedings.

The Response

Within fifteen (15) Days of the date of Commencement of Complaint Resolution Service proceedings, the Respondent may submit a Response.

The Respondent must send the Response to the CCO signed in electronic form at the addresses set out in the explanatory coversheet. In determining whether a Response was submitted in a timely manner, the date and time of receipt (as determined by the CCO’s receiving email server) shall be considered by the CCO as the date and time of submission, provided that such email i) contains a scanned copy of documents which include signatures, ii) contains all attachments, iii) is of a form and format which may be opened by the CCO. The Response shall:

a) include any grounds that the Respondent wishes to rely upon to rebut the Complainant’s assertions;
b) specify whether the Respondent wishes to be contacted directly or through an authorized representative, and set out the e-mail address, telephone number, fax number, and postal address which should be used in communications with the Respondent;
c) disclose to the CCO whether any legal proceedings have been commenced or terminated in connection with the Domain Name(s) which is the subject of the Complaint;
d) conclude with the following statement followed by the signature of the Respondent or its authorized representative:

“The information contained in the response is to the best of the respondent’s knowledge true and complete and the matters stated in this response comply with the Policy and Procedure and applicable law.”

Within (3) Days following the receipt of a signed copy of the Response, the CCO will forward the Response to the Complainant. If the Respondent does not submit a Response, the Domain will be suspended 15 days after the CRS proceedings commence.

Reply by the Complainant

Within five (5) Days of receiving the Respondent’s Response from the CCO, the Complainant may submit a Reply to the Respondent’s Response, which shall not exceed 2000 words (not including annexes). The Reply should be confined to answering any new points raised in the Response not previously dealt with in the Complaint.
No Amicable Complaint Resolution (ʺACRʺ) will occur if the Respondent does not file a Response. Within three (3) Days of the receipt of the Complainant’s Reply (or the expiry of the deadline to do so), the CCO will arrange with the Ombudsman’s office for Amicable Complaint Resolution to be conducted. ACR will be conducted in a manner that the Ombudsman, at his or her sole discretion, considers appropriate.

Negotiations conducted between the Parties during ACR (including any information obtained from or in connection to negotiations) shall be confidential as between the Parties. Any such information will not be shown to an Expert, should one latter be appointed. Neither the Ombudsman nor any Party may reveal details of such negotiations to any third parties unless a decision-making body of competent jurisdiction orders disclosure. Neither Party shall use any information gained during mediation for any ulterior or collateral purpose or include it in any submission likely to be seen by any court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction in this Complaint or any later Complaint or litigation.

If the Parties reach a settlement during the ACR, then the existence, nature and terms of the settlement shall be confidential as between the Parties unless the Parties specifically agree otherwise, a court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction orders otherwise, or applicable laws or regulations require it.

No binding verbal agreements can be reached as part of the ACR: any settlement reached by the Parties must be in writing to be enforceable.

If the Parties did not achieve an acceptable resolution through ACR within ten (10) Days, the Ombudsman will send notice to the Parties that the Complainant has the option to request appointment of an Expert. The Complainant will have ten (10) Days upon receipt of the notice from the Ombudsman to pay the applicable fees to CoCCA if he or she wants to move forward with binding arbitration by an Expert.

If the Ombudsman does not receive the Complainant’s request to refer the matter to an Expert together with the applicable fees within ten (10) Days, the Complaint will be deemed to have been withdrawn. This will not prevent the Complainant submitting a different Complaint.

Within five (5) Days of the receipt of the applicable fees from the Complainant, the Ombudsman will appoint an Expert on a rotational basis from a list of Experts. An Expert may only be a person named in the CoCCA list of Experts, which the Ombudsman will maintain and publish along with the Experts’ qualifications. No Expert’s appointment will be challenged on the grounds that they are insufficiently qualified. Once the Expert has been appointed, the Parties will be notified of the name of the Expert appointed and the date by which the Expert will forward, except in the case of exceptional circumstances, his or her decision to the CCO and copy the Ombudsman.

The Expert shall be both impartial and independent before accepting the appointment. During the proceedings the Expert will disclose to the Ombudsman any circumstances giving rise to the justifiable doubt as to their impartiality or independence. The Ombudsman will have the discretion to appoint a substitute Expert if necessary, in which case the timetable will be adjusted accordingly.

In addition to the Complaint, and if applicable the Response, the Reply, any appeal notice and appeal notice response, the Expert may request further statements or documents from the Parties. However, the Expert will not be
Step Six | Expert Decision

The Expert will decide a Complaint on the basis of the Policy, the Procedure and the submissions made by the Party. If, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, a Party does not comply with any provision in the Policy, Procedure or any request by the Ombudsman or the Expert, the Expert may draw such inferences from the Party’s non-compliance, as he or she deems appropriate.

Unless exceptional circumstances apply, an Expert shall forward his or her Decision to the Ombudsman within ten (10) Days of his or her appointment. The Decision shall be in writing and signed by the Expert. It will provide the reasons on which the decision is based, indicate the date on which it was made, the place the Decision was made and identify the name of the Expert. Within three (3) Days of the receipt of a Decision from the Expert, the Ombudsman will communicate the full text of the Decision to each Party via email with the date for the implementation of the Decision in accordance with the Policy.

Effect of Court Proceedings

If, before or during the course of proceedings under the Complaint Resolution Service, the Ombudsman is made aware that legal proceedings have begun in or before an applicable court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction or an arbitral tribunal of competent jurisdiction, and that such legal proceedings relate to a Domain Name which is the subject of a Complaint, he or she will suspend the Complaint Resolution Service proceedings pending the outcome of the legal proceedings.

A Party must promptly notify the Ombudsman if it initiates or becomes aware of legal proceedings in a court or decision-making body of competent jurisdiction, or arbitral tribunal of competent jurisdiction relating to a Domain Name that is the subject of a Complaint under the proceedings of the Complaint Resolution Service.

Either party may request, before or during the Complaint Resolution Service Proceedings, an interim measure of protection from a court.

Expert Fees

The applicable fees in respect of the referral of proceedings under the Complaint Resolution Service to an Expert are (in United States Dollars), for Complaints involving 1-5 Domain Names and only one Complainant, $2500 plus applicable taxes, such as goods and services taxes (“GST”). For Complaints involving 6 or more Domain Names, and/or more than one Complainant, the Ombudsman will set a fee in consultation with the Complainant. Fees are calculated on a cost-recovery basis, and are passed on in their entirety to the Expert(s). CoCCA does not charge for its mediation or administration services in respect of the Complaint Resolution Service.

Exclusion of Liability

Neither CoCCA nor its councilors, officers, members, employees or servants nor any Expert, Mediator or any employee of any Expert or Mediator shall be liable to a Party for anything done or omitted, whether negligently or otherwise,
in connection with any proceedings under the Complaint Resolution Service unless the act or omission is shown to have been in bad faith.

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 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 also include additional measures specific to rights protection, such as abusive use policies, takedown procedures, registrant pre-verification, or authentication procedures, or other covenants.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is fully aware of the importance of protecting the rights of others in the .halal gTLD and has made rights projections a core objective. The .halal TLD Rights Protection is something CoCCA has prioritized by necessity throughout its nine-year history. CoCCA currently complies with UDRP proceedings and will comply with URS proceedings as well with methods for handling Sunrise and Trademark Claims outlined below and guided by Specification requirements of the proposed Registry Agreement.

CoCCA also offers a wide range of services including, a wildcard registration program to block variants of a domain for Trademark holders as well as an “Alert” service that any interested party can subscribe to, alerting them if a specific string is registered in any CoCCA TLD. CoCCA recognizes that ICANN has not completed the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) program. While CoCCA cannot fully describe the details of implementation for this application based on incomplete work, CoCCA intends to comply and/or exceed the final ICANN program.

In particular, CoCCA offers the following procedures to help protect the rights of trademark owners:

- Sunrise Services
- Trademark Claims Service
- Name Selection Policy
- Acceptable Use Policy
- Unqualified Registration Safeguards
- Wildcard Registrations / Alert services
- Clearinghouse of Intellectual Property API
- Thick WHOIS
- RPM Compliance auditing of Registrars
UDRP, URS, PDDRP and RRDRP and CRS
Limited License
Rapid Takedown & Suspension
Malware Mitigation
Fast Flux Mitigation
Phishing Mitigation
DNSSEC Deployment
Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

29.1 Registration Abuse Prevention Mechanisms – Pre Launch
To support Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s objectives, CoCCA will implement specific measures in compliance with ICANN’s Applicant Guide Book. At a minimum, ICANN states that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. must offer sunrise registration for a period of thirty days during pre-launch in conjunction with the Trademark Clearing House.

CoCCA’s RPM framework contains several levels of safeguards to deter unqualified registration and other malicious behaviors during pre-launch. This not only exceeds requirements, but also provides customers of the TLD predictably in service offerings and protections.

29.1.1 Sunrise & Land-rush
To meet the ICANN requirement of a 30-day Sunrise process for those with verifiable trademark rights or owners of exact matching strings in other TLDs, CoCCA shall implement for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. a Sunrise period for domain registrations. The validations of domain names that are an identical match will occur via the Trademark Clearinghouse via notice by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. or Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ approved Registrar.

During the Sunrise, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will be responsible for determining eligibility of the registration and it will require the Registrant to affirm that they meet Sunrise Eligibility Requirements (SERs) and incorporate a Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy (SDRP).

29.1.2 Trademark Claims Service
Per ICANN’s Applicant Guide Book, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is required to provide a Trademark Claims service during pre-launch phases and for at least 60 days from the date of open registration. The Trademark claims period will be followed by a 30 day Registration Land-rush for members of the community/business owners-residents etc. The process will end in General Availability or Open Registration. Eligible Trademark holders may continue to register marks on an ongoing basis.

29.1.3 Name Selection Policy
The .halal TLD will enforce a name selection policy that ensures that all names registered in the gTLD will be in compliance with ICANN mandated technical standards. These include restrictions on 2 character names, tagged names, and reserved names for Registry Operations. All names must also be in compliance with all applicable RFCs governing the composition of domain names. Registrations of Country, Geographical and Territory Names will only be allowed in compliance with the restrictions as outlined in the answer to Question 22.

Additionally, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. requires that domain names within the .halal TLD should consist of proper characters unique within top-level domain, followed by the characters ‘.halal’. Domain
names should meet the following technical requirements; They shall:
contend no more than 63 characters;
begin and end with a letter or a digit;
contain no characters different from letters, figures and a hyphen (allowable characters are the letters of the
Roman alphabet; capital and lowercase letters do not differ);
contain no hyphens simultaneously in the third and forth positions.

Acceptable Use Policy
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has developed an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) that is
referred in the answer to Question 28. This AUP clearly defines what type of behavior is expressly prohibited in
conjunction with the use of a .halal domain name. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will
require, through both the Registry Registrar Agreement (RRA), and a Registry Registrant Agreement (RA) that this AUP
be accepted by a registrant prior to Activation of a domain in the .halal TLD. See Life-Cyle and

29.2 Rights Protection Mechanisms — Post Launch
CoCCA offers a suite of post-launch Rights Protection Mechanisms. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd.
Sti., supported by CoCCA services, will promote the security and stability of the TLD with the following:

Unqualified Registration Safeguards
Wildcard Registration / Alert services
Clearinghouse of Intellectual Property API
Thick WHOIS
RPM Compliance audit of Registrars
UDRP, URS, PDDRP and RRDRP
Limited License
Rapid Takedown & Suspension
Malware Mitigation
Past Flux Mitigation
Phishing Mitigation
DNSSEC Deployment
Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

29.2.1 Unqualified Registration Safeguards
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. plans to adopt the CoCCA Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and
Complaint Resolution Service Policy (CRS) as part of the operation of the .halal gTLD. See 28.X

The CoCCA model differs from the “classic” gTLD shared registry system in that Registrants are bound by a collateral
agreement between themselves and the TLD Operator. This collateral agreement binds them to the TLD AUP policy, WHOIS
policy and Complaint Resolution Service.

Although registrars are required to advise registrants of the TLD policies and conditions, with the prevalence of
highly automated registration systems and expansive reseller networks it cannot be guaranteed that registrants have
reviewed or agreed to the policy. An email reiterating these policies will be sent to each registrant to ensure that
new applicants are made aware of and confirm their agreement to these policies.

The same process therefore allows the registry the opportunity to verify the accuracy of customer data supplied by
the registrar, use dynamically generated images as a challenge-response verification to prevent automated processes
activating domains and to directly collect and store additional identifying information about registrants, which can
be utilized to control fraud.

29.2.2 Wildcard Defensive Registrations
CoCCA currently supports a Wildcard option, which will extend to all new gTLDs in which a brand owner's trademark
holder may register a Primary domain and then can upload evidence of the trademark or other rights via PDF in the
The Registrant may then apply online to request a *.name or other wildcard block using Java regular expressions for that text string. CoCCA will manually review the request for approval, collisions with other strings etc. If approval is granted, any attempt to register any domain that triggers that string returns “not available for policy reasons” via EPP or GUI.

The domain must be kept current and up to date in order for the Wildcard Registration to be active if the Primary registration lapses, or is subject to a dispute or UDRP ruling and is transferred the Wildcard is removed.

29.2.3 Alert
Subscribers to the Premium WHOIS service may request email alerts if a domain matching a given string, or containing a specified string, is registered.

29.2.3 Clearing House for Intellectual Property (CHIP)
CHIP is a new technology that is designed to allow trademark owners to efficiently and effectively safeguard and enforce their rights on the Internet, and in particular in the domain name space. CoCCA and IP Clearinghouse, the company that operates CHIP, have collaborated in the past to allow trademark owners to retroactively (or proactively) associate trademark information with specific domain names. This technology is available but may or may not be used depending on the outcome of developments in with gTLD clearinghouse.

29.2.4 Thick WHOIS
CoCCA will provide Thick WHOIS to enhance accessibility and stability and reduce malicious behavior thereby promoting increased rights protection mechanisms and investigations where applicable. All WHOIS services meet Specification 4 of the Registry Agreement in support of Thick WHOIS. The agreement between Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and its Registrars specifies that Registrant information should be complete and accurate and instances where incomplete information occurs will be investigated to prevent reoccurrence. Given the current state nature of WHOIS, CoCCA intends to adapt to new formats and protocols as they go into effect.

29.2.5 Registrar Relationship
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. views the protection of legal rights of a user’s domain name and that of trademark owners as a strategic imperative to operating a successful TLD. Therefore, ICANN accredited Registrars will only be used and be bound to the registry-registrar agreement. Certain components of the RPM framework will be administered on behalf of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.. To ensure compliance with designated RPMs, CoCCA will conduct annual reviews and enforce non-compliance where necessary. In cases where Registrars fail to meet Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ standards, the Registrar will lose its certification to register domains of the TLD until all issues are resolved.

29.2.6 Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)
The UDRP is a proven rights protection mechanism whereby complainants can object to a domain registration via a UDRP provider. The Registrant in question has the opportunity to respond to the complaint and defend its registration and use as good faith. The UDRP provider and assigned panel provide a decision based on the information submitted by both the complainant and the respondent. Where the complainant is successful in proving a bad faith registration ownership of the domain will be transferred accordingly and in line with ICANN policy. Conversely, where the complainant is unable to prove bad faith, the domain registration will remain with the assigned Registrant. Registrars of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ must implement and respond to UDRP policy where applicable. Penalties will apply where Registrars are found to be in breach.

29.2.7 Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS)
CoCCA is required to implement the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) per the Applicant Guidebook. If an infringement is discovered, the complainant may file an objection with a URS provider. The URS provider will investigate compliance via an administrative review. Upon a successful review, the URS provider will notify Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. to place the domain in question in lock status within NEED A TIMEFRAME, meaning that no changes to registration data will occur, but the domain continues to resolve. Upon lock of the domain, the
Registrant will be notified and have an opportunity to respond. If the complainant proves the domain is used in an abusive manner, the domain name will be suspended for the remainder of the registration period and will resolve to an informational site provided by the URS provider. The complainant will have the opportunity to extend the registration for one additional year. Conversely, if the evidence does not result in a successful determination of abuse, the URS Provider will contact CoCCA and controls of the registered domain will be returned to the Registrant.

29.2.8 Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP)
Per the Applicant Guidebook, CoCCA is required to implement the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) that allows a complainant the right to object to Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ manner of operation or use of the gTLD. A PDDRP provider will accept objections and perform a threshold review. CoCCA will respond to the complaint as necessary to defend the operation and use Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ .halal gTLD.

29.2.9 Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP)
The Registration Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) outlines the resolution proceedings whereby the Complainant determines that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has failed to comply with its defined registration restrictions. The parties to the dispute will be the gTLD registry operator and the harmed established institution where proper standing has been reviewed and confirmed. A successful complaint proves that the complainant is a defined community and that a strong association exists between it and the gTLD string. Further proof must be submitted that Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. violated its community-based restrictions and that measurable harm occurred. Upon administrative review of the complaint, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will file a response within 10 days of the filing. If the complainant is determined to be the prevailing party, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will pay all Panel and Provider fees incurred, including filing fees. If Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. is found to have violated its registration restrictions, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will implement all remedial measures outlined by the Expert Panel, including cases where registration suspension may occur. Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. recognizes that this procedure does not preclude entities seeking remedies in courts of laws.

29.2.10 Limited License
Limited License- Registration policies and terms and conditions limit registrants’ rights to a limited license to use (but not to sub-license the use of any portion of) the allocated TLD, subject to continuing compliance with all policies in place during that time.

29.2.11 Rapid Takedown & Suspension
CoCCA, at Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ request, will comply with any takedown or suspension. Usually, these types of requests are based on court orders of competent jurisdiction, but not limited to such. Before any domain take down, CoCCA maintains an internal checklist that will be followed to ensure validation of the request. If for any reason the validation procedure fails, the CoCCA Ombudsman will be notified. Upon confirmation that the registered domain is to be suspended or removed from the zone, CoCCA will execute its auditable procedure documenting the incident number, date, time, domain name, threat level, description and reason for the take down, and any other evidence that may be necessary to properly document the take down. The Ombudsman, Registrar, and Registrant will be notified before and at the time of take down execution.

29.2.13 Malware Mitigation
Where commercially sensible, or a risk factor has been identified, CoCCA will perform automated and regular scanning for malware of all domains (or a subset of domains) in the registry. Often, Registrants are unaware and compromised by malware deployments. Scanning for malware reduces occurrences for this type of abusive behavior for registered domain names in the TLD.

29.2.14 Phishing Mitigation
CoCCA will establish and act upon the results of a regular poll against one or more trusted databases for phishing sites operating (in second level or subordinate domains) within the TLD. Phishing activity most often occurs through a subdomain, rather than a directly registered second level domain. For this reason the registry should
query for any wild-card occurrence of a domain that has been flagged as a phishing site or one that contains malware.

29.2.15 DNSSEC Deployment

As part of Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ mission to maintain a highly secure and stable TLD, CoCCA will implement DNSSEC as part of its backend registry services. DNSSEC helps mitigate, for example, pharming attacks that use cache poisoning to redirect unsuspecting users to fraudulent websites or addresses. DNSSEC protects the DNS system from abuse threats in the following aspects:

- Security of Domain Resolution – DNSKEY/RSSIG provide authentication and integrity verification to ensure data will be compromised during transmission. The CoCCA credit name server trust anchor is signed by the public key and then delivered to the Interim Trust Anchor Repository (ITAR) for TLD verification. NSEC resource records will also be used to verify negative response messages of queried resource records to ensure deletion does not occur during transmission.

- Security of Zone File Distribution – TSIG allows communication among authentication servers to ensure that it is the correct server and that data is not compromised during transmission.

29.2.16 Law Enforcement and Anti-Abuse Community Collaboration

CoCCA does and will continue to cooperate closely with anti-abuse communities, experts, and law enforcement in the mitigation and prevention of abuse behavior. Not only will best practice be shared, but also collaboration on the latest issues will remain a priority. In addition to collaboration instances may take the form of early notification by security agency of malicious content. Another form of cooperation may be the provision of user information (including historical and non-publicly available information, where available) to the security agency, to assist identification of wrongdoers. The existence of existing arrangements for dealings between security agencies and the registry operator facilitates the ability for both registry and law enforcement to react promptly to threats, promptly minimizing harm. With respect to suspensions, the registrant will be given an opportunity to remedy via automated processes, given the time sensitive nature of criminal activity automated suspension based on triggers - flags, or at the request of law enforcement should be enabled. Critical domains can be manually “Super Locked” in the registry to ensure they are not removed from the zone or suspended inadvertently by automated suspension technology. Automated suspensions will only be initiated when required to protect the public interest or network integrity. They should not be initiated to simply protect an entity’s or individuals intellectual or other property rights - those sorts of disputes should be dealt with via a formal complaint resolution service.

29.3 Resource Plans

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. will dedicate 2 professionals to coordinate the operation of the .halal gTLD. At the same time, the technical professionals at CoCCA will be supporting the vast majority of the technical aspects of operating the .halal gTLD.

As the .halal gTLD is a community-supported effort, it is also expected that members of the community will help Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. develop policies and procedures that govern the operation of the gTLD.

The following Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. team members will be used to support the rights protection plan; CoCCA NOC Support, Ombudsman.

CoCCA acting as Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’ registry services provider maintains a resource model to meet the demands of RPM implementation and on-going operation of the protection mechanisms. CoCCA maintains a qualified and experienced technical staff to support registry services that meet or exceed defined service levels.

The CoCCA workforce-staffing model is sized to provide the appropriate services for each managed TLD. Given the dynamic nature of technologies and innovation, the CoCCA staff model is constantly reviewed and adjusted to achieve optimization without sacrifice to customer satisfaction and service level requirements. In cases where growth dictates an increase in staff, CoCCA maintains a proven staffing process for acquiring qualified candidates. Details
of staffing resource plans can be found in response to questions of the Financial Projections section of the application.

There are eight CoCCA CRS Officers whose Role is to monitor registry services and review Complaints lodged online or from Law Enforcement / CERTs CoCCA has an established formal relationship with.

The complaints are dealt with in accordance with the CRS and AUP / Registrant Agreement, which allows the CRS officers discretion to suspend a domain instantly or send the complaint to the Ombudsman for amicable complaint resolution. CRS officers are available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and three hundred and sixty five days a year.

CoCCA estimates it will require the following personnel to support the RPM implementation and operations for Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.:

Complaint Resolution Service Officers: 8
Complaint Resolution Expert - Minimum of Eight
Ombudsman - One

30A. 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).

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. and CoCCA desire to ensure the highest levels of security are applied and maintained for all elements in the chain that ultimately result in the resolution of a .halal TLD on the Internet. CoCCA, together with partners PCH and ISC will endeavor to ensure the secure operation of Registry Services for the .halal TLD as described below.

30.1 DNSSEC - Facility for Key Storage

For reasons of economies of scale and because CoCCA has a nearly decade long relationship with PCH, the .halal key is to be stored offline at a Singapore facility hosted by the National University of Singapore, on behalf of the Singaporean Infocomm Development Agency (IDA), other DNSSEC key-store facilities that are part of PCH’s project are hosted in Zurich by SWITCH, the Swiss national research and education network and at a U.S. facility hosted by
Equinix in San Jose California. The PCH DNSSEC project facilities mirror the security and processes used by ICANN for maintenance of the root.

See Attachment PCH_SG_Backgrounder.pdf

30.1.1 Signature of the .halal

The .halal zones generated by the CoCCA SRS will include the DS records submitted by registrars, zones will be transferred from CoCCA’s hidden signing master DNS to four PCH inbound masters using AXFER / IXFER and TSIG. PCH will transfer the zones using IXFR / AXFRE and TSIG to their signer servers in Frankfurt and Palo Alto. The signed zone is then exported to PCH’s two outbound DNSSEC DNS for secure ASXFR / IXFR TSIG transfer back to CoCCA’s inbound DNSSEC master in Sydney. Key signing keys and zone signing keys are to be rolled out in accordance with best practices and ICANN requirements. CoCCA and PCH’s DNSSEC implementation fully adheres to applicable RFC’s and to the requirements of Specification 6, section 1.3.

30.1.2 Secure Distribution of the Signed Zones

CoCCA has employed the use of a double Anycast and Unicast network for the purpose of distributing signed zones across the DNS. Due to CoCCA’s desire to ensure that this process is not compromised, CoCCA logs and monitors the zone signing and distribution process, and also ensures that the management of signed zones is performed by CoCCA.

On receipt of the signed zones from PCH, CoCCA will perform some basic validation against the zones sent to PCH, and then transfer these zones onto a hidden distribution master DNS which will transfer zones via TSIG and IXAFR / AXFR to ISC’s SNC platform, PCH’s Anycast platform and CoCCA’s Unicast DNS servers. If a critical issue was found that was impacting both the primary and secondary SRS, and if instructed by CoCCA, PCH may distribute the zones to their own Anycast network, the ISC SNS Anycast network and the CoCCA Unicast nodes.

The procedures above have been tested by ccTLDs on CoCCA’s SRS platform.

30.2 Securing the .halal DNS infrastructure and Nodes

The .halal TLD will rely on ISC’s and PCH’s Anycast networks and CoCCA’s Unicast for resolution. ISC authors BIND and pioneered the use of DNSSEC and Anycast technology, PCH manages what is arguably the largest, most geographically dispersed Anycast network, CoCCA currently operates Unicast TLD servers for 12 TLDs. All three entities utilize best of class technology and have rigorous security policies in place to secure, monitor and respond to threats that may compromise the resolution of the .halal TLD.

Both PCH and ISC are members of NSP-Sec and have BGP sinkhole capabilities. Both organizations are well positioned and able to coordinate with ISPs that may be transiting or sourcing Denial of Service attacks (DoS) or other attack traffic to mitigate it closer to its source. The geographically diverse PCH and ISC Anycast services are extremely resilient against DoS attacks, if a node fails or is otherwise compromised, it will swiftly be taken out of the PCH or ISC Anycast cloud, causing traffic to flow to other nodes with minimal or no service disruption. The two independently operated and managed Anycast network’s total distributed capacity will allow the .halal to absorb even a coordinated DoS attack originating from multiple locations at once.

The geographically diverse Anycast network proposed for .halal necessitates locating dozens of nodes in a variety of co-location facilities varying from Tier 4 to Tier 2 - and each facility has different security policies for physical access. From a security and stability perspective, the critical issue is that all nodes be monitored in real time by
PCH, ISC and CoCCA and any node that experiences SLA issues (or is otherwise compromised) is swiftly taken offline or out of the Anycast network. Under CoCCA’s agreements with PCH and ISC, any SLA or security issues with any node in their respective Anycast networks is to be reported immediately so that CoCCA may advise registrars or take any other appropriate action.

30.3 CoCCA’s Sydney SRS Security Policy

30.3.1 CoCCA SYD NOC | SRS Physical Access
CoCCA’s primary NOC is located at Global Switch in the Sydney CBD, an enhanced Tier-3 facility and one of the largest carrier neutral data centers in the southern hemisphere. CoCCA’s SRS servers are housed in a dedicated, caged rack provided by PIPE networks, PIPE also provides CoCCA with the primary bandwidth used by the Sydney SRS.

In order to gain physical access to CoCCA’s servers, an individual must be pre-authorised by CoCCA, pipe and Global Switch – and have formally been inducted by Global Switch. Once approved to enter the facility, an individual must be inspected and be granted access by the Global Switch Security Operations Centre - which is manned 24x7 by security personnel. After passing security, physical access requires passing through a mantrap. Access to the floor, pipe co-location room and master cage is controlled by key-cards with strict access control lists.

Access to CoCCA’s cage and rack require a combination of key-cards and physical keys both of which are distributed by, and only available to, CoCCA staff. All spaces are under constant CCTV surveillance by global switch security and the PIPE Network’s NOC.

CoCCA’s policy is to severely restrict physical access to network appliances, currently only six individuals have physical access to the CoCCA SRS in Sydney and all access is logged. CoCCA’s security policy for physical access is collateral to the Global Switch and PIPE Networks.

30.3.2 CoCCA SYD NOC | SRS Admin Remote Access
The number of individuals with the ability to directly access and administer network appliances is very small – currently six, a number not expected to grow with additional gTLDs. Remote access is only accessible through VPN with the mandatory requirement to use one time passwords (OTP) for authentication purposes. SRS server command line logins use both OTP as well as traditional username and password authentication methods – enabling each login to be traced to an individual.

CoCCA NOC Support Staff, Registrar Support and Complaint / Abuse Officers and Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. staff may only access the SRS via port 443 with OTP from trusted IP addresses. CoCCA NOC Support Staff, Registrar Support and Complaint / Abuse Officers and Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. staff have no physical or remote administrative access to servers or network appliances.

30.3.3 CoCCA’s “pamoja” SRS Software Testing
In designing any security regime it is important to clearly identify potential threats and design the policy to address them. The SRS data is a compilation of publicly available data, and all information on Registrants, Registrars, and Resellers is available via WHOIS, RDDS services or Historical Abstracts. CoCCA does not store credit card or other commercially sensitive confidential information on registrants or registrars in the SRS (or elsewhere). The security threat is not theft of SRS data, it is loss of data or tampering with data.

Information relating to the management of the Data Escrow processes performed by NCC and CoCCA Data Escrow (NZ)
Limited, including information in relation to the backup policies are explained in response to question 38. The Data Escrow process ensures that data is protected against security breaches that result in the loss or unauthorized modification of SRS data, especially as the data can be recovered from several sources. The CoCCA security policy is designed to protect against un-authorized modification of production SRS data.

The only information stored in the SRS that could present a risk should the entire SRS be compromised, stolen and released “into the wild” are SRS credentials and AuthCodes. The credentials and AuthCodes are Hashed (MD5) and Encrypted in the DB. GUI access to CoCCA’s production systems is only granted from trusted IP’s with a requirement for OTP use. For EPP access to the production SRS, the registrar’s IP must be white-listed and they must connect with a CoCCA issued SSL certificate. Even if one were able to steal the SRS DB and de-crypt the login credentials or AuthCodes, other security measures such as IP address locking, OTP and CoCCA issued certificates ensure potential data thieves would not be able to use them to access CoCCA’s production SRS or modify data.

Securing the SRS largely requires ensuring the SRS software cannot be exploited by users. The SRS has four public facing websites, the WHOIS, RDDS, Historical Abstracts and Key Retrieval. The GUI login is not public facing.

CoCCA uses the same “pamoja” SRS database application that it distributes to over 20+ other TLD managers. While the application is tested internally by CoCCA and other TLD manager’s, developers and systems administrators, CoCCA has a policy that each major release also be tested by an independent software testing laboratory. Currently we have contracted with Yonita (http://yonita.com). Yonita tests / audits the pamoja SRS application (not CoCCA’s NOC) for:

- Security vulnerabilities
- Standard quality defects
- Performance anti-patterns
- Database and transaction misuses
- Concurrency issues
- Architectural bad practices

30.3.4 Monitoring and Detecting Threats

CoCCA monitors network traffic and activity through automated processes and seeks to detect threats that impact the SRS and more broadly CoCCA’s Registry Services.

PCH and ISC directly monitor and attempt to detect threats that impact the DNSSEC signing and storage facilities as well as PCH’s and ISC’s respective Anycast networks. Any incident that impacts the security and stability of the .halal TLD in either the PCH DNSSEC facilities or nodes on the ISC or PCH Anycast networks is logged and reported to the CoCCA NOC immediately. ISC and PCH have near-real time reporting for all the Anycast nodes in their clouds and make this information available to CoCCA.

30.3.5 CoCCA SRS NOC | Essential Services Policy

CoCCA’s Security Policy mandates that only essential SRS services (production EPP, WHOIS, RDDS, and SRS GUI with limited access) are to be hosted at the Sydney NOC.

Public facing policy websites, email servers, help-desk software, svn, GIT, team sites, OTE environments, and software development servers are all hosted externally using various commercial cloud-based services. None of these cloud-based servers are configured in such a way that they have access to any SRS services that are not normally available to the public.
CoCCA Security Policy requires that all SRS traffic originating from outside the NOC be subjected to automated intrusion detection. CoCCA’s firewalls (Watchgaurd XTM) are configured for intrusion detection and are able to inspect encrypted HTTPS traffic. CoCCA’s Barracuda load balancers provide an additional layer of firewall protection, DoS and automated intrusion detection. CoCCA’s NOC firewalls are configured in accordance with best practices with both port and application layer filtering. The load balancers are configured for NAT and are also configured for intrusion detection and DoS attacks.

CoCCA’s Security Policy requires that all access to the SRS via the port 443 GUI is logged with originating IP, clientID, OTP (generated by security token), and that the sessions are time and date stamped. All EPP and WHOIS access logs are to be stored for seven days in the production SRS where they can be readily accessed before being archived. Firewall and VPN access is also logged.

CoCCA NOC Support staff are on hand 24-7-365 to monitor the Registry Services offered at the primary SRS in Sydney and the availability of the Failover and Escrow SRS facilities. NOC Staff perform three “roles”:

1) monitoring the CoCCA Sydney NOC and failover SRS’s – and a dozen or so other SRS’s that CoCCA supports;
2) registrar support for the CoCCA NOC and four other locally hosted ccTLDs; and
3) serve as front-line Complaint Resolution Service Officers able to trigger a CoCCA Critical Issue Suspension (CIS) or Uniform Rapid Suspension on a 24-7-365 basis.

The level of SRS access and skills required to perform all three roles are similar. CoCCA NOC support staff have no VPN access or other access to appliances at the CoCCA SRS. The GUI access they have is limited to Customer Service functions, and all the applications they use (helpdesk, monitoring, accounting, email) are hosted outside the primary NOC.

CoCCA’s NOC support is a virtual “function” performed by individuals in New Zealand, Guyana and France (additional NOC staff will be trained and other centers incorporated into the service in Q4 2012). If there is a failure in any of CoCCA’s Registry Services functions, the role of the NOC Support is to:

1) raise the alarm with CoCCA systems administrators or developers as conditions and events dictate;
2) liaise with PIPE Networks, PCH, ISC, IANA - ICANN and registrars as required.
30.3.10 Provisioning against DNS Denial of Service attacks

A Denial of Service (DoS) attack on a network service floods it with fraudulent requests so that there is no capacity left for legitimate requests. CoCCA’s Anycast DNS service is outsourced to PCH and ISC’s Anycast networks, CoCCA’s managed Unicast DNS ensures Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. has at least two “last resort” DNS nodes under direct management. Both PCH and ISC networks provide the .halal with substantial protection against DoS attacks, including Anycasting, over provisioning, and network traffic shaping.

Both PCH and ISC utilize traffic shaping methods that rate limit the number of queries per IP address to help prevent abuse and to trigger an investigation of elevated traffic levels to see whether an attacker is testing resource limits or whether ISC or PCH should provision additional bandwidth-servers or remove the node temporarily. In cases of an active DoS against ISC, CoCCA or PCH each will make every effort to identify the offending traffic and its sources to squelch offending traffic at ISP borders before reaching the servers as well as augmenting capacity to handle any legitimate elevated traffic levels.

30.3.11 Provisioning against WHOIS and EPP Denial of Service attacks

CoCCA actively monitors all Registry Services to ensure they meet any required SLA. In the event of a DoS attack that threatens to lower the SLA for WHOIS or EPP services required in the ICANN Agreement, CoCCA will work with our upstream providers (who also monitor the traffic) and attempt to squelch offending traffic at the ISP borders before it reaches the CoCCA RDDS servers. In the event the traffic is found to be legitimate, the bandwidth can be swiftly increased as required.

30.3.12 Failover Routing

CoCCA currently has multiple links to the Internet but does not load balance across them all. The secondary (failover) link is used to replicate and transfer backup WAL and VM image data files to CoCCA’s Failover SRS infrastructure (currently located in Palo Alto) and Escrow NOC. If there is a critical infrastructure issue at PIPE Networks, BGP routing will be used to move our critical infrastructure on our IPV4 and IPV6 address blocks to the failover Telstra link or to one of the two SRS instances outside of Australia. A forth node will be added in Paris (France) in early 2013.

If the issue relates to an SLA problem, changing the A record and CNAME for RDDS services may be sufficient to resolve such an issue in a timely manner. If required by a pro-longed outage BGP routing may be used to re-rout the entire ranges to a failover facility.

30.3.13 Commitments to Registrants

Taken from the .halal WHOIS and Privacy Policy

"6. DATA SECURITY

6.1 CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to protect the Personal Information it holds from misuse and loss and from unauthorized access, modification or disclosure.

7. OPENNESS
7.1 This Policy sets out CoCCA’s policies on its management of Personal Information. CoCCA shall make this document available to anyone who asks for it."
7.2 On request by any person, CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to let the person know, generally, what sort of Personal Information CoCCA holds, for what purposes, and how it collects, holds, uses and discloses that information.

8. ACCESS AND CORRECTION
8.1 All Registrant information lodged by a registrar that is maintained in the CoCCA SRS is publicly available from CoCCA’s RDDS services - WHOIS, Premium WHOIS, and Historical Abstracts.

See the .halal RDDS Policy (Attached) for more information.

8.2 If CoCCA holds Personal Information about a Registrant and the Registrant is able to establish that the information is not true, accurate, and complete and/or up-to-date, CoCCA shall take reasonable steps to facilitate corrections to the information so that current information is accurate, complete and up-to-date - except where the data is contained in an historical record or archive."

30.3.14 Independent Security Assessments

In addition to software and source security Audits, CoCCA has engaged the services of Connell Wagner Pty Ltd (now known as Aurecon Group Brand (Pte) Ltd) for the purpose of performing independent security audits of the primary data center.

On the condition that a gTLD is approved, CoCCA will engage the services of Aurecon to perform independent security audits to ensure the CoCCA system fully complies with all published security requirements set forth by ICANN. Such reports will be provided to ICANN on request. With new IT infrastructure planned for deployment in 2012 and early 2013, CoCCA will contract further independent assessments with third parties.

© Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers.
Annex 2
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 30 August 2013

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result
Pass
Congrats!
Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Application Guidebook (including submitted supporting notes and advisor reports), your application has passed Initial Evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening
Eligible
Based on review performed to-date, the application seems to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity
Pass - No Contention
The String Similarity Panel has determined that your application satisfies the requirements in Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Application Guidebook, and your application's string does not conflict with any other applied-for strings.

DNS Stability
Pass
The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application satisfies the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Application Guidebook.

Geographic Names
Not a Geographic Name - Pass
The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not conflict with a geographic name contained in the Application Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services
Pass
The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability
Pass
The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:
Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest on</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Who s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Reg strat on Lfe Cyclic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevent on and Mgt on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protect on Mechan sm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Techn ca &amp; Operat ona Capab ty cr ter a spec f ed n the App cant Gu debook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Archecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capab ty capab ty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geograph c D vers ty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Capability

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Application Guidebook.

### Question Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IPv6 Reachability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Faover Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: IDNs (Optional)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 26

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass* 22

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44

---

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In some cases, the results might be subject to change. Applications are subjected to due diligence at contract time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provisions of the Application Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Application Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs cross at <newgtlds.cann.org>.

---

**Financial Capability**

*Pass*

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Application Guidebook.
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 30 August 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App cat on D:</th>
<th>1-2130-23450</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App ed for Str ng:</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr or ty Number:</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App cant Name:</td>
<td>As a Green IT System B_g sayar San. ve T c. Ltd. St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Initial Evaluation Summary**

**Initial Evaluation Result**

**Pass**

**Congratu at ons!**

Based on the rev ew of your app cat on aga nst the re evant cr ter a n the App cant Gu debook (nc ud ng re ated supp ementa notes and adv sor es), your app cat on has passed In t a Eva uat on.

**Background Screening Summary**

**Background Screening**

**Eligible**

Based on rev ew performed to-date, the app cat on s e g b e to proceed to the next step n the Program. ICANN reserves the r ght to perform add t ona  background screen ng and research, to seek add t ona  nformat on from the app cant, and to reassess and change e g b ty up unt  the execut on of the Reg stry Agreement.

**Panel Summary**

**String Similarity**

**Pass - No Contention**

The Str ng S m ar ty Pane  has determ ned that your app cat on s cons stent w th the requ rements n Sect ons 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the App cant Gu debook, and your app ed-for str ng s not n content on w th any other app ed-for str ngs.

**DNS Stability**

**Pass**

The DNS Stab ty Pane  has determ ned that your app cat on s cons stent w th the requ rements n Sect on 2.2.1.3 of the App cant Gu debook.

**Geographic Names**

**Not a Geographic Name - Pass**

The Geograph c Names Pane  has determ ned that your app cat on does not fa w th n the cr ter a for a geograph c name conta ned n the App cant Gu debook Sect on 2.2.1.4.

**Registry Services**

**Pass**

The Reg stry Serv ces Pane  has determ ned that the proposed reg stry serv ces do not requ re further rev ew.

**Technical & Operational Capability**

**Pass**

The Techn ca  & Operat ona  Capab ty Pane  determ ned that:

Your app cat on meets the Techn ca  & Operat ona  Capab ty cr ter a spec f ed n the App cant Gu debook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest on</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Who s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Reg strat on L fe Cyc e</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevent on and M t gat on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rghts Protect on Mech an sm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Secur ty Po cy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Techn ca  Ov erv ew of Reg stry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Arch tecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capab ty tes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geograph c D vers ty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Capability

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Application Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest on</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IPv6 Reachability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Contnuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Failure Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: IDNs (Optional)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tota</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass*: **22**

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest on</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Project Team</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding and Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tota</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**: **8**

**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In most cases, the results may be subject to change. Applications are subjected to due diligence at contract time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Application Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Application Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs cross at <newgtlds.cann.org>.
Annex 3
During his review of the application for the new gTLD “.Islam”, the Independent Objector (IO) has noted that numerous comments have been posted on the public comments webpage of ICANN. To ensure transparency and address public concerns on this controversial application, the hereunder comment aims at informing the public of the reasons why the IO does not consider in principle filing an objection.

Although finalized after an exchange of views with the applicant, this comment is still preliminary and does not prejudge the IO’s final decision to file an objection against the application or not.

**Controversial Applications**


**Overview of the comments against the controversial applications**

The application for the new gTLD .Islam has given rise to numerous comments on the public comments webpage of ICANN. Several articles have also been posted on the Internet. Most of the comments raise identical issues.

Opponents to the launch of the gTLD .Islam mainly argue that the applicant lacks legitimacy to represent the Muslim community. They underline that religions are
legitimacy to represent the Muslim community. They underline that religions are very sensitive subjects. “Within religions there are different sub groups and sects who may have many differences and diversities. It is a very difficult task to unite all of these differences under one TLD unless it is run and supported by an organization that represent the community or its majority”. Therefore, according to opponents to the launch of the gTLD, a private entity, namely the limited company Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., should not be authorized to have control over a gTLD in relation to religion.

The Independent Objector’s position

In the present case, the IO, eager to lead a fair and transparent assessment, first expressed his concerns, regarding certain issues raised by the application, to the applicant through the initial notice procedure. Indeed, as encouraged but not required by ICANN, both parties are given the choice to participate in mediation or negotiation processes. The Initial Notice procedure opened up an opportunity for settling the pending issues.

A detailed note, including the reasons why the IO considered that an objection against the application might be warranted, has been sent to the applicant in order to give them the opportunity to react to the IO’s first assessment. It is only after careful review of their comments and feedbacks that the IO conducted a second assessment of the application. Still for the sake of transparency, to which the IO is fully committed, the present comment aims at informing the public of the results of the IO’s second evaluation of the application, including the reasons why the IO first considered that an objection could be warranted and why he finally considers that it in principle is not the case.

As he is acting in the best interests of the public using the Internet, the IO is convinced that the public should know about the subject matter and extent of his exchanges with the applicant. Indeed, it is important that all relevant facts are known in case his final decision is to not object to an application against which he first considered that an objection could be warranted. Therefore, the applicant’s response is attached to the present comment.

It should be noted that, acting in the interests of global Internet users, the IO has the possibility to file objections against applications on the community and limited
Limited Public Interest Objection

When assessing whether an objection against an application would be warranted on the limited public interest ground, the IO examines if the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under fundamental principles of international law.

1. The IO acknowledges that religions are very sensitive issues. This is particularly true due to the place that religion sometimes plays in the social life and debate. However, this question is more relevant in national legal systems. Indeed, the role of religions varies from State to State depending, notably, on whether it is a secular State or if it has a State religion. In view of the framework established by the applicant guidebook for limited public interest objections, the IO limits his review of the application to its compliance to fundamental principles of international law and rules of international law aimed at protecting common values of the international society, such as prohibition of genocide, slavery, torture or sexual exploitation of children.

2. It should be noted that the understanding of international morality is not uniform within the international society. It is difficult to list such principles since those value judgments, even when fundamental, also change over time. When reviewing applications, the IO makes his assessment in the light of those value judgments that have been transcribed in international norms, and not with regard to specific religious or national moral values. However, it does not mean that the IO cannot examine and discuss issues relating to religion.

3. In fact, the IO notes with interest for the present review that international law is concerned with issues related to religion. The fundamental notion of equal sovereignty, today enshrined in article 2 of the United Nations Charter, stemmed from the right of each State to choose its religion without any foreign intervention (Treaty of Westphalia (1648)).

4. International law still addresses issues related to religion, notably since it prevents international relations from conflicts to promote international peace and security and when protecting religious diversity. Thus, the freedom of religion or
belief is one of the fundamental principles protected by international law.

5. The principle is enshrined in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that “1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching. 2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. 3. Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. 4. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions”.

6. Protection of religious diversity is also, inter alia, enshrined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which defines genocide in its article 2 as certain “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group” or in article 8 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe, which states that “The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to manifest his or her religion or belief and to establish religious institutions, organisations and associations”.

7. The same right is incorporated in article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”.

8. Other non-binding international instruments also set important benchmarks for the freedom of religion. This is the case in particular for the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which affirms in its article 3 that “Discrimination between citizens on grounds only of religion or belief is contrary to the principles of freedom of thought, conscience and religion enshrined in international law”.
human beings on the grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations”.

9. In its resolution on “Combating Intolerance, Negative Stereotyping and Stigmatization of, and Discrimination, Incitement to Violence, and Violence Against Persons Based on Religion or Belief”, the Human Right Council also called for “strengthened international efforts to foster a global dialogue for the promotion of a culture of tolerance and peace at all levels, based on respect for human rights and diversity of religions and beliefs”.

10. Similar safeguards are also provided at the regional level and particularly by article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights which stipulates that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance”. Article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights also underlines that “Everyone has the right to freedom of conscience and of religion. This right includes freedom to maintain or to change one’s religion or beliefs, and freedom to profess or disseminate one’s religion or beliefs, either individually or together with others, in public or in private”. Similarly, Article 8 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights states that “Freedom of conscience, the profession and free practice of religion shall be guaranteed. No one may, subject to law and order, be submitted to measures restricting the exercise of these freedoms”.

11. The issue of religion is finally approached from the perspective of the principle of non-discrimination. This principle is notably enshrined in various key international instruments:

- Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that “everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”.
- The United Nations Charter and its Article 1(3), which defines one of the purposes of the United Nations as being the promotion and encouragement for the “respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”.

- According to Article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, States parties agree to “undertake to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

- Similarly, Article 2 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child says that “States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child’s or his or her parent’s or legal guardian’s race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status”.

- Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights also requires States parties to “guarantee that the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”.

**FIRST AND FINAL ASSESSMENT:** For all these reasons, the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community.

**Community Objection**

For the IO to consider filing a community objection, there must be a substantial interest. If you believe your community has a substantial interest, please provide additional information.
opposition to the gTLD application from a representative portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Therefore, the community named by the IO must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection.

When assessing whether a community objection is warranted, the IO bases his review on four preliminary tests.

1. As for the first test, *(the IO determines if the community invoked is a clearly delineated community)*, the IO notes that the notion of “community” is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s guidebook for the new gTLD program. It can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethno-racial, religious, linguistic or similar community. Moreover, communities can also be classified in sub-communities (i.e. the Jewish community in New York or the Italian community on Facebook). However, beyond the diversity of communities, there are common definitional elements.

For the IO, a community is a group of individuals who have something in common (which can include their place of residence – i.e. the French, South-East Asian or Brazilian community – or a common characteristic – i.e. the disability community), or share common values, interests or goals (i.e. the health, legal, internet or ICANN community). For the purpose of the IO evaluation, it is clear that what matters is that the community invoked can be clearly delineated, enjoys a certain level of public recognition and encompasses a certain number of people and/or entities.

In this case, the IO acknowledges that public comments made on the community ground tend to prove the existence of such a community, being the global Muslim community, and generally express an opinion in the name of the designated community. Muslims are adherent of Islam and share common religious values and interests. The community is composed of individuals, whether they are religious officials or ordinary Muslims, as well as non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organization such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). According to some comments, the latter would represent the majority of the community since it “has membership of 57 states spread over four continents”. “The Organization is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensuring to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various peoples of the world”
2. As for the second and third tests, *(The IO verifies if there is a 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 IO pays a particular attention to the representative nature of entities or persons expressing opposition as well as well as the level of recognized stature or weight among sources expressing opposition.

In this regard, the IO particularly notes that the GAC representatives of the governments of India and the United Arab Emirates have issued two early warnings. The United Arab Emirates give three reasons for the issuance of their early warning. First, they argue that “Religious terms and subjects are very sensitive areas. The applicant is a commercial entity. Strict boundaries, measures and policies must be set to ensure that applicant business activities do not conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. They also underline that there is a “lack of community involvement and support” and that “the application lacks any sort of protection to ensure that the use of the domain names registered under the applied for new gTLD are in line with Islam principles, pillars, views believes and law”. As to the Indian government, they argue that “the applicant intends to run the“.islam” gTLD on an exclusive basis, without any regard to the diverse and wide-ranging needs of India’s 120 million plus Muslims”.

The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates has also expressed its concern about the application on the public comments webpage of ICANN. “The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (TRA) of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has been established according to the UAE Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003 – Telecom Law. TRA is responsible for the management of every aspect of the telecommunication and information technology industries in the UAE. TRA, as determined by its mandate, is entrusted with a wide range of responsibilities related to the Telecommunications and Information Technology Sector, both within and outside the UAE”.

Finally, the Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia also expressed concerns on the application. It is “the information and communications technology sector (ICT) regulator in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Telecommunications Act (enacted in June 2001) and its Bylaws (issued in July 2002) provide the basis for regulatory framework
of the sector. The Act includes a number of objectives, including: provision of advanced, sufficient and affordable communications services; creating the proper climate to encourage fair competition; utilizing frequencies efficiently, transferring telecommunications technology and keeping abreast with its developments, and realizing clarity and transparency in processes procedures, in addition to achieving the principles of equality and non-discrimination and protecting the public interest as well as the interests of users and investors. The Commission enjoys the juridical personality and financial independence to achieve its objectives stipulated in the Telecommunications Act, its Bylaw and the Ordinance of the Communications and Information Technology Commission”.

Furthermore, regarding the question as to whether the gTLDs implicitly or explicitly target the invoked community, the link in the present case is to say the least obvious and explicit. Indeed, the applicant itself specifies that “There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this”.

3. Finally and as for the fourth test (the IO conduct when assessing whether an objection is warranted or not, the application for the Top-Level Domain name must create 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), the IO holds that comments against the application have been made by major representatives of the “Muslim world”. They notably state that the applicant lacks support from the Muslim community, which it did not consult prior to its decision to operate the gTLD. In fact, comments against the application suggest that a more representative entity should operate such a gTLD. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation would have greater legitimacy according to them. They also underline that a “.Islam” gTLD should not be operated by a commercial entity, which furthermore does not offer sufficient safeguard for preventing “conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. Also, considering that actors that are among the most important of the community have made comments, it is reasonable to believe that the application could interfere with the legitimate interests of, at least, the above-mentioned stakeholders.
FIRST ASSESSMENT: Therefore, as for his possibility to object on the community ground, the IO was of the opinion that an objection against the application for the new gTLD “.Islam” could have been warranted. However, the IO clarified that he would certainly hesitate to object in case a representative community objector would be in position to object, as it clearly seems to be the case in the present case.

FINAL ASSESSMENT: As a result of the initial notice procedure, the IO now considers that applicant appropriately addresses his first concerns.

In their response, Asia Green IT System (AGIT) notably emphasized that they “agree with most of the Public Comments on ‘sensitivity’ of .Islam and try to create a Governance Platform with cooperation of OIC to address such concerns. AGIT does not want to position itself as the ‘judge’ of ‘choosing suitable candidates for using .Islam gTLD’ without the Muslim community leaders’ involvement. As a private Company with Technical and Managerial capabilities, [they] would like to be mostly involved in operational side of [their] .Islam gTLD application.” They assured that they “will do [their] outmost to include OIC into governance of .Islam gTLD. [Their] proposal to OIC is establishing OIC ICT organization as the Sponsor of .Islam gTLD and in charge of the governance entity”.

They added that an “alternate Governance approach would be formation of "dot-ISLAM Advisory Council", consisting of prominent Islamic leaders like former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Muhammad, personalities and NGOs that acceptable to all Muslim faithful.”.

AGIT also attached to their response numerous letters of support and assured that they had “a plan to increase the level of support [they] can receive from Islamic communities around the world”. However, the IO noted that unfortunately, none of those letters emanated from current officials of governments concerned by this gTLD or from International Organizations such as the OIC.

Following this first exchange, the IO contacted again AGIT in order to clarify certain remaining issues. Indeed, the IO main concern was about the legitimacy of AGIT to represent the Islamic community and operate a gTLD in its sole interests. In order to dispel his doubts as to this issue, the IO sought clarification with regards to what did AGIT exactly meant when they proposed
to share the governance of the gTLD and to what extent the OIC could be involved. The IO also wished to have a more precise idea of the entities AGIT could include in the “Dot Islam Advisory Council” in case the OIC does not intend to get involved in the management of the gTLD and what will be the exact role of the “Dot Islam Advisory Council”.

In a second response, AGIT attached a draft proposal on the governance of the gTLD “.Islam”, which was also shared with governments’ representatives for their feedbacks, including those who issued an early warning against their application. They stated that “the main core of [their] proposed ISLAM governance is “.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC)” which will have great powers in different aspects of operation of a TLD, including Registration Policy Making, Dispute Resolutions, Content Monitoring Policies and activities etc...”. They have proposed “the PAC to include 3 main groups: a) The Governments’ representatives, b) Religious leaders, c) Civil society. And on the head (as PAC Chairperson) [they] would like to benefit from the representative of an international Islamic Organization (like OIC or ICCI)”. They assured that “PAC will be a non-for-profit board elected from interested members, and will have designed enough dynamicity to include representatives of different stakeholder time to time, through its rotating system”.

As an alternative to a representative of an International Organization, like the OIC, appointed as the PAC chairperson, they had contact with the “Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC)”, which gave its support to this initiative.

They also mentioned a fruitful consultation with the GAC representative of the United Arab Emirates as well as several “organizations and associations which can be considered as representatives of specific groups of Muslims”.

The IO considers that guarantees presented by the applicant properly address his initial concerns. Therefore and for all these reasons, the IO is finally of the opinion that an objection on community ground is not warranted.

Moreover, it is the public policy of the IO not to make an objection when an established institution representing and associated with the community having
an interest in an objection can lodge such an objection directly. This does not exclude that the IO deems it nevertheless appropriate to file a community objection in particular circumstances, e.g., if the established institution representing and associated with the community has compelling reasons not to do so, if the community has no representative established institutions entitled to file a community objection, or when several communities are in the same interest and an application could raise issues of priority or in respect to the modalities of the objection.

In the present case, the IO is of the opinion that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is an established institution representing and associated with a significant part of the targeted community. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is already fully aware of the controversial issues and is better placed than the IO to file an objection, if it deems it appropriate. That is also for this reason that the IO, who is primarily acting as a “safety net”, does not in principle intend to file an objection on the community ground.

Applicant's Response to the Independent Objector's Initial Notice

AGIT
First Response to the IO's Initial Notice
AGIT First Response to the IO.pdf
Document Adobe Acrobat [2.5 MB]

AGIT
Second Response to the IO's Initial Notice
AGIT Second Response to the IO.pdf
Document Adobe Acrobat [342.9 KB]
Annex 4
26 December 2012

Mr. Alain Pellet
Independent Objector
ICANN New gTLDs Program

Dear Mr. Pellet,

Subject: AGIT's Feedback to Independent Objector's Opinion on dot-ISLAM Application

On behalf of AGIT System, I thank you for giving us the opportunity to explain our intentions and express our feedback to Independent Objector's Opinion on .ISLAM application.

First of all, I would like to inform you that Asia Green IT System (AGIT), an Istanbul based IT Company, wish to create "a quality online space for the Muslim faithful" with domain name .islam that all members of the Muslim community and other well wishers of Islam can use. AGIT System founders have IT Integration background and all employees are Islam faithful.

I must admit, since AGIT System filed their application at the last, there were no prior consultation with ICANN GAC Members or related bodies. As a result, there were many concerned voices about the applicant for .islam. I personally experienced such sentiment when I first joined the Company at October, during ICANN - Toronto Meeting. Since AGIT Company was not properly introduced to them, most of the Islamic countries' GAC Representatives were concerned at that time and planning for "early warning" regarding .islam application.

I introduced AGIT System, explained our background, our business intentions, listened their concerns and discussed governance strategies for .islam with concerned GAC Members; including Turkey, Pakistan, Libya, Egypt, UAE. Based on our findings from ICANN Toronto meetings, we decided to approach Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) for their sponsorship or cooperation on governance-operation of .islam. We communicated our OIC Plan with ICANN and related GAC representatives (Please find attached our letter to OIC General Secretary).

We attended ECO (Economic Corporation Organization) Telecom Ministries Summit on 12-14 November in Tehran and had an opportunity to meet with Turkey, Iran, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan Ministries and introduce AGIT, our plans for governance and operation for .islam.

Mr. Pellet, if you notice there are very few Countries (India, UAE...) filing "early warnings" now against .Islam after our efforts of introducing AGIT and governance-operations intentions. After UAE's "early warning" filing, we had an appointment with UAE GAC Representative, Mr. Abdul Rahman Al Marzouqi on December 12th at Dubai (during WCIT) to understand their
concerns and our plans for governance of .islam. That was a positive meeting and we plan the same approach with Indian GAC member after our meeting with OIC.

Mr. Pellet, after this long introduction and background on our efforts to create a common platform acceptable to all concerns, please allow me responding to the points that are raised in "early warnings":-

1. We agree with most of the Public Comments on "sensitivity" of .Islam and try to create a Governance Platform with cooperation of OIC to address such concerns. AGIT does not want to position itself as the "judge" of "choosing suitable candidates for using .Islam gTLD" without the Muslim community leaders' involvement. As a private Company with Technical and Managerial capabilities, we would like to be mostly involved in operational side of our .Islam gTLD application.

2. Our alternate Governance approach would be formation of "dot-ISLAM Advisory Council", consisting of prominent Islamic leaders like former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Muhammad, personalities and NGOs that acceptable to all Muslim faithful. (Please see attached Dr. Mahathir’s supporting letter)

3. In some of the "early warnings" they argue that we do not represent majority of Islamic community. As explained earlier in this letter, we have the support of Turkish, Iranian, Egyptian, Pakistani, Libyan, Malaysian, ... Governments (and GAC Members) who did not filed "early warnings" after our communications. If the yardstick is population, we believe we already have the support 2/3 of Islamic community. Please find endorsement letters we have received from many Islamic entities and community leaders from Turkey, Pakistan, Malaysia, France, Brazil, Germany, Denmark and Belarus at our web site.

   We have a plan to increase the level of support we can receive from Islamic communities around the world which I hope will prove our commitment to the voice the community more.

4. On the issue of "terrorism". We believe this should be Governments' concern as internet is used widespread by world population. Should somebody want to embark on a terrorist or separatist act using "Islam" preface, there are already many ways and www.islam.aaaaa domain names they can use. We attached a screen shot picture to show you availability of www.islam domain names that were not regulated, questioned or objected to. Most of such websites does not even provide operating company names or credentials?

5. We believe communities should bring the people closer to better understand each other. Although many Governments does not like communities on internet (as experienced in "Arab Spring"), AGIT's intention is just creating "a quality online space for the Muslim faithful". OIC or any other NGOs did not applied for .islam but we were the one saw the chance to create such online community and applied to independent business organization ICANN.
Dear Mr. Pellet, as explained in introduction part of our letter, we will do our utmost to include OIC into governance of .islam gTLD. Our proposal to OIC is establishing OIC ICT organization as the Sponsor of .islam gTLD and in charge of the governance entity. We also propose donation of substantial part of our business profit OIC ICT section for the development of ICT infrastructure and knowledge base in developing Islamic countries.

Otherwise, as we mentioned earlier, we would establish a governance platform comprising prominent Islamic Leaders and NGOs (dot-ISLAM Advisory Council) which is acceptable to the most of Muslim Community.

Given our background information and progresses, we would be grateful any recommendation or suggestion from your side to improve our application. We hope our feedback and sincere efforts would find a positive place in your evaluation as an Independent Objector.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mustafa Savaş Ünsal
General Manager
Asia Green IT System Ltd.

Copy: Mr. Mehdi Abbasnia
Chairman, Asia Green IT System Ltd.
Dated: February 20, 2013

To: Mr. Alain Pellet
Independent Objector
ICANN New gTLDs Program

Dear Mr. Alain Pellet

First of all we would like to thank you very much for your patience on the case of .ISLAM. Especially for the recent week which helped us a lot to summarize many of our activities regarding .ISLAM governance proposal and the resulted we have achieved in this regards.

Please below note to a list of activities AGIT has done during recent months, to cover the main concern of you which is almost a concern of everybody in the Muslim community: “the legitimacy of AGIT to represent the Islamic community and operate .ISLAM gTLD”. We obviously understand this concern and have always tried our best to bring the sense of trust to the Muslim Community.

1. Proposal for the Governance of .ISLAM gTLD

The main activity we focused on was to prepare a draft proposal on the Governance of .ISLAM gTLD.

AGIT with the help of Internet Public Policy experts and its consultants has drafted a “Proposal for the Governance of .ISLAM gTLD”, as one of its main outcomes in this regards.

The preparation of this proposal has been recently finished, and we have shared this document with few persons and governments (including those who had concerns) to receive their initial feedbacks. The reason we have not published the document on internet is that we would like to be open to receive any feedbacks from major organizations and governments to create the most welcomed final version. Actually we would like to make other Islamic key players to be involved not only in the governance of .ISLAM, but also in designation of this governance.

In summary the main core of our proposed .ISLAM governance is “.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC)” which will have great powers in different aspects of operation.
of a TLD, including Registration Policy Making, Dispute Resolutions, Content Monitoring Policies and activities etc…

AGIT believes that the Muslim Community is a multi stakeholder community consisting of all personal and legal entities. So we have proposed the PAC to include 3 main groups:

a) The Governments’ representatives
b) Religious leaders
c) Civil society

And on the head (as PAC Chairperson) we would like to benefit from the representative of an international Islamic Organization (like OIC or ICCI).

AGIT has also decided to contribute parts of ISLAM’s financial incomes to the programs for development of Muslim situation, and PAC would be the decision making system to select the projects or programs receiving these contributions.

PAC will be a non-for-profit board elected from interested members, and will have designed enough dynamicity to include representatives of different stakeholder time to time, through its rotating system.

Attached to this letter you can find AGIT’s draft proposal. We would appreciate to have your complementary ideas in making this proposal better.

2. Our efforts regarding Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC)

It was really a hard work to access OIC to start negotiation with. Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) is the 2nd largest international organization (after UN) and with lots of subsidiaries and sub-organizations.

Another challenge we had was the limited ways of communication with OIC (limited to traditional Post and Mail systems) which made it time consuming to communicate with OIC.

We approached to OIC through different channels. Our second letter to OIC general secretariat has been recently posted to them (including our Governance proposal) following our first letter (asking for a meeting) which we have not yet get any response on it. Many times, a communication with huge organizations regarding a complicated internet subject like TLDs may be supposed to be a technical subject and might be referred to lower technical departments for further investigations, which will make the
process longer. So we hope that the new letter with an invitation for participation of .ISLAM PAC chair will be seen straighter forward to be notable as a managerial subject.

But in parallel we tried to find good alternatives which could reflect similar positions and authority on the governance of .ISLAM as the chair of PAC.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was our next alternative. ICNIC is established in 2003 and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

ICRIC has major programs which are mostly related to economic subjects, which .ISLAM can be mentioned as one of them if necessary. We could arrange for meetings with ICNIC General Secretariat, explaining the concept of .ISLAM gTLD and fortunately got their support on .ISLAM. We believe that ICNIC as an international Islamic center formed under ICCI would also have enough capacity to role as PAC chair, although we will continue our communication with OIC as the highest possible level.

Attached please find our recently received supporting letter from ICNIC.

3. Other Communications / Negotiations

During recent weeks we have targeted specific organizations and associations as well as important government representatives in GAC, to communicate and negotiate with them. Among them are:

3.1. Communications with the representative of UAE in GAC:

The first Meeting with Mr. Abdulrahman Al Marzooqi, was a positive meeting in general.

Mr. Marzooqi had a logical point of view which again reflected his governments worry about the legitimacy of AGIT on operating .ISLAM TLD.

When we explained about our approach on the governance of .ISLAM (the involvement of OIC or other international Islamic organizations), Mr. Marzooqi welcomed this approach and accepted our plans as positive initializes which can address their concerns. His feedback was a conditional one based on our future
activities in this regards. We have recently sent him the draft .ISLAM Governance Proposal and invited them to send us back their comments on the governance proposal and be a member of PAC as the representative of UAE government.

3.2. Communication with Indian GAC representative:

We have also sent a letter to the Indian GAC representatives. Because of the nature of their concern which was different from other countries (and we understand it as an important concern which should be addressed), we tried to bold the subject of “Terrorism” in PAC’s activities. In the draft proposal, governments can manage this issue through the power of PAC in Dispute Resolutions and Content Monitoring. PAC has enough mandates to improve its internal regulations to address all its concerns.

We have also invited the Indian GAC representative to send us back their comments and participate in PAC, and hope this proposal will make them satisfied about their concern.

3.3. Communications with different communities to get their support:

AGIT has tried to communicate with different sectors of the Muslim Community to explain its plans on .ISLAM gTLD and get their support on .ISLAM.

Till now, AGIT has received many new supporting letters from organizations and associations which can be considered as representatives of specific groups of Muslims, but unfortunately we have not yet been able to upload them to our application on ICANN website.

We have prepared a document explaining more about these supporting letters, since we think so of them are really important, but obviously everybody may not have ideas about the importance of all of them. As explained earlier in this letter AGIT believes that the governments of Islamic countries should not be considered as the only representatives of the Muslim community and we should note to other parts of this community as well. As an example, the religious leaders can be even more considerable in this regards because we are talking about a religious TLD which should not be only looked at through political windows.

Some of the support letters AGIT has received are from these religious leading organizations / personals which many Muslims are their followers. We have tried to
provide more explanations about the signers of these letters and hope this will help everybody to understand the value of them in a realistic way.

Please also note that our efforts to communicate with more Islamic Organizations / Associations to attract them support. ISLAM is an ongoing non-stop activity and we try to add more letters based on the channels we find. We will hopefully receive more letters in upcoming weeks from Arab States (Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt, etc…)


As a conclusion we thank you again for your patience and our feedback and sincere efforts would find a positive place in your evaluation as an Independent Objector.

Please let us know in case you need more information.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mehdi Abbasnia
Chairman and Managing Director
Asia Green IT System Ltd.

Tel: +90 212 319 38 87, 89
Fax: +90 212 319 38 02
Email: info@agitsys.com
No.11, 4th Floor, Block D, Metrocity Shopping Mall, Kirgulu St., Buyukdere Ave., 34394, Levent, Istanbul, Turkey
Annex 5
Application ID: 1-2131-60793

Entity/Applicant Name: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

String: HALAL

Early Warning Issue Date: 20 November 2012

Early Warning Description – This will be posted publicly:

The government of UAE would like to express its serious concerns toward “.halal” new gTLD application made by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. specifically in the areas highlighted below:

(1) private entity control over sensitive name
(2) Insufficient community support.
(3) Sensitivity of the name and domain name use policy

Reason/Rationale for the Warning – This will be posted publicly:

(1) private entity control over sensitive name

“Halal (Arabic: حلال halāl, "permissible") is a term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law. The term is used to designate food seen as permissible according to Islamic law.

Religious terms and subjects are very sensitive areas. The applicant is a commercial entity. Strict boundaries, measures and policies must be set to ensure that applicant business activities do not conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws. Therefore any religious terms must be only applied as a gTLD by a government or not-for-profit organization acting on behalf of that community as oppose to a private entity. It is unacceptable for a private entity to have control over religious terms such as Halal without significant support and affiliation with the community its targeting.

(2) Insufficient community support.

The application targets a specific community of those interested in Halal products and producers supporting Halal products. This covers wide range of community covering over 50 countries where significant Halal products are produced and consumed (over 1.6 Billion populations). The applicant has presented couple of letter of supports from organizations mostly associated with one country. The support letters presented by the applicant constitute a minority (less than 5% of the community) hence it clearly does not constitute as a sufficient community support.

If there is lack of support from the community to this application then it will most probably be
dominated by subgroup from the religion and will ignore the interests of the remaining majority. This will adversely affect the interest of the community to register in the TLD and therefore limit its growth.

Furthermore there is lack of information regarding background and affiliation of the applicant and its leader. In all cases they will not represent the entire Muslim community and hence the support of community is an essential prerequisite and must be in a form of letter from known NGOs and inter-governmental organizations that do represent majority of the community such as the IOC.

(3) Sensitivity of the name and domain name use policy

Religious topics such as Halal are extremely sensitive subject. Within religions there are different sub groups and sects who may have many differences and diversities. It is very difficult task to unite all of these differences under one TLD unless it is run and supported by an organization that represents the community or its majority. There are many organizations that do represent significant parts of the community and it is vital that those organizations endorse and support this application.

As with all religious terms, Halal is closely associated with Islamic law. Anything that would conflict with Islamic law would be unacceptable for the followers and believers of Islam (hence the community) in general which naturally brings issue of registration and use policies. A very important question must be raised as to how the applicant will ensure that the use of the domain name is in line with Islamic Law and Halal principles? These issues will be eliminated if this TLD is supported and supervised by an IGO which represents majority of the community. Furthermore, the application lacks any sort of protection to ensure that the use of the domain names registered under the applied for new gTLD are in line with Islam laws and Halal principles. There are no clear mechanisms to prevent any abuses related to the above.

For the above reasons, the TRA on behalf of the government of UAE would like to raise its disapproval and non-endorsement to this application and request the ICANN and the new gTLD program evaluators to not approve this application.

Possible Remediation steps for Applicant – This will be posted publicly:

The applicant should withdraw their application based on the information provided above.

Further Notes from GAC Member(s) (Optional) – This will be posted publicly:
INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

About GAC Early Warning

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 or of a formal objection at a later stage in the process. Refer to section 1.1.2.4 of the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) for more information on GAC Early Warning.

Instructions if you receive the Early Warning

ICANN strongly encourages you work with relevant parties as soon as possible to address the concerns voiced in the GAC Early Warning.

Asking questions about your GAC Early Warning

If you have questions or need clarification about your GAC Early Warning, please contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. As highlighted above, ICANN strongly encourages you to contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org as soon as practicable regarding the issues identified in the Early Warning.

Continuing with your application

If you choose to continue with the application, then the “Applicant’s Response” section below should be completed. In this section, you should notify the GAC of intended actions, including the expected completion date. This completed form should then be sent to gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. If your remediation steps involve submitting requests for changes to your application, see the change request process at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/change-requests.

In the absence of a response, ICANN will continue to process the application as submitted.

Withdrawing your application

If you choose to withdraw your application within the 21-day window to be eligible for a refund of 80% of the evaluation fee (USD 148,000), please follow the withdrawal process published at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/withdrawal-refund. Note that an application can still be withdrawn after the 21-day time period; however, the available refund amount is reduced. See section 1.5 of the Applicant Guidebook.
For questions please contact: gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org

Applicant Response:
Application ID: 1-2131-60793
Entity/Applicant Name: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.
String: Halal
Early Warning Issue Date: 20 November 2012

Early Warning Description – This will be posted publicly:

India is a secular country with a large Muslim population. Use or this extension is likely to impact upon section of the community unless there are stringent checks and balance with a strong anti-abuse policy.

Further, there are specific restrictions on the certification of food items as “Halal.” There is no certainty that the applicant will conform to the rules and regulations regarding this type of food item in India.

Reason/Rationale for the Warning – This will be posted publicly:

India is a secular country and the grant of this extension has to be proceeded with stringent pre-verification. The term halal is associated with Muslim community and carries with it a lot of sensibility.

The capture of such a term online needs to ensure that sufficient check and balance are put in place to prevent its misuse. Unrestricted use of the extension is likely to increase the possibility of hurting religious sentiments leading to the social unrest. Also as per the Indian Trade Mark Law any term likely to hurt religions susceptibilities of any class or section of the citizens of India should not be registered the trade mark.

In addition, the designation of food as “Halal” must conform to strict regulations and rules that govern this area in India. The applicant must demonstrate how they will conform to such rules, and must submit an undertaking that only verified registrants with documentation determining that they are certified to carry Halal food will be allowed to register names.

Therefore pre verifications along with required anti abuse policy must be put in place before this gTLD extension is granted.
Possible Remediation steps for Applicant – This will be posted publicly:

1. The designation of food as “Halal” must conform to strict regulations and rules that govern this area in India. The applicant must demonstrate how they will conform to such rules, and must submit an undertaking that only verified registrants with documentation determining that they are certified to carry Halal food will be allowed to register names.

2. Clear rules as to takedowns of names should they not conform to the verification must be shown.

3. At the same time, this name should not be restricted to just Muslims, or to just registrants from predominantly Muslim countries.

4. Finally, to address the needs of developing nations, the applicant must demonstrate that their gTLD will not disadvantage registrants from developing countries due to economic reasons, or render unable to register names due to cost factors.

Further Notes from GAC Member(s) (Optional) – This will be posted publicly:

INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS
About GAC Early Warning

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 or of a formal objection at a later stage in the process. Refer to section 1.1.2.4 of the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) for more information on GAC Early Warning.

Instructions if you receive the Early Warning

ICANN strongly encourages you work with relevant parties as soon as possible to address the concerns voiced in the GAC Early Warning.

Asking questions about your GAC Early Warning

If you have questions or need clarification about your GAC Early Warning, please contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. As highlighted above, ICANN strongly encourages you to contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org as soon as practicable regarding the issues identified in the Early Warning.

Continuing with your application

If you choose to continue with the application, then the “Applicant’s Response” section below should be completed. In this section, you should notify the GAC of intended actions, including the expected completion date. This completed form should then be sent to gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. If your remediation steps involve submitting requests for changes to your application, see the change request process at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/change-requests.

In the absence of a response, ICANN will continue to process the application as submitted.

Withdrawing your application

If you choose to withdraw your application within the 21-day window to be eligible for a refund of 80% of the evaluation fee (USD 148,000), please follow the withdrawal process published at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/withdrawal-refund. Note that an application can still be withdrawn after the 21-day time period; however, the available refund amount is reduced. See section 1.5 of the Applicant Guidebook.

For questions please contact: gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org
Applicant Response:
### Application ID:
1-2130-23450

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity/Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String:</td>
<td>ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Warning Issue Date:</td>
<td>20 November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Warning Description – This will be posted publicly:

The government of UAE would like to express its serious concerns toward “.islam” new gTLD application made by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. specifically in the areas highlighted below:

1. **private entity control over sensitive name**
2. **Lack of community involvement and support**
3. **Sensitivity of the name and domain name use policy**

### Reason/Rationale for the Warning – This will be posted publicly:

1. **private entity control over sensitive name**

   Religious terms and subjects are very sensitive areas. The applicant is a commercial entity. Strict boundaries, measures and policies must be set to ensure that applicant business activities do not conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws. Therefore any religious terms must be only applied by a government or not-for-profit organization acting on behalf of that community as oppose to a private entity. It is unacceptable for a private entity to have control over religious terms such as Islam without significant support and affiliation with the community its targeting.

2. **Lack of community involvement and support**

   The application targets the entire Muslim community. This covers wide range of population (approximately 1.4 to 1.6 Billion). The applicant has presented couple of letter of supports from organizations mostly associated with one country, Iran. However Islam has many schools and branches whose followers spreading over 4 continents. Even within Iran, there are many branches within the country and the support letters does not cover all of them. The support letters presented by the applicant constitute a minority (less than 5% of the community).

   If there is lack of support from the majority of the community to this application then this application will most probably be dominated by subgroup from the religion and will ignore the interests of the remaining majority. This will adversely affect the interest of the community to register in the TLD and therefore limit its growth.
Furthermore there is lack of information regarding background and affiliation of the company and its leader. In all cases they will represent the entire Muslim community and hence the support of community is an essential prerequisite and must be in a form of letter from known NGOs and intergovernmental organizations that do represent majority of the community such as the IOC.

(3) Sensitivity of the name and domain name use policy

Religions are extremely sensitive subject. Within religions there are different sub groups and sects who may have many differences and diversities. It is very difficult task to unite all of these differences under one TLD unless it is run and supported by an organization that represent the community or its majority.

As with all religions, Islam has basic principles, pillars, views and law. Anything that would conflict with such principles, pillars, views, believes or law would be unacceptable for the followers and believers of Islam (hence the community) in general which naturally brings issue of registration and use policies. A very important question must be raised as to how the applicant will ensure that the use of the domain name is in line with Islam principles, views and law? These issues will be eliminated if this TLD is supported and supervised by an IGO which represents majority of the community. The application lacks any sort of protection to ensure that the use of the domain names registered under the applied for new gTLD are in line with Islam principles, pillars, views believes and law. There are no clear mechanisms to prevent any abuses related to the above.

For the above reasons, the government of UAE would like to raise its disapproval and non-endorsement to this application and request the ICANN and the new gTLD program evaluators to not approve this application.

Possible Remediation steps for Applicant – This will be posted publicly:

The applicant should withdraw their application based on the information provided above

Further Notes from GAC Member(s) (Optional) – This will be posted publicly:
INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

About GAC Early Warning

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 or of a formal objection at a later stage in the process. Refer to section 1.1.2.4 of the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) for more information on GAC Early Warning.

Instructions if you receive the Early Warning

ICANN strongly encourages you work with relevant parties as soon as possible to address the concerns voiced in the GAC Early Warning.

Asking questions about your GAC Early Warning

If you have questions or need clarification about your GAC Early Warning, please contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. As highlighted above, ICANN strongly encourages you to contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org as soon as practicable regarding the issues identified in the Early Warning.

Continuing with your application

If you choose to continue with the application, then the “Applicant’s Response” section below should be completed. In this section, you should notify the GAC of intended actions, including the expected completion date. This completed form should then be sent to gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. If your remediation steps involve submitting requests for changes to your application, see the change request process at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/change-requests.

In the absence of a response, ICANN will continue to process the application as submitted.

Withdrawing your application

If you choose to withdraw your application within the 21-day window to be eligible for a refund of 80% of the evaluation fee (USD 148,000), please follow the withdrawal process published at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/withdrawal-refund. Note that an application can still be withdrawn after the 21-day time period; however, the available refund amount is reduced. See section 1.5 of the Applicant Guidebook.

For questions please contact: gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org
Applicant Response:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1-2130-23450</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entity/Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String:</td>
<td>islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Warning Issue Date:</td>
<td>20 November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Warning Description – This will be posted publicly:**

Asia Green IT System is seeking to have exclusive use of the gTLD ‘islam’. There is no plan in the application to address the needs of the approximately 120 million Muslims in India.

Without strong and proper procedures to curb the wrong use of this gTLD, there exists a very high potential to stoke tensions and negatively affect the well-being of millions of Muslims and non-Muslims in India.

**Reason/Rationale for the Warning – This will be posted publicly:**

The word islam is closely associated with the sentiments of millions of Muslims residing in India. Under Indian Trade Mark Act Section 9(2) clearly mentions that a mark shall not be registered if it contains or comprises of any matter likely to hurt the religion susceptibilities of any class or section of the citizens of India.

The applicant intends to run the “.islam” gTLD on an exclusive basis, without any regard to the diverse and wide-ranging needs of India’s 120 million plus Muslims.

As a result, and based on the provisions of the Indian Trade Mark Act, we believe that the gTLD string “islam” should be set aside by ICANN.
Possible Remediation steps for Applicant – This will be posted publicly:

The applicant should withdraw their application based on the information provided above.

The sensitive nature of the gTLD, and the continued opportunity for abuse and misrepresentation makes remediation difficult.

Further Notes from GAC Member(s) (Optional) – This will be posted publicly:


ingformations for Applicants

About GAC Early Warning

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 or of a formal objection at a later stage in the process. Refer to section 1.1.2.4 of the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) for more information on GAC Early Warning.
Instructions if you receive the Early Warning

ICANN strongly encourages you work with relevant parties as soon as possible to address the concerns voiced in the GAC Early Warning.

Asking questions about your GAC Early Warning

If you have questions or need clarification about your GAC Early Warning, please contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. As highlighted above, ICANN strongly encourages you to contact gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org as soon as practicable regarding the issues identified in the Early Warning.

Continuing with your application

If you choose to continue with the application, then the “Applicant’s Response” section below should be completed. In this section, you should notify the GAC of intended actions, including the expected completion date. This completed form should then be sent to gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org. If your remediation steps involve submitting requests for changes to your application, see the change request process at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/change-requests.

In the absence of a response, ICANN will continue to process the application as submitted.

Withdrawing your application

If you choose to withdraw your application within the 21-day window to be eligible for a refund of 80% of the evaluation fee (USD 148,000), please follow the withdrawal process published at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/customer-service/withdrawal-refund. Note that an application can still be withdrawn after the 21-day time period; however, the available refund amount is reduced. See section 1.5 of the Applicant Guidebook.

For questions please contact: gacearlywarning@gac.icann.org

Applicant Response:
Annex 6
GAC Advice Response Form for Applicants

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) has issued advice to the ICANN Board of Directors regarding New gTLD applications. Please see Section IV, Annex I, and Annex II of the GAC Beijing Communiqué for the full list of advice on individual strings, categories of strings, and strings that may warrant further GAC consideration.

Respondents should use this form to ensure their responses are appropriately tracked and routed to the ICANN Board for their consideration. Complete this form and submit it as an attachment to the ICANN Customer Service Center via your CSC Portal with the Subject, “[Application ID] Response to GAC Advice” (for example “1-111-11111 Response to GAC Advice”). All GAC Advice Responses must be received no later than 23:59:59 UTC on 10-May-2013.

Respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Asia Green IT Sistem Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>1-2131-60793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for TLD (string)</td>
<td>halal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:
I am writing to you as CEO of Asia Green IT System (hereafter "AGIT"). We are the sole applicant for Dot HALAL and our application is currently in Initial Evaluation with priority number 1695.

Our application has received no String Confusion Objections, no Existing Legal Rights Objections and no Limited Public Interest Objections. It has received a Community Objection from the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates.

The GAC’s Beijing Communiqué dated April 11, 2013 includes advice to the ICANN Board on our application for Dot HALAL. Specifically, the GAC said: "The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed."

This advice is very specifically worded and must be carefully considered to avoid any misunderstanding. It is made by the GAC under Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook which states that "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."

This advice therefore is not the result of an overall consensus of the GAC. It is, as the GAC highlights in its Beijing Communiqué, the result of some GAC members raising concerns. These concerns and any statements accompanying them, such as the suggestion made in the Beijing Communiqué by the members in question that our application for Dot HALAL lacks community involvement cannot be considered as anything more than individual opinions being expressed by at most a few GAC members.
GAC Advice Response Form for Applicants

As the applicants for Dot HALAL, we stand ready to engage with the ICANN Board to provide in-depth explanations on our TLD and to help the ICANN Board complete the process described under Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook.

Dot HALAL is an ambitious project which we have approached with an extremely high level of commitment to the Muslim faith and Islamic culture. Halal is an Arabic term which can be translated as "lawful" and which is used to designate an object or action permissible under Islamic law. The main use of the term pertains to food which can be eaten under Islamic law.

Dot HALAL aims to bring Muslims together across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. Our company was founded by Muslims. We are devoted to our religion, and proud of it. We aim to create a quality namespace for the Muslim faithful and those who wish to learn about our culture and religion.

We take our responsibility towards the Internet users that will be served by Dot HALAL very seriously indeed. AGIT will be putting measures in place to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith or with a positive interest in the Muslim community. Due to the complexity of enforcing this through a set of standard registration rules, Dot HALAL registrants will be asked to self-impose their commitment to proper behaviour within this TLD and will be provided with mechanisms to report abusive, irrelevant or anti-Muslim registrations.

As Dot HALAL operator, we will not tolerate radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith, and we will take immediate and severe action against this should it occur. We will strive to ensure Dot HALAL is both an abuse-free TLD and one that is open to those who respect our faith. This will be accomplished with Registration safeguards, keyword alerts, name selection polices, all governed by an Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections.

We have gone to great lengths to ensure Dot HALAL meets the highest possible standards of quality. Our application has received letters of support from, amongst others, the media, civil society, religious organisations, public figures and NGOs. We have received letters of support from prominent members of the Muslim community, such as religious Islamic Leaders, Religious Organizations, and such countries as Turkey, Lebanon and Pakistan and the Muslim communities in countries in Europe and even South America.

In the objection our application has received from the UAE, the argument is made that there is no community support for Dot HALAL. Clearly, quite the contrary is true. This is shown by the advice received from the GAC, which is not concensus advice but the opinion of only a very few members (the Beijing Communiqué does not provide specific information as to which members, or how many members, voiced concerns). Similarly, the UAE is one of 57 member states of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). The OIC is the second largest inter-governmental organization after the United Nations and is the collective voice of the Muslim world. It exists to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world. If Dot HALAL was against these interests, it would have raised significant opposition from a great many more than just one OIC member state, or OIC itself could object directly.

It should also be noted that this TLD aims to provide a safe and easily recognisable space on the Internet for Halal industry service providers. One example of this could be a company like McDonalds, who would be eligible to register a Dot HALAL domain name to promote the Halal food service they provide in some Islamic countries. Our application has the support of the only Halal certification body to be recognised by all Islamic countries, HalalWorld (http://halalworld.ca/about-us). This is a strong sign of support from the TLD's target community.
We have also communicated with the OIC and the ICRIC (Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center) to ensure they have sufficient knowledge of Dot HALAL and have good opportunity to participate and comment.

Asia Green IT System is keen to work with both the GAC and the ICANN Board to help alleviate concerns, even when they are from specific entities rather than whole groups. I would be personally be very happy to speak with the Board to provide any background or detail on our application which would be helpful to the Board before it goes back to the GAC to provide its rationale for the decision it will take with regards to Dot HALAL.

Best regards,

Mr. Mehdi Abbasnia
Chief Executive Officer
Asia Green IT System
Turkey

P.S.: In addition to the information contained in this letter, please find attached a list of the support received for Dot HALAL (and another of our applications, Dot ISLAM).
Who support .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs?

.ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs, applied for through Asia Green IT System have received several endorsement letters from different Islamic organizations and famous people around the world, and from different branches of Islam (Shia and Sunni as the main branches).

AGIT as the Muslim company applying for .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs, has an ongoing task to promote .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs to the Muslim community to receive new supporting letters.

As a strategic approach, AGIT is trying to make International Islamic organizations like Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), or Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) to be involved in the governance of .ISLAM and major Halal certification bodies to be involved in .HALAL policy making. Although it is hard to contact such huge organizations (OIC is the second largest international organization after UN), and very hard to explain the concept of TLD in their managerial positions (since most of high level managers in these organizations forward our letters to lower technical staff considering them as less important and more technical cases), but eventually we found the correct entities to sponsor .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs in terms of making decisions and policy making. After many meetings we have recently been succeeded in getting Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC)'s supporting letter for .ISLAM. Earlier we have also been succeeded in involving HALALWORLD, the only HALAL certification body which is accepted by all Islamic countries. (There are many Halal certification bodies around the world but all of them are supported by one or few countries. HALALWORLD is OIC’s Halal certification standard project which is accepted by all Islamic countries)

Since getting the supporting letter, our decisions with them has improved in principle agreement of ICRIC-OIC to become a partner in the project and take a leadership role beyond support.
In particular they could act as a potential sponsoring organization. We currently are working out the formalities of such relationship.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) in association with the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was established in 2003. ICRIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Malaysia, Jordan, Iran and Egypt plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

AGIT has also recently started to open the opportunity to Muslim people to express their interest in .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs through online social media like Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/DotIslam and https://www.facebook.com/GotHalal) with thousands of fans.

**List of .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLD supporters (updated on May 5th, 2013):**


1. **Major Organizations / Associations / Leaders representing Muslim populations:**

   1.1. **Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

      ICRIC is a subsidiary of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). ICRIC is responsible for research and information activities of ICCI and operates some of OIC and ICCI’s
projects. OIC has created ICCI in line with the goal of development for all Islamic communities, and its continuous consideration on the promotion of commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve the goal of sustainable and comprehensive development. ICRC acts as the research and development wing of ICCI in terms of new ideas and technologies, so when contacting OIC’s different sections, we were forwarded to ICRC as the most relevant subsidiary of OIC and ICCI.

After several meetings with the general secretariat of ICRC, we finally got their support of .ISLAM new gTLD, but we still have more negotiations to establish a formal cooperation in the governance of .ISLAM (maybe as one of their projects).


1.2. Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad (.ISLAM)

The former president of Malaysia and the man who moved Malaysia to an advanced country. He is with no doubt the most popular figure in Malaysia and many other countries. Dr. Mahathir was one of the first who supported us and his support has brought a great credit for AGIT, because everybody knows that he will not support a non-eligible entity to hold the sensitive TLD of .ISLAM.

Malaysia has a 14.5 million Muslim population and we believe Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad is the best representative of this community.


1.3. The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The management center for Twelver or Imami Shia Schools of thought (Hawza’s) in Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India, Bahrain, Syria, Lebanon etc... operate under this center’s supervision. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hawza](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hawza) and [http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_shi-religion-islam-shia](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_shi-religion-islam-shia))
Shia’s population is around 200 Million. 85% of them (170 Million) are Twelver or Imami Shia’s. All Imami Shi’a’s follow the thoughts of religious leaders which are trained in schools of thoughts in different countries under the supervision of this center. This center is the main training management system of Shia schools in terms of religious content and can be counted as the representative of 170 million Twelver or Imami Shia’s around the world.

Making them attracted to support .ISLAM was hard and time consuming process, following their deep investigations on the eligibility of AGIT to operate .ISLAM TLD.


1.4. The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is a multi cultural organization that several hundreds of Islamic leaders (both Shia and Sunni) cooperate with, in its consideration about creation of peace and proximity between different Islamic sects.

The forum holds the “Islamic Unity Conference” each year with participants from around the world, including mostly religious leaders of different Sects of Islam. The followers of these leaders are Muslims from all sects of Islam all around the world.


1.5. HALAL WORLD Center (.HALAL)

Halal Research& Development Center (HALAL WORLD) is the unified Halal standard and certification project of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). ICRIC operates under Islamic Chamber of Commerce and affiliated with OIC.

1.6. Islamic Center Hamburg, Germany (.ISLAM)

Germany has the largest Muslim population in Western Europe after France. Approximately 3 to 3.5 million Muslims live in Germany, and 80% of them do not have German citizenship; 608,000 are German citizens. 70% of the Muslim population is of Turkish origin. (http://www.euro-islam.info/country-profiles/germany/)

The Islamic Centre Hamburg (German: Islamisches Zentrum Hamburg) is one of the oldest Shia mosques in Germany and Europe.

Established in Hamburg, in northern Germany, in the late 1950s by a group of Hamburg-based emigrants and business people it rapidly developed into one of the leading Shia centers in the Western world.

Muslim groups of different nationalities get together for regular meetings, prayers, lectures, seminars, readings, Islamic festivals, funerals, etc. For interested people there is always opportunity to learn Arabic. Under Islamic rules, marriages are implemented. There are experienced theologians dedicated to help people who have psychological or family problems as well as those who have been newly converted to Islam. The Islamic Centre is regularly visited by schools, church communities and other interested groups from Hamburg and the nearby towns. Lots of organizations, lectures and discussions have been held to get rid of prejudices about Islam and to develop a better understanding of Islam. Our centre and Mosque may be visited at appropriate times.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg

1.7. Islamic Shiite High Council, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

One of the highest level Islamic centers in Lebanon: http://www.shiitecouncil.gov.lb/ and http://www.shiitecouncil.org/

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Islamic-Shia-High-Council.jpg
1.8. Islamic Academy, Germany (.ISLAM)

One of the oldest and most well-known Islamic educational centers in Germany with over 50 years of activity. Many Islam fans are trained in this center.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Academy_Germany.jpg

1.9. The ECO cultural institute (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ECO Cultural Institute is one of the specialized agencies under the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO), an intergovernmental organization consisting of Islamic State of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan Republic, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan. Among ECO member states, 9 out of 10 are members of OIC. ECO Cultural Institute has supported ISLAM as a subsidiary of the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO) which is most likely related to governmental attitudes of its member states.


1.10. Association AlGhadir Islamique, France (.ISLAM)

A Shia Islamic training institute in France (with 350,000 Shia’s out of 5 million Muslims)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_AlGhadir_Islamique.jpg

1.11. Centro Islamico No Brasil (.ISLAM)

The main Islamic organizations in Brazil (Muslim population of around 900,000) (http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_num_of_mus-religion-islam-number-of-muslim)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg
1.12. Islamic Institution Arresalla, Brazil (ISLAM)

An Islamic institute offering cultural, religious services to a large group of Muslim community in Brazil.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg

1.13. Association Culturelle Musulmane de Roissy en Brie, France (ISLAM)


Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_Culturelle_Musulmane_de_Roissy_en_Brie.jpg

1.14. Muslim Religious Community, Belarus (ISLAM)

The main organization of Muslims in Belarus (total Muslim population: 51,000)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Belarus_Muslim_Religious_Community.jpg

2. Islamic Institutes / NGOs in Muslim Countries:

2.1. Islamic United Council, Pakistan (ISLAM)

One of the main Islamic Societies in Pakistan.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Islamic_United_Council.jpg
2.2. Islamic Unity Magazine (Wahda Islamiya), Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

The Lebanese Islamic organization’s magazine on the unity of Islam Branches: http://wahdaislamyia.org/


2.3. Aras Justice, Freedom and Solidarity Association, Turkey (HALAL)

Established in 2012 in Istanbul, As a Non-government and non-profit organization, Aras’s mission is to support victims and protect their rights and help them to solve their problems. And creating public awareness in order to uphold political freedom and prevent inhumane conduct.

For this reason, Aras organizes panels, Symposiums and conferences in Turkey and Azerbaijan. Aras is kept public informed through the release of periodicals, press releases. Aras makes use of the internet, as well as radio and TV broadcasts preparing, organizing contests, demonstrations, dinners and evening performances.

Apart from these, Aras finances scholarships for poor student and opens the student dormitory.


2.4. Beyan Cultural Center, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Beyan started its activities in 2012 in Istanbul. The main object of the Beyan Cultural Center is to provide better understanding of Islam for Muslims and non-Muslims in Turkey. Therefore, they organize such activities as conference, symposium, and meetings.

2.5. Kudus-Der, Turkey (.ISLAM)

Founded in 2012, the association's headquarters in Istanbul. The association was founded to help the Palestinian people.

Kudüs Der assistance not only humanitarian aid but also inform Turkish public about Palestinian issue by organizing media conferences, meetings in Turkey.


2.6. Halal Supreme Council, Iran (.HALAL)


2.7. Fatih Akincilar Social and Cultural Association, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Akınclari social solidarity and cultural association was founded in the 1970s in Istanbul district Fatih.

Akınclari aims to meet the needs of those who are suffering poverty or hunger.

Social Aid: food aid and organizations during the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner, Qurban programs.

Educational Aid: delivering school bags, educational sets, and supplementary materials to needy students.


2.8. Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products, Iran (.HALAL)

2.9. Diplomatic Correspondents Association, *Pakistan (ISLAM)*

The association of Diplomatic Journalists of Pakistan, with thousands of members, all active in the media in Pakistan.


2.10. Peoples Youth Organization, *Pakistan (ISLAM)*

A famous civil socia Islamic organization, very active in Islamic cultural activities in Pakistan.


2.11. The Danish-Palestinian Friendship Association, Denmark *(ISLAM)*

An NGO active in Humanity helps to Palestinians


2.12. Brasil Halal Foods, Brazil *(ISLAM and HALAL)*

The main institute in Brazil working as a certification body for Halal foods (Foods certifying Islamic criteria on religious approved foods and drinks) *(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal)*

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg)

2.13. Halal Export Consortium, *Iran (HALAL)*

2.14. Baheth Center for Palestinian Studies, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

An Islamic Educational institute for Palestinian Strategic Studies: [http://www.bahethcenter.net](http://www.bahethcenter.net)


2.15. Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association, Iran-Tajikistan (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

A multinational NGO working on cultural activities to tighten the relationships of Farsi-Speaking Muslims in Iran and Tajikistan.


2.16. Ehlíbeýt Alimleri Dernegi / Ehla Der, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Ehlíbeýt Alimleri Derneği (Association of Ahlulbayt Scholars) was founded in May 31, 2011 in Istanbul.

The short name is Ehla-Der and the Head Office is in Yenibosna - Istanbul. Currently, 18 people work in Headquarters Building. There are 190 Ahlulbayt Scholar members of the association who work in different cities in Turkey.

The purpose of Ehla-Der is contributed to the spread of social unity and brotherhood in the country. And provide correct information about Ahlulbayt.

Ehla-Der organizes cultural and social activities throughout Turkey.


2.17. Dar El Feta El Jafari, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

An Islamic Shia religious educational center in Lebanon

3. Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic people:

3.1. Mr. Nureddin Sirin, *Turkey (ISLAM)*

Well-known journalist by Islamic circles in Turkey. He was born in Trabzon and knows English, Arabic and Persian.

He has worked as a journalist with different News Papers and Magazines till 1997. In 1997 military memorandum he was arrested and sentenced to a prison term of 17.5 years, in the prison Type-F of Kandira. He released in 2004. During that time his name has become a symbol for victims.

He currently works for Kudüs TV.


3.2. Dr. Pere Michel Lelong, *France (ISLAM)*

Famous Islamologist in France with lots of researches and publishing.


3.3. Dr. Majid Tafreshi, *UK (ISLAM and HALAL)*

University Professor and history Researcher, and the manager of a cultural publishing institute.

4. Newspapers / Media / Publications:

4.1. Medya 14 Radio TV, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayincilik A.Ş is the owner of On4 TV; On4 TV is a nation-wide television channel in Turkey. The channel was established by the Turkish businessmen in 2012.

On4 TV delivers the latest breaking news and information on the latest top stories, weather, business, entertainment, politics, and more.

Headquarters is located in Istanbul and more than 100 journalists, reporters etc. work in it.


4.2. Kevser Basin Yayin Organization, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Kevser Basin Yayincilik (Kevser Press Publishing) has about 200 branches and distribution networks throughout Turkey and 10 distribution networks abroad. Headquarters is located in Istanbul Asaray and one of the leading Press publishing companies in Turkey.


4.3. Al Ahed News, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Lebanese Islamic News Agency: http://alahednews.com.lb

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Ahd-News.jpg

4.4. Daily Nijat, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

4.5. Al Bilad Magazine, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

Islamic Cultural monthly magazine in Lebanon

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Bilad-magazine.jpg

4.6. Daily Spokesman, Pakistan (ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS ISLAM_Pakistan_Daily_Spokesman.jpg

4.7. Daily Wisdom, Pakistan (ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS ISLAM_Pakistan_Daily_Wisdom.jpg

4.8. Inbaa News, Lebanon (ISLAM and Halal)

News agency in Lebanon


4.9. Mr. Malik Abdul Qayum Khan, Pakistan (ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS ISLAM_Pakistan_Malik_Abdul_Qayum_Khan.jpg

4.10. Haqooq Ul Awam, Pakistan (ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS ISLAM_Pakistan_Haqooq Ul Awam.jpg

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

GAC Advice Response Form for Applicants

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) has issued advice to the ICANN Board of Directors regarding New gTLD applications. Please see Section IV, Annex I, and Annex II of the GAC Beijing Communique for the full list of advice on individual strings, categories of strings, and strings that may warrant further GAC consideration.

Respondents should use this form to ensure their responses are appropriately tracked and routed to the ICANN Board for their consideration. Complete this form and submit it as an attachment to the ICANN Customer Service Center via your CSC Portal with the Subject, “[Application ID] Response to GAC Advice” (for example “1-111-111111 Response to GAC Advice”). All GAC Advice Responses must be received no later than 23:59:59 UTC on 10-May-2013.

Respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>1-2130-23450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for TLD (string)</td>
<td>islam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

I am writing to you as CEO of Asia Green IT System (hereafter "AGIT"). We are the sole applicant for Dot ISLAM and our application is currently in Initial Evaluation with priority number 564.

Our application has received no String Confusion Objections, no Existing Legal Rights Objections and no Limited Public Interest Objections. It has received a Community Objection from the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates.

The GAC’s Beijing Communiqué dated April 11, 2013 includes advice to the ICANN Board on our application for Dot ISLAM. Specifically, the GAC said: "The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed."

This advice is very specifically worded and must be carefully considered to avoid any misunderstanding. It is made by the GAC under Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook which states that "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."

This advice therefore is not the result of an overall consensus of the GAC. It is, as the GAC highlights in its Beijing Communiqué, the result of some GAC members raising concerns. These concerns and any statements accompanying them, such as the suggestion made in the Beijing Communiqué by the members in question that our application for Dot ISLAM lacks community involvement, cannot be considered as anything more than individual opinions being expressed by at most a few GAC members.
GAC Advice Response Form for Applicants

As the applicants for Dot ISLAM, we stand ready to engage with the ICANN Board to provide in-depth explanations on our TLD and to help the ICANN Board complete the process described under Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook.

Dot ISLAM is an ambitious project to bring Muslims together across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. AGIT is based in Turkey, a country often considered a bridge between Europe and the Middle East and between different cultures, including Islam. AGIT was founded by Muslims. We are devoted to our religion, and proud of it. Our aim is to create a quality namespace for the Muslim faithful and those who wish to learn about Islam or interact with Muslims. For the last 8 years, our team has been at the forefront of efforts towards dedicated Muslim domain names. Dot ISLAM is about putting the Internet's vast resources within reach of the Muslim community, whilst also increasing the amount of information and resources about Islam that is available online. We seek to serve the Muslim people, but also all those interested in Islam.

We take our responsibility towards the Internet users that will be served by Dot ISLAM very seriously indeed. AGIT will be putting measures in place to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith or with a positive interest in the Muslim community. Due to the complexity of enforcing this through a set of standard registration rules, Dot ISLAM registrants will be asked to self-impose their commitment to proper behaviour within this TLD and will be provided with mechanisms to report abusive, irrelevant or anti-Muslim registrations.

As Dot ISLAM operator, we will not tolerate radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith, and we will take immediate and severe action against this should it occur. We will strive to ensure Dot ISLAM is both an abuse-free TLD and one that is open to those who respect our faith. This will be accomplished with Registration safeguards, keyword alerts, name selection policies, all governed by an Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections.

We have gone to great lengths to ensure Dot ISLAM meets the highest possible standards of quality. Our application has received letters of support from, amongst others, the media, civil society, religious organisations, public figures and NGOs. We have received letters of support from prominent members of the Muslim community, such as former Malaysian President Dr. Mahathir Mohammad, and such countries as Turkey, Lebanon and Pakistan and the Muslim communities in countries in Europe and even South America.

Being supported by the Islamic community and operating our TLD in a way which meets with the requirements of that community is also something we have been working hard towards. Some of the initiatives we have currently ongoing to reach these objectives include:

Creating a Dot ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC): We have been working with Internet public policy experts to draw up a governance plan for Dot ISLAM. The PAC is a result of this work. It would exercise an oversight function on the operation of the TLD in areas such as registration policies, dispute resolution and content monitoring. The PAC would include representatives of 3 main groups that make up the Muslim community:

a. governmental representatives,
b. religious leaders
c. civil society
Ideally, the PAC would be chaired by a representative of one of the international Islamic Organisations such as OIC (Organization of the Islamic Conference) or ICCI (Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry) or their subsidiaries.

As part of our drive to actively support the Muslim community, we have decided that part of the revenue obtained from operating Dot ISLAM would be assigned to it. The PAC would oversee the selection of programs and initiatives slated to receive this financial support.

We have also communicated with the OIC and sent our proposals for the governance of Dot ISLAM to them. We have also communicated with the ICRIC (Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center). ICRIC is established in 2003 and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber to bolster trade and economic exchanges between Islamic countries.

We have also been working with the new gTLD program's Independent Objector (IO). The IO considered the case of Dot ISLAM and said: "the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community."

The IO's determination is crucial because of the sensitive nature of strings such as Dot ISLAM. For the new gTLD program to achieve its objectives, we as a community must abide by some key general principles at all times. Questions of religion are of paramount importance. In some countries, they play a key part at the highest levels of social, political and economic areas. But the way these issues are considered will vary from country to country, from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and according to different cultural orientations. Simply put, there is no one size fits all here and this is precisely why the new gTLD program has been designed not to put ICANN in the position of having to try and determine a uniform solution to a situation that has many shapes and sizes.

As I have stated above, we understand the responsibility of operating this TLD with the appropriate respect for Muslims all over the world. This TLD is not just for one part of the Muslim community, and the ICANN Board should not limit its analysis of our application to one opinion or one perception.

This was evidently the approach taken by the GAC, as shown by the advice received which clearly states that the advice provided is not the result of GAC-level consensus but instead, reflects the opinion of just a few individual members. One such member is the UAE and as mentioned perviously, before pushing for the comments made on Dot ISLAM to be included in the GAC's Beijing Communiqué, they had opted to work through the new gTLD program's objection procedure to bring their disagreement with our proposed TLD to the fore.

We believe this is the better avenue to determine whether our application should proceed and we therefore do not understand why this GAC member has also chosen to push the GAC to include Dot ISLAM in its Communiqué, unless there is a lack of confidence in the arguments presented against our application through the objection process and a desire to attempt to try and force their opinion by another mechanism.

This is not the way these issues should be considered. It is not fair on applicants like us, who have followed the new gTLD program's requirements to the letter and in spirit, and have played by its
rules as laid out in the Applicant Guidebook. It is not fair on the ICANN Board who is being placed in a position to judge what it should not have to. And it is not fair to the Internet users who stand to benefit greatly from the creation of a specific TLD for Islam.

We therefore urge the ICANN Board to let our application for Dot ISLAM work through the process established for the new gTLD program.

As CEO of the company behind what I sincerely believe will be a landmark TLD embodying all of the new gTLD program's ambitions of opening up the Internet's namespace to communities that have not had good access to it before, I would be personally be very happy to speak with the Board and answer any questions Board members may have as they prepare to make a determination on Dot ISLAM and provide the GAC with their rationale on this issue.

Best regards,

Mr. Mehdi Abbasnia
Chief Executive Officer
Asia Green IT System
Turkey

P.S.: In addition to the information contained in this letter, please find attached a list of the support received for Dot ISLAM (and another of our applications, Dot HALAL). I also attach for your information the first draft of the Dot ISLAM governance model which will provide you with detailed insight into the initiatives we are working on to endow Dot ISLAM with a robust, fair and effective governance mechanism.
Who support .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs?

.ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs, applied for through Asia Green IT System have received several endorsement letters from different Islamic organizations and famous people around the world, and from different branches of Islam (Shia and Sunni as the main branches).

AGIT as the Muslim company applying for .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs, has an ongoing task to promote .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs to the Muslim community to receive new supporting letters.

As a strategic approach, AGIT is trying to make International Islamic organizations like Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), or Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) to be involved in the governance of .ISLAM and major Halal certification bodies to be involved in .HALAL policy making. Although it is hard to contact such huge organizations (OIC is the second largest international organization after UN), and very hard to explain the concept of TLD in their managerial positions (since most of high level managers in these organizations forward our letters to lower technical staff considering them as less important and more technical cases), but eventually we found the correct entities to sponsor .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs in terms of making decisions and policy making. After many meetings we have recently been succeeded in getting Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC)’s supporting letter for .ISLAM. Earlier we have also been succeeded in involving HALALWORLD, the only HALAL certification body which is accepted by all Islamic countries. (There are many Halal certification bodies around the world but all of them are supported by one or few countries. HALALWORLD is OIC’s Halal certification standard project which is accepted by all Islamic countries)

Since getting the supporting letter, our decisions with them has improved in principle agreement of ICRIC-OIC to become a partner in the project and take a leadership role beyond support.
In particular they could act as a potential sponsoring organization. We currently are working out the formalities of such relationship.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) in association with the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was established in 2003. ICNIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Malaysia, Jordan, Iran and Egypt plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

AGIT has also recently started to open the opportunity to Muslim people to express their interest in .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs through online social media like Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/DotIslam and https://www.facebook.com/GotHalal) with thousands of fans.

List of .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLD supporters (updated on May 5th, 2013):


1. Major Organizations / Associations / Leaders representing Muslim populations:

1.1. Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ICRIC is a subsidiary of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). ICNIC is responsible for research and information activities of ICCI and operates some of OIC and ICCI’s
projects. OIC has created ICCI in line with the goal of development for all Islamic communities, and its continuous consideration on the promotion of commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve the goal of sustainable and comprehensive development. ICRC acts as the research and development wing of ICCI in terms of new ideas and technologies, so when contacting OIC’s different sections, we were forwarded to ICRC as the most relevant subsidiary of OIC and ICCI.

After several meetings with the general secretariat of ICRC, we finally got their support of .ISLAM new gTLD, but we still have more negotiations to establish a formal cooperation in the governance of .ISLAM (maybe as one of their projects).


1.2. Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad (.ISLAM)

The former president of Malaysia and the man who moved Malaysia to an advanced country. He is with no doubt the most popular figure in Malaysia and many other countries. Dr. Mahathir was one of the first who supported us and his support has brought a great credit for AGIT, because everybody knows that he will not support a non-eligible entity to hold the sensitive TLD of .ISLAM.

Malaysia has a 14.5 million Muslim population and we believe Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad is the best representative of this community.


1.3. The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The management center for Twelver or Imami Shia Schools of thought (Hawza’s) in Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India, Bahrain, Syria, Lebanon etc... operate under this center’s supervision. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hawza and http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_shi-religion-islam-shia)
Shia’s population is around 200 Million. 85% of them (170 Million) are Twelver or Imami Shia’s. All Imami Shi’a’s follow the thoughts of religious leaders which are trained in schools of thoughts in different countries under the supervision of this center. This center is the main training management system of Shia schools in terms of religious content and can be counted as the representative of 170 million Twelver or Imami Shia’s around the world.

Making them attracted to support .ISLAM was hard and time consuming process, following their deep investigations on the eligibility of AGiT to operate .ISLAM TLD.


1.4. The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is a multi cultural organization that several hundreds of Islamic leaders (both Shia and Sunni) cooperate with, in its consideration about creation of peace and proximity between different Islamic sects.

The forum holds the “Islamic Unity Conference” each year with participants from around the world, including mostly religious leaders of different Sects of Islam. The followers of these leaders are Muslims from all sects of Islam all around the world.


1.5. HALAL WORLD Center (.HALAL)

Halal Research& Development Center (HALAL WORLD) is the unified Halal standard and certification project of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). ICRIC operates under Islamic Chamber of Commerce and affiliated with OIC.

1.6. Islamic Center Hamburg, Germany (.ISLAM)

Germany has the largest Muslim population in Western Europe after France. Approximately 3 to 3.5 million Muslims live in Germany, and 80% of them do not have German citizenship; 608,000 are German citizens. 70% of the Muslim population is of Turkish origin. (http://www.euro-islam.info/country-profiles/germany/)

The Islamic Centre Hamburg (German: Islamisches Zentrum Hamburg) is one of the oldest Shia mosques in Germany and Europe.

Established in Hamburg, in northern Germany, in the late 1950s by a group of Hamburg-based emigrants and business people it rapidly developed into one of the leading Shia centers in the Western world.

Muslim groups of different nationalities get together for regular meetings, prayers, lectures, seminars, readings, Islamic festivals, funerals, etc. For interested people there is always opportunity to learn Arabic. Under Islamic rules, marriages are implemented. There are experienced theologians dedicated to help people who have psychological or family problems as well as those who have been newly converted to Islam. The Islamic Centre is regularly visited by schools, church communities and other interested groups from Hamburg and the nearby towns. Lots of organizations, lectures and discussions have been held to get rid of prejudices about Islam and to develop a better understanding of Islam. Our centre and Mosque may be visited at appropriate times.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg

1.7. Islamic Shiite High Council, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

One of the highest level Islamic centers in Lebanon: http://www.shiitecouncil.gov.lb/ and http://www.shiitecouncil.org/

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Islamic-Shia-High-Council.jpg
1.8. Islamic Academy, Germany (.ISLAM)

One of the oldest and most well-known Islamic educational centers in Germany with over 50 years of activity. Many Islam fans are trained in this center.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Academy_Germany.jpg

1.9. The ECO cultural institute (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ECO Cultural Institute is one of the specialized agencies under the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO), an intergovernmental organization consisting of Islamic State of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan Republic, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan. Among ECO member states, 9 out of 10 are members of OIC. ECO Cultural Institute has supported .ISLAM as a subsidiary of the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO) which is most likely related to governmental attitudes of its member states.


1.10. Association AlGhadir Islamique, France (.ISLAM)

A Shia Islamic training institute in France (with 350,000 Shia’s out of 5 million Muslims)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_Algadir_Islamique.jpg

1.11. Centro Islamico No Brasil (.ISLAM)

The main Islamic organizations in Brazil (Muslim population of around 900,000) (http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/religionismus-muslim-number-of-muslim)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg
1.12. Islamic Institution Arresalla, Brazil (ISLAM)

An Islamic institute offering cultural, religious services to a large group of Muslim community in Brazil.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg

1.13. Association Culturelle Musulmane de Roissy en Brie, France (ISLAM)


Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_Culturelle_Musulmane_de_Roissy_en_Brie.jpg

1.14. Muslim Religious Community, Belarus (ISLAM)

The main organization of Muslims in Belarus (total Muslim population: 51,000)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Belarus_Muslim_Religious_Community.jpg

2. Islamic Institutes / NGOs in Muslim Countries:

2.1. Islamic United Council, Pakistan (ISLAM)

One of the main Islamic Societies in Pakistan.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Islamic_United_Council.jpg
2.2. Islamic Unity Magazine (Wahda Islamiya), Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

The Lebanese Islamic organization’s magazine on the unity of Islam Branches: http://wahdaislamiya.org/


2.3. Aras Justice, Freedom and Solidarity Association, Turkey (HALAL)

Established in 2012 in Istanbul, As a Non-government and non-profit organization, Aras’s mission is to support victims and protect their rights and help them to solve their problems. And creating public awareness in order to uphold political freedom and prevent inhumane conduct.

For this reason, Aras organizes panels, Symposiums and conferences in Turkey and Azerbaijan. Aras is kept public informed through the release of periodicals, press releases. Aras makes use of the internet, as well as radio and TV broadcasts preparing, organizing contests, demonstrations, dinners and evening performances.

Apart from these, Aras finances scholarships for poor student and opens the student dormitory.


2.4. Beyan Cultural Center, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Beyan started its activities in 2012 in Istanbul. The main object of the Beyan Cultural Center is to provide better understanding of Islam for Muslims and non-Muslims in Turkey. Therefore, they organize such activities as conference, symposium, and meetings.

2.5. Kudus-Der, Turkey (ISLAM)

Founded in 2012, the association's headquarters in Istanbul. The association was founded to help the Palestinian people.

Kudüs Der assistance not only humanitarian aid but also inform Turkish public about Palestinian issue by organizing media conferences, meetings in Turkey.


2.6. Halal Supreme Council, Iran (HALAL)


2.7. Fatih Akincilar Social and Cultural Association, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Akınçlar social solidarity and cultural association was founded in the 1970s in Istanbul district Fatih.

Akınçlar aims to meet the needs of those who are suffering poverty or hunger.

Social Aid: food aid and organizations during the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner, Qurban programs.

Educational Aid: delivering school bags, educational sets, and supplementary materials to needy students.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkey_Akincilar_Social_Solidarity_and_Cultural_Association.pdf

2.8. Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products, Iran (HALAL)

2.9. Diplomatic Correspondents Association, *Pakistan (.ISLAM)*

The association of Diplomatic Journalists of Pakistan, with thousands of members, all active in the media in Pakistan.


2.10. Peoples Youth Organization, *Pakistan (.ISLAM)*

A famous civil socia Islamic organization, very active in Islamic cultural activities in Pakistan.


2.11. The Danish-Palestinian Friendship Association, Denmark *(ISLAM)*

An NGO active in Humanity helps to Palestinians


2.12. Brasil Halal Foods, Brazil *(ISLAM and HALAL)*

The main institute in Brazil working as a certification body for Halal foods (Foods certifying Islamic criteria on religious approved foods and drinks) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal))

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg)

2.13. Halal Export Consortium, *Iran (HALAL)*

2.14. Baheth Center for Palestinian Studies, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

An Islamic Educational institute for Palestinian Strategic Studies: http://www.bahethcenter.net

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Libanon_Baheth-Center-for-Palestine-Studies.jpg

2.15. Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association, Iran-Tajikistan (ISLAM and HALAL)

A multinational NGO working on cultural activities to tighten the relationships of Farsi-Speaking Muslims in Iran and Tajikistan.


2.16. Ehlibeyt Alimleri Derneği / Ehla Der, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Ehlibeyt Alimleri Derneği (Association of Ahlulbayt Scholars) was founded in May 31, 2011 in Istanbul.

The short name is Ehla-Der and the Head Office is in Yenibosna - Istanbul. Currently, 18 people work in Headquarters Building. There are 190 Ahlulbayt Scholar members of the association who work in different cities in Turkey.

The purpose of Ehla-Der is contributed to the spread of social unity and brotherhood in the country. And provide correct information about Ahlulbayt.

Ehla-Der organizes cultural and social activities throughout Turkey.


2.17. Dar El Feta El Jafari, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

An Islamic Shia religious educational center in Lebanon

3. Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic people:

3.1. Mr. Nureddin Sirin, **Turkey (ISLAM)**

Well-known journalist by Islamic circles in Turkey. He was born in Trabzon and knows English, Arabic and Persian.

He has worked as a journalist with different News Papers and Magazines till 1997. In 1997 military memorandum he was arrested and sentenced to a prison term of 17.5 years, in the prison Type-F of Kandira. He released in 2004. During that time his name has become a symbol for victims.

He currently works for Kudüs TV.

[Link to download the letter](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkey_Nurettin-Sirin.pdf)

3.2. Dr. Pere Michel Lelong, **France (ISLAM)**

Famous Islamologist in France with lots of researches and publishing.

[Link to download the letter](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Pere_Michel_Lelong.pdf)

3.3. Dr. Majid Tafreshi, **UK (ISLAM and HALAL)**

University Professor and history Researcher, and the manager of a cultural publishing institute.

[Link to download the letter](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS-ISLAM-Dr.Tafreshi.pdf)
4. Newspapers / Media / Publications:

4.1. Medyam 14 Radio TV, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayincilik A.S is the owner of On4 TV; On4 TV is a nation-wide television channel in Turkey. The channel was established by the Turkish businessmen in 2012.

On4 TV delivers the latest breaking news and information on the latest top stories, weather, business, entertainment, politics, and more.

Headquarters is located in Istanbul and more than 100 journalists, reporters etc. work in it.


4.2. Kevser Basin Yayin Organization, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Kevser Basin Yayincilik (Kevser Press Publishing) has about 200 branches and distribution networks throughout Turkey and 10 distribution networks abroad. Headquarters is located in Istanbul Asaray and one of the leading Press publishing companies in Turkey.


4.3. Al Ahed News, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Lebanese Islamic News Agency: http://alahednews.com.lb

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Ahd-News.jpg

4.4. Daily Nijat, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

4.5. Al Bilad Magazine, Lebanon (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

Islamic Cultural monthly magazine in Lebanon


4.6. Daily Spokesman, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


4.7. Daily Wisdom, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


4.8. Inbaa News, Lebanon (*ISLAM and Halal*)

News agency in Lebanon


4.9. Mr. Malik Abdul Qayum Khan, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


4.10. Haqooq Ul Awam, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

4.11. Page International, Pakistan (ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Page_International.jpg
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Section I: General Information about the Applicant

Executive Summary

Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. (AGIT) is an Information and Communication Technology (ICT) solutions and service provider with a highly competent management team, powerful strategic alliances, and strong customer orientation.

AGIT -with a team of more than 20 years of professional experience in ICT industry- is one of the leading private ICT companies which has successfully designed and implemented mega ICT projects in the Middle East. Since 1989, the team behind AGIT as one of the leading teams in ICT field has actively focused on following sections of ICT that made the company a reputable brand in the Middle East:

- Consultation
- Execution of ICT Turnkey Projects
- Provision of ICT Total Solutions
- System Integration
- Provision of high-end enterprise level ICT products
- Value added services and support

To assist its expansion of objectives, AGIT has forged numerous business relationships with prominent local and international players in the ICT industry.

AGIT as one of its main objectives on becoming more active in the internet infrastructure, has recently applied for new Top Level Domains by targeting the Muslim and Middle Eastern markets as the next billion internet users.

Vision:

By 2017, AGIT shall be the excellent, number one ICT solution provider and Internet Company with world class standards in the Middle East region.
Mission:

AGIT’s mission is to expand the usage of ICT and Internet among the Middle East and Muslim countries’ citizens by establishing Internet Registry Services as an infrastructure.

AGIT plans to consistently provide ICT products, solutions and services that meet customers’ satisfaction through highly skilled people, industry aligned processes and strategic partnerships.

1. Creating innovative, unique, and cost-effective ICT solutions
2. Delivering products and services more effectively and efficiently
3. Committing toward employees improvement
4. Providing fast and reliable technical assistance for customers

Strategy:

AGIT, on its way to its vision, has focused on internet’s new gTLD program as the next generation of accessibility tool on the internet. AGIT believes in this project as an opportunity for the next billion internet users to have better access to the new world’s information, pushing them toward new successes based on the knowledge they achieve.

Middle East, as a multi-language, multi-cultural developing region, is an important market for every business, in which AGIT will invest more and more to leverage its dominancy on the information market. Based on this belief, AGIT has focused on “The Muslim Community” as its main target market.

The Muslim community is one of the most important markets for every business with over one billion population around the world. Middle East is the origin of Islam and one of the most important and key regions of the world for this community.

AGIT, thanks to its localization in Turkey, has a smooth and easy access to its target audiences, which brings many advantages for it. This accessibility to the target market, in addition to business ideas behind domain name industry and services, and the untouched markets in the region, has formed AGIT’s business strategy.
Core Values:

1. **Passion for Excellence**
   - Striving to be great and not just good; continuously improving results,

2. **Professional Discipline**
   - With strong work ethic; deserving of others’ trust and respect; using company resources prudently; acting with fairness and objectivity; being accountable for one’s actions.

3. **Teamwork**
   - Actively tapping areas of synergy; communicating and collaborating towards common goals. AGIT believes in TEAM "Together Everyone Achieve More”

4. **Loyalty**
   - A good corporate citizen; pursuing corporate interests as one’s own; speaking well of the company and taking pride in its achievements

Value Proposition:

AGIT has to insist of using resources to supply greater value to clients in different aspects:

5. **Quality**
   - Comprehensive quality systems for various processes

6. **Services**
   - On time, on-budget project delivery

7. **Partnership**
   - Being partner for customers rather than a mere vendor

8. **Knowledge Management**
   - AGIT has a Knowledge Base library containing all processes and repeatable solutions acquired from 20 years of ICT experience.

9. **Wide spectrum of ICT Solutions and Services**
   - AGIT offers complete solution to its customers with various ICT technologies, products and services.

10. **Value for Money**
    - AGIT delivers the best benefits to its customers’ ICT investment.

11. **Continuous Technology Adaptation and Innovation**
    - AGIT maintains numerous partnerships with key industry players for easy access to latest innovations.
Section II: Domain Names, ICANN & the new gTLD Program

The Domains

A domain is the name that identifies a web site. Each domain is unique within the Internet. The www.AGIT.com domain belongs to this page you are viewing, and no other. A single web server can serve many pages of several domains, but a domain can only have one web server.

Domains normally consist of three parts: the three www, the name of the organization (AGIT) and the type of organization (com).

The last part of a domain name (the extension) is called the “Top Level Domain (TLD)”, and the standards for assigning top level domains are established through an international organization, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), www.icann.org.

There are two types of top level domains (TLDs): generic and country code.

Generic names (gTLDs) were created for the public use of the Internet, and the country code domains (ccTLDs) to be used individually in each one. Generic names can be .com, .org, .net, .info, .gov, .mil or .int. Country codes are, for example, .uk, .de, .tr or .fr.

ICANN

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is the non-profit multi-stakeholder governing and policy body of the worldwide Internet naming system, which coordinates unique identifiers across the world, with the purpose of maintaining one global, safe and secure Internet.

In addition to providing technical operations of vital DNS resources, ICANN also defines policies for how the names and numbers of the Internet should operate. Through open forum meetings, grassroots participation, and conscientious inclusion of individuals in the public and private sector and governments, policies are based on thorough review and consensus building.

History of generic Top-Level Domains

Soon, the Internet will change in a major way. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the non-profit organization that oversees the Internets domain name system, plans to open its doors to new gTLD (generic top-level domain) applications.

Currently there are 21 gTLDs in use on the Internet today. A Top-level domain is what Internet users are accustomed to seeing on the right-most side of a domain name, e.g. .com, .net, and .org.

The introduction of new gTLDs will add a wide variety of new extensions for consumers to choose from. We expect a steady stream of innovation to take place in the next few years as the new gTLD program takes off. The information below should give you an idea of what is to come.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Period</th>
<th>Top-Level Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original gTLDs (Prior to 1998)</td>
<td>.com .net .edu .gov .int .mil .org .arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st gTLD Expansion (2000)</td>
<td>.aero . biz . coop . info . museum . name . pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd gTLD Expansion (2004)</td>
<td>.asia . cat . jobs . mobi . tel . travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:
3 Reference: ICANN New gTLD Program website (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/program)
Launch of the New gTLD Program

In June 2011, ICANN’s Board of Directors authorized the launch of the New gTLD (generic Top-Level Domain) Program, which would add new web address endings to what already included .com, .org, .edu and others.

The program’s goals include enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs. The program was introduced in June 2008 and has gone through a thorough multi-stakeholder review process that resulted in an Applicant Guidebook that outlines all details of the initiative.

---

4 Reference: ICANN New gTLD Program website (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/program)
Section III: .ISLAM Top Level Domain

Introduction:

Internet is facing the biggest change in its history. New brands, ideas, groups, communities… have now found the chance to apply for their own specific space on internet naming system through ICANN’s new gTLD program.

One of the most interesting points of this courageous program was the motivation which was created among communities to try to represent their specific webspace on the internet by applying for their own TLD; and the religious communities were among them as well.

AGIT as a Muslim company was a pioneer in using this opportunity with the philosophy of providing new internet presence opportunity for Muslims around the world. Described below are some facts and statistics about ICANN’s new gTLD Program and AGIT’s ideas for the proposed .ISLAM generic Top Level Domain:

Facts and statistics about Applied for new gTLDs:

- A total number of **1930 applications have been submitted to ICANN for 1470 TLDs**. It means that around 1400 new top level domains will be added to the current internet infrastructure, each of them explaining a specific field of business, brand, community, nationality etc…

- A majority of these TLDs have been applied for, from non-Islamic countries. The *share of Islamic countries* in the future of internet will be is very low in comparison to the share of Muslim population in the world. (just 3.3% of TLDs, in comparison to 20% of the world population)

- A total number of 17 applications have been submitted for TLDs which were related to religious concepts. If all of them approve, Christians will own 56.25% of all religious TLDs and Muslims will have 37.5%.
The number of applications for TLDs inconsistent with Islamic values (gambling, porno, etc…), are 34 in comparison to 6 Islamic TLDs.

It means, if all being approved, internet will be mostly a host for Domain names inconsistent with Islamic values in the future. So Muslims must support their own internet domain names.

Facts about AGIT’s activities and application for .ISLAM:

AGIT is the only Muslim company applying for .ISLAM as the most important faith TLD for the Muslim community, although everybody expected more activity from the companies and organizations in the Islamic countries. In a very simple rule of thumb, we can feel the activity of other religions’ main leading reference (e.g. Christian organization) and the inactivity of main Islamic organizations on the other hand, which is an evidence on the presence of the “Digital Gap” between these countries. The “Gap” AGIT hopefully efforts to decrease through .ISLAM gTLD.

In other word, AGIT was the only Islamic entity which understood the lack of Muslim’s power on the internet, (while many rich companies were just thinking about pure business TLDs), and tried to act in a way to bring back the power of governing the internet to the Muslim community.

In its commitment to the growth and development of the Muslim community, AGIT’s BoD has decided to contribute a specific part of .ISLAM gTLD financial revenues to the projects done by major Islamic organizations in Islamic countries. These contributions will take place as donations to specific programs/activities by the decision of .ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (will be explained later in this document).
Why .ISLAM?

There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. They are a group whose origins are found some 1400 years in the past, their ethnicity often inextricably linked with their faith. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this.

The majority of Muslims are Sunni, being 75-90% of all Muslims. The second largest sect, Shia, makes up 10-20%. About 13% of Muslims live in Indonesia, the largest Muslim country, 25% in South Asia, 20% in the Middle East, 2% in Central Asia, 4% in the remaining South East Asian countries, and 15% in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sizable communities are also found in China, Russia, and parts of Europe. With over 1.5 billion followers or over 22% of earth's population, Islam is the second-largest and one of the fastest-growing religions in the world.

A robust gTLD has the power to bring together Muslims across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. There is not a .COM or .ORG equivalent of .ISLAM, a domain that has universal appeal across a common religion. Asia Green IT System (AGIT) was founded in, and as is headquartered in, Turkey (an Islamic nation that straddles Europe and the Middle East) by Muslims with great devotion to their religion, which manifests itself in both pride and honor. The .ISLAM gTLD will increasingly open up the vast resources of the Internet and the interconnectedness it brings to the Muslims community, while stimulating the introduction of more information and resources among Muslims online. The .ISLAM gTLD is designed to accommodate a global community, and AGIT’ team’s work with ICANN has always looked not just to serving Muslim people but all users of the internet - thus serving Muslims and those interested in the Muslim faith all around the world, whilst simultaneously achieving ICANN’s goal of creating greater competition in the gTLD space.

The .Islam gTLD is intended for Muslim faithful who wish to promote, participate or learn about Islam and its various facets, its affect on people’s daily life around the world, its history, its law and jurisprudence and the rich and diverse culture that surrounds it. Thus, any well-
intentioned Muslim who wants to supply such content, or do business based around it, will be able to operate a domain under the .ISLAM gTLD.

How .ISLAM gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?

The benefits of the .ISLAM gTLD will be manifold, not just to registrants but also to tens of millions of Muslim internet users, as well as many others with an interest in or curiosity regarding Islam. The presence of a Muslim-specific gTLD will increase the volume of online Islamic resources, as the emergence of .ISLAM second-level domains sees a network effect kick in. This network effect will create an additional incentive for the digitization of existing Islamic materials, so as to facilitate their posting online as the demand for such material grows.

Consequently, the new .ISLAM gTLD will also increase access to online resources as the tens of millions of people that read Islamic and Islam-related materials are able, for the first time, to find the material they seek within the sites operating under the .ISLAM gTLD. Existing website registrants will be able to extend their presence to that audience with new .ISLAM sites, while new registrants will emerge from those Muslim populations brought together by the .ISLAM gTLD, adding to the value of the Internet in ways not currently possible.

As the global population expands, more people become willing Internet users and seek out second-level domains. The .ISLAM gTLD is flexible, and is thus capable of being used for sites focused on ecommerce, information dissemination, charitable endeavors and many more functions among Muslims. A transformation in competition is anticipated for web sites within .ISLAM, allowing them to depart from conventional methods of attracting new customers in this expanding market. This is because it will encourage competitors, targeting the extensive and diverse collection of global Islamic Internet users. This incentive doesn't currently exist in an online space devoid of the .ISLAM gTLD, where competition amongst the already saturated existing TLDs is stagnant.
Section IV: .ISLAM gTLD Governance, the draft proposal

AGIT as a member of the Muslim community has a deep understanding about the sensitivity of .ISLAM gTLD, like many other religious gTLDs applied by other applicants.

This has made AGIT to monitor and watch all internet stakeholders’ reaction to the application for .ISLAM gTLD during past months, to find out a better understanding of the major concerns in this regards, and help us design a better governing structure which can respond to all concerns.

AGIT believes that the presence of specific Muslim community TLD on internet, having a strong governance system behind it which is highly responsive to the majority of stakeholders’ concerns, is the best way to help the presence of the Muslim community on the internet. So the .ISLAM gTLD Governance system is designed after hours of discussions and receiving advices from different groups as described below:

We believe that .ISLAM as a “Muslim specific TLD which is going to serve all the Muslim community”, belongs to all Muslims as well. Muslim community is a 1.5 billion population living around the world including both governments and nations, which is typically a multi stakeholder system.

So through research and consultation with internet and public policy experts, AGIT has decided to design a multi stakeholder governing system called “.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council”, letting Islamic governments, organizations and individuals have their representatives in the Management/Governing system of .ISLAM and under direct supervision of a multinational Islamic organization/institute.
.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC)

.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC) can be a response to all concerns about .ISLAM governance by acting as the governing body for .ISLAM gTLD, in terms of public policy development, .ISLAM collaborations with the Muslim community, .ISLAM contributions in the growth and development of the Muslim community in general and in the cyber space, etc…

.ISLAM PAC will serve as a non-for-profit governing board and will be made up of leadership from the broad spectrum of the .ISLAM stakeholders around the world.

.ISLAM PAC will be formed by 17 voting members including:

1. Five (5) representatives from 5 different governments (including Muslim countries and/or countries with a significant Muslim population) (rotating members)
2. Five (5) representatives from the leaders of the Muslim communities around the world (including religious leaders, public leaders etc…) (rotating members)
3. Five (5) representatives from the Muslim Civil Society (including famous/well-known Muslim figures, celebrities, superstars, NGOs etc…) (rotating members)
4. One (1) representative of a leading Islamic organization e.g. Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC), Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI), Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) etc…, as the Chairman of .ISLAM PAC (permanent member)
5. One (1) representative (Chairman of AGIT) (permanent member)

PAC makes decisions by simple majority. First round PAC members will be selected by AGIT-ICRIC for a period of one year to create the roles, following will be the 2nd PAC board whom will be selected from the nominees applying, for period of 3 year; each year 5 of 15 will be replaced with new members to create a dynamic rotating council.

The first PAC will be established within 60 days of the appointment of AGIT as the .ISLAM registry operator. And the initial members of the .ISLAM PAC will be selected from interested governments, organizations and individuals of the above categories by AGIT’s BoD (for the first round).

Next rounds will be based on a nomination or election system and both AGIT BoD and .ISLAM PAC will collaborate in the election of the new members.
.ISLAM PAC role and power:

.ISLAM PAC will be the main role-player in .ISLAM gTLD governance by making major decisions on:

1. **Major policies** for .ISLAM gTLD (including registration policies, etc…)
2. **Dispute Resolutions** of .ISLAM domain names
3. **Monitoring and Controlling** Systems of the .ISLAM registered domain names (in terms of content etc…)
4. **.ISLAM Contributions** in Muslim growth and development activities

To better serve in its roles, .ISLAM PAC can create specific committees/working groups responsible for specific subjects.

Each PAC member can apply to any of the committees Initial recommended committees consist of:

1. **Anti-Terrorism / Human Rights committee**: responsible to investigate issues regarding the possible terrorist activities through .ISLAM registered domain names, and actions to reduce these possibilities
2. **Corporate Social Responsibility committee**: responsible to investigate on environment protection activities, etc…
3. **Contribution Management committee**: the registry will allocate a specific amount of its annual revenue to the charitable activities which are targeted to the development of Islamic societies. This committee would be responsible to find qualified candidates to receive these contributions and provide recommendations about them to the PAC to make the final decisions.

Committees/Working Groups are mostly research/knowledge sharing teams which will reports their opinions to PAC for further decisions, and PAC will make decisions based the information received from the committees in case needed.
Section v:
Preliminary registration policies and regulations assigned for a .ISLAM domain name

AGIT has developed a preliminary version of the policies covering .ISLAM registrations. The .ISLAM PAC’s first and immediate action plan would be the review and change of these registration policies.

1. Eligibility

Who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined?

As mentioned above, the primary goal of the .ISLAM gTLD is the protection and promulgation of the Islamic culture, beliefs, heritage, laws and rules. To this end, in order to register a .ISLAM Domain Name, you declare that you are part of the Islamic Religious and Cultural Community. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, “I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God.”

Our policies may permit registrations within .ISLAM gTLD from the following groups:

- Universities, schools, research institutions and other academic entities performing Islamic academic activities or which teach/promote aspects of Islamic culture.
- Public or private entities whose aim is promoting different aspects of Islam.
- Publishing companies that publish works about Islamic culture, in Islamic script or relating to the Islam.
- Individuals, groups, businesses, organizations, entities or initiatives, however constituted, carrying online communications specifically among Muslims
- Individuals, groups, businesses, organizations, entities or initiatives affirming their belonging to the Muslim Community

Registrations within the .ISLAM gTLD are intended for members of the Muslim community who wish to promote, participate or learn about ISLAM and its many facets,

Reference: .ISLAM gTLD application, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System
its effect on the daily life of the people around the world, its history, Law and jurisprudence and its rich and diverse culture.

As part of the renewal of the domain name, each registrant must certify their compliance with the Acceptable Use Policy as well as pronounce the Shahadah via electronic means.

2. Name selection

What types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD?

AGIT will follow ICANN guidelines regarding potential restrictions of second-level domains. The names selected to be registered under .ISLAM gTLD must not present any conflict with the cultural, traditional and historical values of the Muslim community. This restriction will be controlled by creating a “black list” of prohibited names managed by the .ISLAM Policy Advisory Committee described above.

3. Content/Use

What restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name?

AGIT will have an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and registration policies that will govern how a registrant may use its registered name. We will ask all members to honor Islamic Culture, Heritage and rules. We will also require registrants to ensure that websites hosted within the .ISLAM gTLD do not violate the sensitivities of the Muslim Community. These requirements will be enforced through the AUP and other contracts registrants must sign with their registrars prior to the registration of a domain name.

Specifically, use being deemed “Acceptable” begins with certifications in the registration and renewal process. Certification constitutes a series of acknowledgements that the Registrant is either of Muslim faith, or has a clear interest in ameliorating the community. Acceptable Use Certification contains the following:

1. Registrants must electronically accept that they have pronounced the Shahadah (declaration of faith) which states, "I testify that there is no god except for the God [Allah], and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of the God."

2. Registrants must accept and abide by the following:
   a. No denegation of The Prophet Mohammad will be propagated within any site content of the .ISLAM gTLD
   b. Messaging about Islam or the Quran will not criticize the Muslim faith
c. Registrants and Users will refrain from activities that run contrary to Islamic principles

d. Not to use the .ISLAM gTLD or site content as a communications and coordination vehicle of radical or terrorist activities

e. Registrants will not establish third level DNS management of second level .ISLAM domains.

4. 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?

As part of the AUP and registration polices, AGIT will have complete enforcement rights over registrants’ use of .ISLAM domain names. AGIT will randomly audit domain names registered in the .ISLAM gTLD to ensure compliance with all eligibility and use criteria. If a violation is discovered, an investigation will begin immediately to rectify said violation. Penalties for violation range from suspension of a domain, to removal of the domain name from the TLD and blacklisting of the registrant, preventing them from being able to register any other names in the .ISLAM TLD. The .ISLAM PAC may need to be engaged to consult on potential enforcement activities.
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

Applicant Entity Name: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.
Application ID#: 1-2130-23450

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 [date to be determined at time of contracting], 2013 or any subsequent form of Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors 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 ([url to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]), as it may be amended 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

- Section 28.4 .ISLAM Acceptable Use Policy

3. Registry Operator agrees to perform following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

a. Registry Operator does its utmost to ensure that WHOIS data is verified, authentic and publicly accessible.

b. Registry Operator does its most to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith, or those with a clear interest in serving the Muslim community and faith beneficially.

c. Registry Operator will not tolerate any illegitimate and non-legal activity such as terrorism, online counterfeiting and piracy, radical content, content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promulgating either, and a black list will be created in an attempt to pre-empt any such attempts. Registry operator will fully cooperate with any authorities that have jurisdiction over it in this regards.

d. While the Registry Operator cannot guaranty to prevent all illegitimate and non-legal activities, but will do all possible or utmost to prevent these activities by implementing protection measures for registrations to ensure an abuse free environment whilst maintaining choice.
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

**gTLD String:** .HALAL  
**Applicant Entity Name:** Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.  
**Application ID#:** 1-2131-60793

**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 [date to be determined at time of contracting], 2013 (or any subsequent form of Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors) 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 [url to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]), as it may be amended 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

- Section 28.4 .HALAL Acceptable Use Policy

3. Registry Operator agrees to perform following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

   a. Registry Operator does its outmost to ensure that WHOIS data is verified, authentic and publicly accessible.

   b. Registry Operator does its most to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith, or those with a clear interest in serving the Muslim community and faith beneficially.

   c. Registry Operator will not tolerate any illegitimate and non-legal activity such as terrorism, online counterfeiting and piracy, radical content, content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promulgating either, and a black list will be created in an attempt to pre-empt any such attempts. Registry operator will fully cooperate with any authorities that have jurisdiction over it in this regards.

   d. While the Registry Operator cannot guaranty to prevent all illegitimate and non-legal activities, but will do all possible or utmost to prevent these activities by implementing protection measures for registrations to ensure an abuse free environment whilst maintaining choice.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. On July 11, 2013, the Expert rendered Procedural Order No. 1 in the above-referenced case. In such Order, the Expert inter alia invited the parties to submit a brief comment on the following issues:

   (i) Whether, in accordance with Article 17 of the Attachment to Module 3 – New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”), the parties should be allowed to submit a second round of written pleadings. If so, please refer to the length, timing and scope of these submissions.

   (ii) Whether, in accordance with Article 19 of the Procedure, the parties consider that there are any extraordinary circumstances that would require a hearing. If so, please state if the hearing should be held in person or via conference call.

   (iii) Whether, in accordance with Article 21(g) of the Procedure, the Expert Determination should be published in full.

   (iv) Any other procedural matter relevant at this time.

2. Each party electronically submitted comments in relation to these questions on July 15, 2013.1

II. PARTIES’ POSITIONS

3. For the Objector, a second round of pleadings is necessary in order to address the following issues:

   (i) The Objector is collecting letters of support to its position from other members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”) and will therefore require a second submission to include them on the record.

   (ii) The Objector believes that the English version of OIC’s letter dated January 29, 2013 (“OIC’s Letter”) does not reflect the same meaning as the Arabic text of such letter.2 For this reason, the Objector requests a second submission to include the Arabic version of OIC’s Letter on the record.

   (iii) The Objector would like to comment on certain points raised in the response and, more specifically, in relation to the entities which allegedly provided endorsement to Respondent’s applied-for string and their relationship with the OIC.

---

1 Due to time difference, the Respondent’s comments were received on July 16, 2013.

2 A copy of OIC’s Letter has been provided to the Expert as Annex 1 to the Objector’s memorial.
4. The Objector requests a term of not less than thirty (30) to file its second memorial.

5. Furthermore, the Objector does not find any extraordinary circumstances that would require a hearing and is contrary to the publication of the Expert’s Determination. The Objector does not explain the reasons for its position.

6. The Respondent takes the opposite position. In particular, the Respondent points out that the Objector had over a year to prepare its case since the former’s application was made available to the public (June 13, 2012). Respondent is of the view that the Objector had ample time to prepare its objection, which exceeds by far the thirty (30) days that the Respondent had to prepare its response in accordance with the Procedure. Therefore, no additional submissions should be allowed.

7. For Respondent, additional submissions or any delay will be exceptionally expensive and burdensome, and will also affect its market position.

8. The Respondent does not find any extraordinary circumstances that would require a hearing and requests the publication of the Expert’s Determination. With regard to the latter point, the Respondent sustains that the Objector’s opposition “has generally been clandestine, coordinated behind closed doors”. Respondent argues that, under Article 3.4.6 of Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”), the general rule is that the Expert’s Determination should be published in full.

III. DECISION

A. Additional Submissions

(a) Objector’s Additional Letters of Support

9. Without doubt, additional letters of support may serve the Expert to judge more appropriately whether there is “substantial opposition” to Respondent’s application for the “.Halal” string.

10. However, the Respondent is absolutely right that its application was posted in June 2012, which means that the Objector has had over a full year to collect letters supporting its position. Additionally, almost 6 months have elapsed since the date of OIC’s
Letter (January 29, 2013). In the Expert’s opinion, this is ample time for an OIC member to form an opinion as to favor or oppose the registration of the new gTLD “.Halal”.

11. In accordance with Articles 17(a) and 18 of the Procedure, the Expert directs the Objector to submit any additional letters supporting its position and provide a brief explanation (if necessary) within a very short period of time, which should be much less than the thirty (30) days requested. Of course, the Respondent shall be afforded an opportunity to contest and reply such letters and any allegations in relation thereto. See Section III.A(d) below for details on the deadlines.

(b) OIC’s Letter

12. The Expert considers OIC’s opinion in relation to the applied-for string highly relevant and that it should certainly be taken into consideration in the Expert’s Determination. As advanced, the Objector believes that the English version of OIC’s Letter differs from the Arabic text of the same letter.

13. Article 38 of the Charter of OIC states that “[l]anguages of the Organisation shall be Arabic, English and French” and thus the English version of OIC’s Letter is as valid as the Arabic version of such letter. ³ Nevertheless, in order to carry out an integrative interpretation of OIC’s intention when circulating its Letter, the Expert considers appropriate to compare the English version with both the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter. For this reason, in accordance with Article 18 of the Procedure, the Expert directs the Objector to submit a copy of OIC’s Letter in both Arabic and French (without any translations whatsoever). ⁴ The Expert will not accept any further pleadings in relation to the content, nature or interpretation of OIC’s Letter.

14. See Section III.A(d) below for details on the deadline.

(c) Additional Comments to the Response

15. The Objector has requested to comment on certain points raised in the response. In particular, the Objector would like to comment on the entities which allegedly

³ Annex 5 to Response, Article 30.
⁴ Article 19 of the Procedure states that “[i]n exceptional cases, the Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence”.
provided endorsement to Respondent’s applied-for string and their relationship with the OIC.

16. As mentioned in the previous section, the Expert considers OIC’s position relevant to render the Expert’s Determination. The Respondent claims that some of its supporters fall under the umbrella of the OIC.\(^5\) Therefore, in accordance with Article 17(a) of the procedure, the Expert grants both parties an opportunity to explain in more detail the relation between the OIC and: (i) the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”); and (ii) HalalWorld. No submissions will be accepted by the Expert beyond the scope described in this paragraph.

17. See Section III.A(d) below for details on the deadlines.

\[ \text{(d) Timing and Length of Submissions} \]

18. Respondent has requested a term of thirty (30) days to file its second memorial. However, Article 17(b) of the Procedure states that, unless exceptional circumstances justify a longer time limit, “[t]he time limits fixed by the Panel for additional written submissions shall not exceed thirty (30) days” (emphasis added). The Expert reads this provision, which is worded in plural, to allow thirty (30) days in total for all additional submissions from both parties (unless there are exceptional circumstances).

19. Since the Respondent has had plenty of time to collect letters of support by today’s date, the Expert does not find any exceptional circumstances that justify a longer time limit than thirty (30) days. No other exceptional circumstances apply to the submission of the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter (Section III.A(b) above) or to the comments to the response (Section III.A(c) above).

20. In the Expert’s opinion, a very short period of time is more than enough. Accordingly, the Objector shall submit by July 26, 2013 (8.00pm Paris time): (i) any additional letters of support, together with a brief commentary (if necessary); (ii) the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter (without any commentary or allegations); (iii) a commentary on OIC’s relationship with ICRIC and HalalWorld. Respondent may submit a response to (i) and (iii) above by August 5, 2013 (8.00pm Paris time).

\(^5\) Response, p. 6.
21. The memorial of each party shall be limited to three (3) pages in total (excluding annexes).

B. Hearing

22. Both parties agree that there are no exceptional circumstances that require a hearing. Accordingly, no hearing will be held in this proceeding.

C. Publication of the Expert’s Determination

23. Both parties disagree as to the publication of the Expert’s Determination. Article 21(g) of the Procedure and Article 3.4.6 of the Guidebook express that all expert determinations will generally be published in full. In this regard, “[t]he findings of the panel will be considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process”.  

24. In light of the foregoing, the Expert is of the opinion that the Expert Determination shall be published in full.

Date: 16/07/2013

Signature: Bernardo M. Cremades

---

Guidebook, Article 3.4.6.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. On July 18, 2013, the Expert rendered Procedural Order No. 1 in the above-referenced case.

2. In ¶ 4 of Procedural Order No. 1, the Expert ordered as follows:

(i) In accordance with Article 18 of the Attachment to Module 3 – New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”), that the Objector submits to the Expert the French and Arabic versions of the letter of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”), dated January 29, 2013 (“OIC’s Letter”).1 The Expert does not require any translation whatsoever. The Expert will not accept any further pleadings in relation to the content, nature or interpretation of OIC’s Letter. Article 38 of the Charter of OIC states that “[l]anguages of the Organisation shall be Arabic, English and French” and thus the English version of OIC’s Letter is as valid as the Arabic and French versions of such letter.2 Nevertheless, in order to carry out an integrative interpretation of OIC’s intention when circulating its Letter, the Expert considers appropriate to compare the English version with both the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter.

(ii) In accordance with Articles 17(a) and 18 of the Procedure, the Expert directs the Objector to submit any additional letters supporting its position and provide a brief explanation (if necessary). The Respondent shall be afforded an opportunity to contest and reply such letters and any allegations in relation thereto. Respondent may also submit additional letters of support with the reply.

Additional letters of support from both sides may serve the Expert to judge more appropriately whether there is “substantial opposition” to Respondent’s application for the “.Islam” string.

(iii) The Expert considers OIC’s position relevant to render the Expert’s Determination. The Respondent claims that some of its supporters fall under the umbrella of the OIC.3 Therefore, in accordance with Article 17(a) of the procedure, the Expert grants both parties an opportunity to explain in more detail the relation between the OIC and: (i) the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”); and (ii) HalalWorld.

(iv) No further submissions relating to the substance of this proceeding shall be accepted by the Expert outside the scope of this ¶ 4.

---

1 Annex 1 to Objection.
2 Annex 5 to Response, Article 30.
3 Response, p. 6.
3. In addition, in ¶ 6 of Procedural Order No.1, the Expert invited the parties to submit a brief comment on the following issues:

   (i) Whether, in accordance with Article 19 of the Procedure, the parties consider that there are any extraordinary circumstances that would require a hearing. If so, please state if the hearing should be held in person or via conference call.

   (ii) Whether, in accordance with Article 21(g) of the Procedure, the Expert Determination should be published in full.

   (iii) Any other procedural matter relevant at this time.

II. PARTIES’ POSITIONS

4. Each party electronically submitted comments in relation to these questions on July 22, 2013:

   (i) Neither party found any extraordinary circumstances that would require a hearing.

   (ii) Both parties agreed on the publication of the Expert's Determination.

   (iii) Neither party commented on any other procedural matter.

III. DECISION

A. Timing of Additional Submissions

5. Article 17(b) of the Procedure states that, unless exceptional circumstances justify a longer time limit, “[t]he time limits fixed by the Panel for additional written submissions shall not exceed thirty (30) days” (emphasis added). The Expert reads this provision, which is worded in plural, to allow thirty (30) days in total for all additional submissions from both parties (unless there are exceptional circumstances).

6. Since the Objector has had plenty of time to collect letters of support by today’s date (¶ 2(ii) above), the Expert does not find any exceptional circumstances that justify a longer time limit than thirty (30) days. No other exceptional circumstances apply to the submission of the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter (¶ 2(i) above) or to the comments to the response (¶ 2(iii) above).

7. In the Expert’s opinion, a very short period of time is more than enough. Accordingly, the Objector shall submit by August 2, 2013 (8.00pm Paris time): (i) the Arabic and French versions of OIC’s Letter (without any commentary or allegations); (ii) any
additional letters of support, together with a brief commentary (if necessary); (iii) a commentary on OIC’s relationship with ICRIC and HalalWorld. Respondent may submit a response to (ii) and (iii) above by August 12, 2013 (8.00pm Paris time). Respondent may also submit additional letters of support with the reply.

8. For the avoidance of doubt, the Respondent shall not file anything on August 2, 2013 and the Objector shall not file anything on August 12, 2013.

9. The Expert is aware that the Objector has had the opportunity to prepare its second submission since the day on which Procedural Order No. 1 was rendered (i.e., July 18, 2013). Therefore, the Expert will be flexible if the Respondent requests a short extension of its August 12, 2013 deadline.

10. The memorial of each party shall be limited to three (3) pages in total (excluding annexes).

B. Hearing

11. Both parties agree that there are no exceptional circumstances that require a hearing. Accordingly, no hearing will be held in this proceeding.

C. Publication of the Expert’s Determination

12. Both parties agree as to the publication of the Expert’s Determination. Accordingly, the Expert’s Determination shall be published in full.

***

Date: 23/07/2013

Signature  Bernardo M. Cremades
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix III</td>
<td>Means Appendix III to the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce, Schedule of expertise costs for proceedings under the new gTLD dispute resolution procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Means Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Means the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>Means Domain Name System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Means Bernardo M. Cremades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Determination</td>
<td>Means this expert determination rendered on October 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD</td>
<td>Means generic top level domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidebook</td>
<td>Means the gTLD Applicant Guidebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Means Internet Corporation for Assigned Names &amp; Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Means International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Practice Note</td>
<td>Means the ICC Practice Note on the Administration of Cases under the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCIA</td>
<td>Means Islamic Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRIC</td>
<td>Means Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Means the community objection filed by the Objector against Respondent’s application for the String on March 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objector</td>
<td>Means the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Means the Organization of Islamic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC’s Letter</td>
<td>Means the letter from the OIC dated January 29, 2013 (attached as Annex 1 to the Objection in English and as Annex [without number] to the Reply in both Arabic and French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Means the Attachment to Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejoinder</td>
<td>Means the rejoinder to the Reply filed by the Respondent on August 4-5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Means the reply to the Response filed by the Objector on July 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Means the response to the Objection filed by the Respondent on May 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Means the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String</td>
<td>Means the applied-for gTLD “.HALAL” by the Applicant (Application No. 1-2131-60793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Law</td>
<td>Means the UEA’s Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Means the United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. This expert determination (the “Expert Determination”) is issued under the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “Rules”), supplemented by the ICC Practice Note on the Administration of Cases (the “ICC Practice Note”), and under the Attachment to Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”) of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”).

I. THE PARTIES AND THE EXPERT

A. Objector

2. The Objector is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Mohammed Al Ghanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>P.O.Box 26662, Sheikh Zayed Street, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Objector is represented herein by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Talal Abu Ghazaleh Legal Member to Talal Abu Ghazaleh Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Badr El-Dein Abdel Khalek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>A26 Smart Village, Km 28 Cairo/Alex DesertRoad, P.O.Box: 150 Smart Village 12577, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Cairo, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Objector has appointed its legal representative to receive all communications and notifications in the present proceeding.
B. Respondent

5. The Respondent (also referred to as the Applicant) is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Büyükdere Cad. Kırşül Sk. Metrocity AVM, D Block, Floor 4, No.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>34394 Levent, Istanbul, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Respondent is represented herein by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rodenbaugh Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Rodenbaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>548 Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>San Francisco, California, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The Respondent has appointed its legal representative to receive all communications and notifications in the present proceeding.

C. Expert

8. The Expert is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mr. Bernardo M. Cremades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>B. Cremades &amp; Asociados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Calle Goya 18 – Planta 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. APPLIED-FOR GTLD

9. The applied-for generic top level domain ("gTLD") is ".HALAL" (the "String").

III. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

10. On March 13, 2013, the Objector filed a community objection against Respondent’s application for the String in accordance with Article 3.2.1 of the Guidebook and Article 2 of the Procedure (the "Objection").¹

11. According to Article 3.2.1 of the Guidebook, a community objection is filed when "]t]here 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".

12. On May 15, 2013, the Respondent filed a response disputing “both standing and grounds for the Objection” and “pray[ed] that it be dismissed” (the “Response”).²

13. On June 12, 2013, the Chair of the Standing Committee of the Centre appointed Mr. Bernardo M. Cremades as Expert in accordance with Article 7 and Article 3(3) Appendix I of the Rules. On July 9, 2013, the Centre transferred the file to the Expert and confirmed in writing that: (i) the estimated costs had been paid in full by each Party; and (ii) the full constitution of the Expert Panel had taken effect as of that same day.³

14. On July 11, 2013, the Expert issued Procedural Order No.1 directing both Parties to submit their views on certain procedural matters. The Parties replied on July 15, 2013.⁴ On July 16, 2013, the Expert issued Procedural Order No. 2 directing the Parties to submit additional evidence and allegations on very limited matters (Articles 17(a) and 18 in fine of the Procedure). The Expert also found that no hearing was necessary in this proceeding (Article 19 of the Procedure) and that the Expert Determination should be published in full (Article 21(g) of the Procedure).

15. On July 26, 2013, the Objector filed its reply memorial together with the additional evidence requested by the Expert (the “Reply”). On August 4 and 5, 2013, the

---

¹ Objection, p. 3.
² Response, p. 4.
³ Letter from the Centre to the Parties and Expert, dated July 9, 2013.
⁴ Due to the time difference, the Respondent’s comments were received by the Expert on July 16, 2013.
Respondent filed its second memorial, together with the supporting evidence, in response to the Reply (the “Rejoinder”).

16. In the Rejoinder, the Respondent requested the Expert to disregard the section “Further points raised in the response” of the Reply because, in its opinion, it was outside the scope of Procedural Order No. 2. Alternatively, the Respondent requested additional time to reply to the new allegations of the Objector.

17. On August 6, 2013, the Objector submitted an email explaining the reasons why it included in the Reply a section with allegations beyond the scope of Procedural Order No. 2. On the same day, the Expert issued Procedural Order No. 3 in which he refused to accept the section “Further points raised in the response” of the Reply. In the Expert’s opinion, the Objector did not sufficiently justify the reasons for having disobeyed the Expert’s instructions contained in Procedural Order No. 2. For this reason, such portion of the Reply will not be taken into consideration by the Expert in rendering his Expert Determination. However, as will be seen below, the Expert’s reasoning would not have been affected by such disregarded allegations.

18. On August 12, 2013, the Respondent submitted an updated version of Annex 3 to the Rejoinder. On August 14, 2013, the Objector communicated its objection to Respondent’s late submission and recalled that, in ¶ 9 of Procedural Order No. 3, the Expert “order[ed] both parties to refrain from submitting any further allegations and/or evidence”. On August 15, 2013, the Respondent submitted comments on this issue. On August 19, 2013, the Expert rendered Procedural Order No. 4 refusing to take into consideration Respondent’s late submission of August 12, 2013. As will be seen below, the Expert’s reasoning would not have been affected by such disregarded exhibit.

19. In accordance with Articles 5(a) and 6(a) of the Procedure, as well as Articles 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 of the Guidebook, all of the Parties’ communications were submitted electronically in English, which is the official language of this proceeding. The Expert notes, however, that Annex 9 to the Response contains portions in languages other than English. Likewise, the Objector filed with the Reply the Arabic and French versions of

---

\[5\] Rejoinder, p. 1.
\[6\] Id.
Annex 1 to the Objection. In all cases, the Expert does not consider it necessary to provide certified or official translations pursuant to Article 5(b) of the Procedure.

20. For all purposes, the place of the proceedings is Paris (France), where the Centre is located (Article 4(d) of the Procedure).

IV. OBJECTOR’S STANDING

21. In this section, the Expert will summarize the Parties’ positions as to the Objector’s standing to file the Objection. Thereafter, the Expert will draw his conclusions in this regard.

A. Objector’s Position

22. As described in section I.A above, the Objector is the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”), which claims to be a governmental agency representing both the people and Government of said country.\(^7\) The Objector asserts that it is acting following an “invitation” of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”), of which the UAE is member, to file the Objection that triggered the present proceeding.\(^8\) Such “invitation” was furnished by the Objector in English as Annex 1 to the Objection and in both Arabic and French with the Reply (without Annex number) (collectively, “OIC’s Letter”). The English version of the OIC’s Letter provides in its relevant portion as follows:

[T]he OIC would like to draw the attention to the fact that new applications were already submitted for new gTLDs and these new applications are being evaluated according to the consensus-based mechanism determined by ICANN. The period for submitting any objections, if any, has been expanded until 13th March 2013 for any group and/or community that holds objection on religious or ethical values. The OIC Member States may kindly like to avail of this opportunity to act quickly through their representation in the organs of the ICANN, to avoid any

---

\(^7\) Objection, p. 4.

\(^8\) Id.
misuse and misrepresentation of gTLDs of concern to them, including the ones like .ISLAM or .HALAL.9

23. Together with the Reply, the Objector submitted a draft resolution of the OIC and letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman and Turkey, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council.10 For these reasons, the Objector claims to represent a substantial portion of the Muslim community.

24. The Objector was incorporated by Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003 (the "Telecom Law").11 The Objector argues that, since its inception, it has been charged with a "wide range of responsibilities related to the Telecommunications and Information Technology Sector, both within and outside the UAE."12 The Objector lists a number of its "functions and powers" – none of which relate to religious or public policy matters – but fails to provide documental support.13 The Expert notes, however, that such functions and powers are contained in Article 13 of the Telecom Law.

25. In light of the foregoing, the Objector claims to be "an established institution associated with the Arabian and Islamic UAE community having an institutional purpose related to the benefit of the community".14

26. Next, the Objector explains that the word "Halal" is intrinsically linked to Islamic lifestyle.15 For the Objector, because the Respondent allegedly gained neither the support of the Muslim Community nor of the OIC, it lacks legitimacy to register the String.16 The Objector concludes by stating that, since religious matters are very sensitive, the

---

9 Annex 1 to the Objection, p. 1. "ICANN" means Internet Corporation for Assigned Names & Numbers ("ICANN").
10 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-9 to the Reply. The letter of support from Kuwait is duplicated (see Annexes 3 and 9 to the Reply).
11 Objection, p. 4 (citing Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003). The Expert notes that the Objector has not provided an electronic copy of the Telecom Law. However, the Expert has been able to obtain a copy of the Telecom Law by following a link included in the Objection (p. 4). The incorporation of the Objector is set forth in Chapter 3 (Part 1) of the Telecom Law under the official name “General Authority for Regulating the Telecommunication Sector”.
12 Objection, p. 4.
13 Id., p. 5.
14 Id.
15 Id.
16 Id.
Respondent – a commercial entity – should not be authorized to register or control a new gTLD of a religious nature.17

B. Respondent’s Position

27. The Respondent takes the opposite view regarding the Objector’s standing to file the Objection. First, the Respondent sustains that the Objector is the regulatory authority of just one Islamic country – namely, the UAE – which “demonstrates no relevance to the global Muslim population, or to that subset that practices Halal lifestyle”.18 The Respondent adds that the Objector merely provides a domestic technical function within the UAE and that, far from defending a community interest, is pursuing its own commercial interest.19

28. Second, the Respondent advances an argument based on Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook,20 which provides in the part quoted by Respondent as follows:

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.

29. For the Respondent, the Objector has “no association whatsoever with any ‘Halal’ community, other than it is one of 57 member states of the [OIC]”.21 Furthermore, the Respondent criticizes the Objector for grasping support from OIC’s Letter, specifically because such letter does not contain an invitation from the OIC to its members to file an objection (but is rather a simple instruction to review ICANN’s new gTLD program and act if necessary).22

30. Third, the Respondent points out that the OIC did not file an objection itself and that only the regulatory authority of one of its members (of a total of 57) filed an objection. Accordingly, for the Respondent, this represents no “semblance of the global

---

17 Id.
18 Response, p. 4.
19 Id. See also id., p. 6.
20 Id., p. 4.
21 Id.
22 Id., p. 5.
Halal community” and thus the Objector lacks standing. Had there been substantial opposition, either the OIC itself or a significant number of States would have filed an objection.

31. Fourth, the Respondent asserts that all the functions and powers mentioned by the Objector are circumscribed to the territory of the UAE and that, in any case, they are of technical nature without relationship whatsoever to the global community of Halal individuals. The Respondent adds that, even if the Objector were to have governmental authority within the UAE, it would only represent a small percentage (i.e., 0.01%) of the Muslims of the world as of 2009. In addition, the Respondent notes that the OIC did not entrust the Objector to act on its behalf or in the name of any other of its remaining 56 members. For this reason, in the Respondent’s opinion, the Objector only “purport[s] to represent less than 2% of the OIC’s collective weight”, which does not amount to a representation of the “global Muslim community to which the .Halal TLD will be targeted”.

32. Finally, the Respondent argues that one of the OIC’s most relevant affiliates – the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”) – has endorsed Respondent’s application to register the String, which would support its argument that the Objector is not backed by the OIC, that the Objector does not represent any greater Muslim community than the UAE and, in sum, that it lacks standing overall.

C. Expert’s Conclusion

(a) Standard

33. Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook provides guidance on who may file a community objection. As the Respondent has correctly quoted in its Response, such article provides in its very first paragraph as follows:

Established institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection.

---

23 Id.
24 Id.
25 Id.
26 Id.
27 Id.
28 Id., pp. 5-6.
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. . . . \textsuperscript{29}

34. The Guidebook provides some explanation regarding the main requirements set forth in the quoted passage. In this regard, the Guidebook states that, “[t]o qualify for standing for a community objection, the objector must prove both of the following”, which makes abundantly clear that the two requirements that follow must be met.\textsuperscript{30} These two requirements are: (i) the objector must be an “established institution”; and (ii) the objector must have “an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community”.\textsuperscript{31} Each of them will be analyzed separately below.

35. For each requirement, the Guidebook lists some “factors” to steer the Expert’s judgment. As a threshold matter, the Expert will analyze the value of the “factors” outlined in Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook. In this regard, the Guidebook states that the “[f]actors that may be considered [by the Expert] in making its determination include, but are not limited to. . . .” The use of the optional term “may” instead of any other mandatory term clearly implies that the Expert has absolute discretion to apply or not the factors expressly included in the Guidebook. In addition, the final portion of the quoted passage – “but are not limited to” – opens the door to other factors not expressly listed in the Guidebook. This conclusion is also supported by the last paragraph of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, which states that the Expert “will perform a balancing of the factors listed above, as well as other relevant information, in making its determination”.\textsuperscript{32} The reference to “other relevant information” eliminates any doubt as to the orientative nature of the factors contained in the Guidebook.

36. All the above is consistent with the last phrase of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, which provides that “[i]t is not expected that an objector must demonstrate satisfaction of each and every factor considered in order to satisfy the standing requirements”.

\textsuperscript{29} Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4 (emphasis added).
\textsuperscript{30} Id. (emphasis added).
\textsuperscript{31} Id.
\textsuperscript{32} Emphasis added.
(b) Analysis

37. As advanced, according to Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, only “[e]stablished institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection”.

38. In relation to the question of whether the Objector is an established institution, the Expert will take into consideration several factors. First, the orientative factors outlined in Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook include “validation by a government” of the objector. In this case, the Objector was incorporated under Article 6 of the Telecom Law, which states as follows:

It is hereby established an independent public authority, called the “General Authority for Regulating the Telecommunication Sector” for the purpose of performing the functions and implementing the duties given to it under this Federal Law by Decree and its Executive Order.33

39. Furthermore, it is worthwhile noting that the Telecom Law was signed by Mr. Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan, the UAE’s President at the time.34

40. According to the Telecom Law, the Objector “shall have an independent legal personality and shall have full capacity to act accordingly and to perform legal actions in accordance with this Federal Law by Decree, including the capacity to enter into contracts of all types and to own and lease movable and immovable assets of all types and the capacity to sue”.35 Therefore, the Objector has an independent legal personality under UAE’s law and the capacity to sue, which most certainly includes the capacity to file the Objection.

41. Second, the Telecom Law was enacted in 2003, which is almost a decade ago. In the Expert’s view, this period of time is sufficient to consolidate a governmental agency. More importantly, this evidences that the Objector was not “established solely in conjunction with the gTLD application process”.36

33 Telecom Law, Article 6.
34 Id., p. 34.
35 Id., Article 7.
36 Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4.
42. For the foregoing reasons, the Expert finds that the Objector is an established institution for the purposes of filing the Objection.

43. The Expert will now turn to analyze whether the Objector is “associated with clearly delineated communities” or, in other words, whether it “has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community”, such as the Halal or the Muslim communities. The Expert notes that, as opposed to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, the word association in Article 3.2.2.4 is not preceded by the adjective “strong”. As a consequence, in the Expert’s opinion, the threshold is lower for the purposes of Article 3.2.2.4 than for Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook.

44. The question of whether the Halal or Muslim communities are “clearly delineated” will be dealt with in section V.B below. For the time being and for the sake of argument, the Expert will assume that they are clearly delineated communities, an assumption that will be confirmed below (see ¶¶ 63-76 below).

45. Each Party places a great deal of emphasis on its association or relationship with the relevant community. In a few words, the Objector claims to represent a number of Muslim countries and to have been invited by the OIC to file the Objection whereas the Respondent sustains that the Objector is acting solely on behalf of the Muslims of the UAE and that, on the contrary, the Respondent’s position is the one endorsed by the OIC though one of its affiliates (i.e., ICRIC). Additionally, the Respondent asserts that the Objector provides domestic technical functions with no relevance whatsoever to the relevant community.

46. In the Expert’s view, the threshold requires a “relationship” or an “association” with a clearly delineated community but does not require an objector – for the purpose of establishing standing – to represent a substantial portion, not to mention the majority, of the members of such community. Therefore, the discussion regarding whether the Objector represents a wider Muslim or Halal community than the one circumscribed to the UAE is irrelevant for the purpose of analyzing the Objector’s standing. The important question is

37 Id.

38 According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, there should be “a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string”. Emphasis added.
whether the “relationship” or “association” between the Objector and UAE’s Halal or Muslim community in fact exists.

47. A few issues should be taken into consideration. First, under public international law, the government of a nation is entitled to represent the interests of its constituents. Second, it has been established that the Objector is a governmental entity with certain functions and powers.39 Among these functions and powers, the Objector has been charged with registering and managing the UAE’s country code top-level domains (ccTLD).40 For these reasons, the Objector is undoubtedly a relevant governmental agency to represent the people of the UAE in proceedings dealing with the registration of domain names, including the String.

48. Indeed, the Objector provides services to the people of the UAE, a country with a population of 4.7 million (as of 2010).41 There is no doubt that the UAE is a Muslim country. This is evidenced by its membership to the OIC and Article 7 of the UAE’s Constitution:

Islam is the official religion of the Union. The Islamic Shari’ah shall be a main source of legislation in the Union.
The official language of the Union is Arabic.42

49. The telecommunication services provided by the Objector in the UAE certainly benefit the people of the UAE, including its Muslim community. For this reason, the Expert is of the view that there is a relationship with the Muslim community. As a result, in the Expert’s opinion, two of the factors listed in the relevant subsection of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook are satisfied:

- “Institutional purpose related to the benefit of the associated community”; and
- “Performance of regular activities that benefit the associated community”.

39 See ¶¶ 38-42, supra. See also Telecom Law, Article 13.
40 Annex 1 to the Response.
41 Annex 3 to the Response.
42 See Constitution of the UAE at http://www.refworld.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/nwmain?page=category&category=LEGAL&publisher=type=coi=ARE&docid=48eca8132&skip =0. See also Annex 4 to the Response (map showing demographics of Islam at p. 19) and Annex 1 to the Rejoinder.
50. In addition, the Expert is convinced that the Objector takes a leadership role in matters related to domain names within the territory of the UAE, which is part of another factor listed in the same subsection of the Guidebook.\textsuperscript{43} Hence, the Expert finds that three out of four factors of the relevant subsection of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook favor the Objector’s position.

51. In sum, in the Expert’s view, the Objector can be considered an established institution with an ongoing relationship with the Muslim community in the UAE. In section V.B below, the Expert will analyze whether the relevant community is “clearly delineated” for the purpose of this community objection.

V. **SUBSTANCE OF THE OBJECTION**

52. In this section, the Expert will consider the substance of the Objector’s community objection. First, the Expert will set the applicable standard. Thereafter, the Expert will analyze the Parties’ submissions point by point and will reach a number of conclusions.

A. **Standard**

53. Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook establishes the four tests that enable the Expert to “determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted”. Article 3.5.4 expresses the four tests as follows:

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

\textsuperscript{43} Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4 (“The presence of mechanisms for participation in activities, membership, and leadership”).
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• 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.\textsuperscript{44}

54. The Expert notes that each one of the four tests transcribed is separated by the term “and”, which implies that each one of them must be met in order to sustain an objection. This is further confirmed by the last sentence of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, which states that “[t]he objector must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to prevail”. This leaves no room for interpretation and evidences the high threshold that a community objection must satisfy.

55. The Expert observes that the Guidebook provides some explanation of the above-transcribed four tests. For each test, the Guidebook lists some “factors” to steer the Expert’s judgment. However, as with the factors relating to the standing discussed in ¶¶ 35-36 above, the language of the factors relating to each of the four tests is open. In particular, all factors set forth in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook are introduced with an optional language, such as “a panel could balance a number of factors to determine this” or “[f]actors that could be balanced by a panel to determine this include”. Once again, this proves the mere orientative nature of these factors.

56. Additionally, in all instances the Guidebook mentions that the factors included therein are not exhaustive (\textit{i.e.}, the Guidebook uses language in the fashion of “including but limited to” or “include but are not limited to”). Therefore, the Expert may weigh other factors if considered appropriate.

B. \textbf{Is the Community Invoked by the Objector Clearly Defined?}

(a) \textbf{Objector’s Position}

57. The Objector sustains that the “notion of ‘community’ is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s guidebook for the new gTLD program”.\textsuperscript{45} For the Objector, such notion “can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethnical,
religious, linguistic or similar community’. In short, the Objector argues that a “community is a group of individuals who have something in common . . . or share common values. . . .”

58. Hence, the notion of community includes the world’s total number of Muslims, which the Objector claims to be 1.4 to 1.6 billion people. For the Objector, these Muslims are adherent to Islam and share common religious values and interests. As a result, they form a clearly delineated community.

(b) Respondent’s Position

59. The Respondent’s argument begins with the following caveat:

While Applicant would concede that the .Halal TLD is targeted generally to persons striving to live a Halal lifestyle, product manufacturers and product certification agencies throughout the globe, it will prove that there is no delineated community of global Halal individuals, there is no substantial opposition to the applications, and there is no likelihood of material detriment to anyone.

60. The Respondent quotes the factors set forth in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Community” subsection) to support the position that “[t]here are no formal boundaries around who can claim faith in Islam or strive to live a Halal lifestyle” and adds that “Islam is a religion open to anyone.”

61. The Respondent then draws a distinction between Catholicism and Islam in an attempt to evidence that there is no global hierarchy in Islam, mainly because there are different branches of Islam. Additionally, the Respondent points out that nobody “can

---
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47 Id.
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50 Id., pp. 7-8.
claim to speak for all Muslims, or all Halal individuals, or even a majority of them, particularly on such a topic as new gTLD applications”.53

62. For these reasons, the Respondent concludes that the global Halal community is not “clearly delineated”.54

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

63. The subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook regulating the issue at bar provides that “[t]he objector must prove that the community expressing opposition can be regarded as a clearly delineated community”. The same subsection expresses that “[i]f 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”. Therefore, the threshold for this test is not whether a great number of people or entities oppose, as the Objector appears to suggest, but rather whether the community may in fact be clearly delineated.

64. Both the Objector and the Respondent concede that the world’s total population of Muslims is around 1.6 billion.55 This figure is confirmed by the Wikipedia articles submitted by Respondent.56

65. The Expert finds that Muslims in general – regardless of the different branches of Islam – form a large group of individuals which share at least certain core values. Support for this consensus is found in a document submitted by Respondent, which evidences that all Muslims share at least the Five Pillars of Islam:

The Pillars of Islam (arkan al-Islam; also arkan ad-din, “pillars of religion”) are five basic acts in Islam, considered obligatory for all believers. The Quran presents them as a framework for worship and a sign of commitment to the faith. They are (1) the shahadah (creed), (2) daily prayers (salat), (3) almsgiving (zakah), (4) fasting during Ramadan

53 Id., p. 8.
54 Id.
55 Objection, p. 6 (“All over the world there are approximately 50 countries having Muslim-majority. With over 1.4 to 1.6 billion followers amounting to approximately 25% of the earth’s population, Islam is the second-largest and one of the fastest-growing religions in the world.”); Response, p. 5 (“Whereas there were an estimated 1.57 billion Muslims in the world as of 2009. (Annex 4, Wikipedia article, p. 19.”).
and (5) the pilgrimage to Mecca (hajj) at least once in a lifetime. The Shia and Sunni sects both agree on the essential details for the performance of these acts.\textsuperscript{57}

66. The Respondent agrees with the Expert in this regard, as evidenced in its application for the String (“[Muslims] are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core belief”).\textsuperscript{58} The Objector has also recognized that all branches of Islam share certain common beliefs.\textsuperscript{59} In view of the above, the Expert has no hesitation in finding that all Muslims, regardless of the branch of their faith, form a large, clearly delineated community of approximately 1.6 billion people.

67. The Objector argues that the word “Halal” is a “term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law”.\textsuperscript{60} The Objector adds that “[t]he term is used to designate food or actions deemed permissible according to Islamic law”, as well as “certain procedures [that] need[ ] to be followed for certain types of food to be permissible to be eaten (i.e. halal food)”.\textsuperscript{61} Notably, the Respondent used the same language in its application for the String.\textsuperscript{62} Although neither Party provided the source of their meaning of Halal, the Expert has found that the wording is strikingly similar to the language used in a Wikipedia article regarding Halal.\textsuperscript{63} The following chart compares the wording in Respondent’s application with both the Objection and the aforementioned Wikipedia article:

\textsuperscript{57} Annex 4 to the Response, p. 6 (emphasis added, footnotes omitted).
\textsuperscript{58} Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a).
\textsuperscript{59} Reply, p. 1 (“Though all the Islamic groups share main common beliefs such as the reality of one God (Allah) and the existence of angels of Allah … etc.”).
\textsuperscript{60} Objection, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{61} Id.
\textsuperscript{62} Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Wikipedia Article Re. “Halal”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Halal (Arabic: حلال, ‘lawful’) is a term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law. The term is used to designate food seen as permissible according to Islamic law. The terms Halal (sic) is also applied to many other facets of life; and one of the most common uses of these term is in reference to meat products, food contact materials, and pharmaceuticals. In Islam there are many things that must clearly be defined as halal” 64</td>
<td>“The word Halal (Arabic: حلال, ‘permissible’) is a term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law. The term is used to designate food or actions deemed permissible according to Islamic law. The opposite of this word is haraam (forbidden). According to Islam, there are certain food types that are not permissible to be eaten. Further, certain procedures needs (sic) to be followed for certain types of food to be permissible to be eaten (i.e. halal food)” 65</td>
<td>“Halal (Arabic: حلال, ‘permissible’) is a term designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in, according to Islamic law. The term is used to designate food seen as permissible according to Islamic law. The opposite of this word is haraam. Halal foods are foods that Muslims are allowed to eat under Islamic Shari’ah. The criteria specify both what foods are allowed, and how the food must be prepared. The foods addressed are mostly types of meat and animal tissue” 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Therefore, both the Objector and the Respondent are in agreement that Halal is a key aspect of a Muslim’s behavior.

69. The same conclusion is supported by other materials in the record. For instance, the Respondent expressly states in its Response that “ICRJC operates the only Halal certification body to be recognised by all Islamic countries, HalalWorld...” 67 In the description of HalalWorld submitted by Respondent, such organization describes the Halal lifestyle as follows:

As Islam has programs for controlling human being social life in the political, economic and intellectual arena; it has considered a number of plans and programs for his personal life which is to observe the criteria of “Halal”, including eating, drinking, dressing, job functions and applied means and tools in his life. Each should be secured by the seal of Halal on the basis of Islamic Shariah.

---

64 Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a).
65 Objection, p. 5.
67 Response, p. 6 (citing Annex 7 to the Response).
Islamic community has safeguarded such independent system and regulated a special life according to such principles which is rooted in the divine inspiration within the human community during 15 centuries . . .

70. In Annex 7 to the Response, there is a brochure entitled “The Guideline of the Principles of OIC Halal Services” referring to many different areas, which evidences that the Halal lifestyle is beyond dietary restrictions and covers all areas of a Muslim’s behavior: (i) the Principles of the Halal Standard in Hotels; (ii) the Principles of Halal Standard in Banks and Financial Organizations; (iii) the Principles of Halal Standard in Transportation Services; (iv) the Principles of Halal Standard in IT Services and Media; (v) the Principles of Halal Standard for Tourism; (vi) the Principles of Halal Standard in Public Trade and Business; (vii) the Principles of Halal Standard in Clothes; (viii) the Principles of Halal Standard for Sport and Amusement Services. The Respondent is consistent with this in its application for the String: “The concept of Halal has slowly become accepted as a consumer lifestyle choice encompassing not only religious practices and food, but also finance, non-food products and logistics”.

71. Yet, in another document submitted by the Respondent, it is evidenced that the objectives of ICRIC include “[t]o research, develop and collect information about the Halal issues in Muslim and non-Muslim countries and supporting and cooperating with the Halal centers in the world”. In this report, ICRIC describes the size of the market in which Halal products trade as follows:

Around 2 billion of the Muslim populations who live in the world whether concentrated or dispersed have created economic exigencies including trading Halal products and services “whose global annual volume is estimated around US $ 200 billion. The vast market of food stuff has required the producers to stamp their products with Halal

---

70 Annex 13 to Response, section 18(a).
Certificate in order to distinguish their goods among other products in the market. . . .72

72. Notably, ICRIC makes no distinction as to the branches of Islam and includes all Muslims within the potential market of Halal products. Additionally, ICRIC makes reference to a “Halal magazine” and “Halal forums” – which clearly are targeted at Muslims following the Halal lifestyle – and even describes some sort of “Muslim tourism” which “is under the influence of certain cultural aspects such as Halal food in hotels and restaurants”.73

73. The Expert has found no evidence in the Parties’ submissions that the Halal lifestyle is followed outside Islam. In fact, the Respondent said quite the opposite in its application for the String: “The common understanding of Halal is still limited to religious needs and only applicable to Muslims”.74 For this reason, the Respondent expressly recognized that the String will be “targeted” to the “global Muslim community”.75 Therefore, even the Respondent acknowledges that the String will affect the Muslim community exclusively.

74. In light of the foregoing, the Expert finds that the Halal lifestyle is deeply-rooted in Islam and consists of a pattern of behavior that any Muslim should observe. It follows that Halal lifestyle is not limited to dietary restrictions and, on the contrary, applies to many facets of a Muslim’s daily life. Though presumably not all Muslims strictly follow the Halal lifestyle, in the Expert opinion, it would be wrong to divorce the Halal community from the Muslim community. In ¶ 66 above, the Expert found that the Muslim community is clearly delineated.

75. As a final check, the above discussion supports the conclusion that all factors included in Article 3.5.4 of Guidebook (“Community” subsection) are fulfilled:
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72 Id.
73 Id., pp. 52-53.
74 Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a) (emphasis added).
75 Response, p. 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Compliance with Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of public recognition of the group as a community at a local and/or global level.</td>
<td>Yes. Islam enjoys global recognition and is the second-largest religion in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of formal boundaries around the community and what persons or entities are considered to form the community.</td>
<td>Yes. Although there are different branches of Islam, all branches share the same core principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of time the community has been in existence.</td>
<td>Yes. Islam was founded around approximately 1400 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The global distribution of the community (this may not apply if the community is territorial).</td>
<td>Yes. Islam is widespread across the world, with special emphasis in certain areas of the globe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people or entities that make up the community.</td>
<td>Yes. The community is formed of approximately 1.6 billion individuals, of which most appear to follow the Halal lifestyle to some extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. In light of the foregoing, the Expert concludes that the community invoked by the Objector is clearly delineated.

C. Is the Community Opposition to the Application Substantial?

(a) Objector’s Position

77. The Objector sustains that “[a] substantial portion of the Muslim community is opposing the string .HALAL.” Without providing documentary evidence in the Objection, the Objector mentions that most of the nearly seventy comments regarding Respondent’s application for the String are against its registration. In addition, the Objector states that there have been early warnings from the UAE and India, together with expressions of concern by the Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) of the

---

77 Id., p. 6.
78 See Annex 4 to the Response, p. 11; Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a).
80 Id., p. 1; Annex 1 to the Rejoinder, p. 1.
81 Objection, p. 6 (emphasis omitted).
82 Id., pp. 6-7.
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Objector does not provide any evidence in support of such allegations.

78. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the Objector submitted together with the Reply letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman and Turkey, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council.  

79. The Objector also claims to have the support of the OIC. In this regard, the Objector heavily relies on the OIC’s Letter, which claims to be an “invitation” from the OIC urging all its members to oppose and act against the registration of the String. For the Objector, the OIC “is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensures to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various people of the world”.

80. In addition, the Objector submitted with the Reply a draft resolution of the OIC (to be voted in November 2013) pursuant to which the OIC will presumably oppose the registration of the String by the Respondent.

81. Per the Expert’s request in Procedural Order No. 2, the Objector explained in the Reply the relation between the OIC and both ICRIC and HalalWorld (because, as discussed below, the Respondent claims that the latter two institutions support its position). As to ICRIC, the Objector sustains that “no ‘subsidiary’ or even ‘affiliation’ relation ever existed between OIC and ICRIC”. The Objector mentions that ICRIC neither appears listed as a subsidiary or affiliate of the OIC in the latter’s official website nor is there a link to ICRIC included in the section “OIC Organs and Institutions” of such webpage. Further, the Objector sustains that ICRIC’s website does not introduce the organization as an affiliate of the OIC, but rather merely mentions that ICRIC was “established through a
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83 Id., p. 7.
84 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-7 and 9 to the Reply. The letter of support from Kuwait is duplicated (see Annexes 3 and 9 to the Reply).
85 Objection, pp. 4, 7. As noted, this “invitation” has been provided as Annex 1 to the Objection (in English) and as Annex (without number) to the Rejoinder (in both French and Arabic).
86 Objection, p. 4.
87 Annex 8 to the Reply.
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89 Id. See Annexes 10-12 to the Reply.
Memorandum of Understanding between [the Islamic Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (ICCIA)] and the Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines. . . .”90 The Objector recognizes that ICCIA “is an affiliate organ of the OIC and represents the private sector of 57 member countries”.91 For the Objector, the fact that ICRIC was established through a Memorandum of Understanding between an affiliate of the OIC and a national chamber of commerce does not make ICRIC an affiliate of OIC and does not place ICRIC under OIC’s umbrella.92 On the contrary, for the Objector, ICRIC is an organization closely related to Iran.93

82. As to HalalWorld, the Objector sustains that it is nothing more than an affiliate of ICRIC with no connection with OIC.94 For the Objector, neither the OIC nor the Islamic countries have entrusted HalalWorld with the task of issuing Halal certifications.95 Instead, there are many Halal certification bodies and the requirements for Halal food labeling vary from one country to another (which may differ from HalalWorld’s standards).96

83. For these reasons, the Objector claims to represent a substantial portion of the relevant community.

(b) Respondent’s Position

84. The Respondent, on its part, relies on the language of the Guidebook to support its position.97 First, the Respondent alleges to have presented “voluminous evidence and documented support from many community leaders and leadership organizations”, as well as a letter from the Ministry of ICT of Iran (Information Technology Organization), in support of its application for the String.98 These documents have been provided as Annexes 6 though 9 to the Response and Annexes 2 through 4 to the
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90 Reply, p. 2 (emphasis omitted). See Annex 14 to the Reply. ICCA was formerly known as “ICCI”. Both Parties agree on this point. See Reply p. 2 and Rejoinder, p. 2.
91 Reply, p. 2.
92 Id.
93 Id.
94 Id.
95 Id. See Annex 17 to the Reply.
96 Id. Reply, p. 2.
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98 Id.; Annex 4 to the Rejoinder.
Rejoinder. The Respondent argues that support for its application generally comes from the following categories of entities:

1. Major Organizations / Associations / Leaders representing Muslim populations throughout the world -- from Belarus to Brazil, such as the ICRIC, HalalWorld, The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought, and the ECO Cultural Institute.

2. Islamic Institutes / NGOs in Muslim Countries -- some 17 of them, such as Islamic Unity Magazine, and The Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal, and Brasil Halal Foods.

3. Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic people -- three well-respected academics.

4. Newspapers / Media / Publications – eleven different popular media outlets.99

85. Among the letters of support, the Respondent argues that the most relevant entity within the OIC – ICRIC – has fully endorsed the Respondent’s new gTLD application.100 In this regard, the Respondent has furnished a letter of support to its application signed by ICRIC’s President.101 Therefore, “by logical extension, the [Objector] effectively admits that a majority of the global Halal community supports the Applicant”.102 In addition, the Respondent claims to have furnished a positive letter from HalalWorld, a widespread Halal certification body operated by ICRIC.103

86. Pursuant to the Expert’s instructions in Procedural Order No. 2, the Respondent further explained in the Rejoinder the relation between the OIC and both ICRIC and HalalWorld. The Respondent places emphasis on the fact that ICRIC was established via a Memorandum of Understanding between ICCIA – an affiliate of OIC – and a local chamber of commerce in order to evidence ICRIC’s affiliation with the OIC.104 In addition, the Respondent points out that ICCIA’s Secretary General is a Vice Chairman of
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100 Id., pp. 6, 8.
101 Annex 6 to the Response.
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103 Id., p. 6. The letter of support from HalalWorld is included in Annex 7 to the Response.
104 Rejoinder, p. 2. As mentioned earlier, ICCA was formerly known as “ICCI”. Both Parties agree on this point. See id. and Reply p. 2.
ICRIC and that ICRIC’s Board Members are appointed by ICCIA.\footnote{Rejoinder, p. 2 (citing Annex 6 to the Response, p. 7).} As to HalalWorld, the Respondent first mentions that ICRIC operates HalalWorld.\footnote{Id.} Then, citing Annex 17 to the Reply, the Respondent claims that HalalWorld’s “mandate stems from the OIC adoption of Halal Food Standards”.\footnote{Id.}  

87. Second, for the Respondent, the Objector refers in its Objection to nearly seventy “unspecified public comments”, which are “unsupported with evidence of [the] same”.\footnote{Response, p. 9.} For this reason, the Respondent argues that the Expert should disregard such comments.\footnote{Id.}

88. Third, the Respondent points out that neither India nor the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia – or anyone else besides the Objector – has filed objections to Respondent’s application.\footnote{Id., pp. 8-9.} The Respondent adds that only one of the 57 members of the OIC – namely, the UAE – has formally filed a community objection through the Objector, which would clearly indicate the lack of support for the Objection from the OIC.\footnote{Id., p. 9.}

89. In the Rejoinder, the Respondent argues that Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Turkey and the Gulf Cooperation Council, all of which have submitted letters of support to UAE’s objection, amount to a “small fraction of the global Muslim population”.\footnote{Rejoinder, p. 1. Surprisingly, the Respondent omits that Egypt also filed a letter of support to the Objector’s position (see Annex 1 to the Reply). However, the Expert considers this omission a \textit{bona fide} error and not an attempt to mislead.} The Respondent argues that all these countries represent around 80 million Muslims, which cannot be deemed “substantial opposition”.\footnote{Id. (citing Annex 1 to the Rejoinder).} Citing a Wikipedia article, the Respondent sustains that all these countries combined have around the population of Iran (a country...
allegedly supporting the Respondent’s application). In addition, for the Respondent, many Muslims live in non-OIC countries.

90. Moreover, the Respondent points out that the OIC is composed of 57 members and these 6 countries only amount to 10% of the OIC member countries (or 5% of the Global Muslim population).

91. Finally, as to the OIC’s draft resolution submitted with the Reply, the Respondent elaborates a few arguments. For the Respondent, such draft is yet to be voted. In this regard, the Respondent points out that the OIC will presumably not reach a consensus. For this reason, a vote will be taken with no guarantees that the draft resolution will eventually be approved.

92. In sum, for the Respondent, the Objection should fail because the Objector has failed to evidence substantial opposition to Respondent’s application.

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

93. According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Substantial Opposition” subsection), “[t]he objector must prove substantial opposition within the community it has identified itself as representing”. The key element of this provision is “substantial opposition”. For this reason, quite unsurprisingly, the Guidebook concludes the same subsection by stating that, “[i]f some opposition within the community is determined, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection will fail”.

94. The Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the OIC is a political organization and not a religious one. However, the OIC is the second largest international organization after the United Nations, and among OIC’s objectives is “[t]o disseminate, promote and preserve the Islamic teachings and values based on moderation
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and tolerance, promote Islamic culture and safeguard Islamic heritage”. Therefore, the Expert agrees with the Objector that the OIC is a valid speaker for the world’s Muslim population.

95. The first question presented to the Expert is whether the OIC has urged its members to file an objection to Respondent’s application or has simply invited its members to review such application and act if necessary.

96. Article 38 of the Charter of the OIC states that the “[l]anguages of the Organisation shall be Arabic, English and French”. This Article does not establish that any language should prevail over the others and thus all of them are equally valid. As a consequence, if the versions of the OIC’s Letter written in two official languages are identical, but differ from the one written in a third official language, the former versions should prevail over the latter one.

97. The Expert will now turn to analyze the versions of the OIC’s Letter written in the three official languages. At the outset, the Expert notes that the English and French versions of the OIC’s Letter are identical. As a result, regardless of the wording of the Arabic version, the language of the English and French versions must control the Expert’s findings. The English and French versions of OIC’s Letter say:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The OIC would like to draw the attention to the fact that new applications were already submitted for new gTLDs and these new applications are being evaluated according to the consensus-based mechanism determined by ICANN. The period for submitting any objections, if any, has been expanded until 13th March 2013 for any group and/or community that holds objection on religious or ethical values. The OIC Member States may kindly like to avail of this opportunity to act quickly through their representation in the organs of the ICANN, to avoid any misuse and misrepresentation of gTLDs of concern to them, including the ones like .ISLAM or .HALAL.&quot; ¹²⁴</td>
<td>&quot;L’OIC voudrait attirer l’attention sur le fait que de nouvelles demandes ont déjà été soumises pour les nouveaux gTLD et ces nouvelles demandes sont en cours d’évaluation selon mécanisme de consensus établi par l’ICANN. Le délai pour la présentation d’éventuelles objections a été étendu jusqu’au 13 Mars 2013 pour tous les groupes et / ou communautés qui ont une objection sur des valeurs religieuses ou éthiques. Les États membres de l’OIC peuvent bien profiter de cette occasion pour agir rapidement à travers leur représentation dans les organes de l’ICANN, afin d’éviter toute utilisation abusive et fausse déclaration de gTLD qui les concernent, y compris celles comme : .ISLAM ou .HALAL.&quot; ¹²⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. After a careful review of the transcribed passage, the Expert concludes that the OIC directed its members to review Respondent’s application and, in case of concern, act through their representation in the organs of the ICANN. Ergo, the OIC neither endorsed nor opposed Respondent’s application and certainly did not openly instruct its members to file an objection thereto. Hence, the Expert is of the opinion that the OIC’s letter is not a statement of policy against Respondent’s application.

99. As a result of the above, there would be no need to analyze the Arabic version. However, for the sake of completeness, the Expert will briefly look into the Arabic version of the OIC’s Letter, which is slightly different to the other two. The literal translation into English of the relevant portion of the Arabic version is:

The OIC member States should seize this important opportunity to act quickly against any party that wishes to own the gTLDs that end with (.ISLAM) or (.HALAL). And encourages the member States to file within the time limit specified their objections, if any, to prevent any company or private institution from buying or registering the gTLD (.ISLAM) or (.HALAL) to avoid any complications that

¹²⁴ Emphasis added.
¹²⁵ Emphasis added.
could lead to any disputes or the misuse of these gTLDs.\textsuperscript{126}

100. This language is clearly stronger than the English and French versions. However, by including the underlined words “if any”, the Expert finds that the OIC left to the member States the ultimate decision of filing an objection or not. Hence, the OIC anticipated that no objections may be filed by the member States should none of them chose to do so. This may be indicative of the intention behind this version of the letter, but the drafting could have easily been less ambiguous. In any case, a detailed discussion and analysis of this wording is irrelevant, as the Expert has already found that the English and French versions of the OIC Letter shall prevail.

101. As to OIC’s draft resolution submitted with the Reply, two points should be addressed in this Expert Determination. First, the Expert is of the opinion that it is a mere draft with no binding power. In this regard, the Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the approval of OIC’s draft resolution is yet to be seen.\textsuperscript{127} The resolution may not be adopted by a unanimous vote because it may find the opposition of at least Iran.\textsuperscript{128} Since the Objector has not furnished letters of support from the necessary majority of OIC’s members to pass such resolution, it has not evidenced with any certainty that such resolution will be passed. Second, OIC’s draft resolution refers to a report from OIC’s General Secretariat on the matter which has not been submitted to the Expert by either Party.\textsuperscript{129} Without such report, the Expert cannot assess the recommendation of OIC’s General Secretariat to its member States on the position they should take when voting the OIC’s draft resolution. For these reasons, it remains unclear whether OIC’s draft resolution will finally be approved.

102. The Respondent has provided letters of support from ICRIC and HalalWorld.\textsuperscript{130} The Parties disagree as to their relationship with the OIC but both Parties agree that ICRIC was established by a Memorandum of Understanding between ICCIA –

\textsuperscript{126} The Expert sought an independent translation of this passage from another member of his firm. Emphasis added.
\textsuperscript{127} Rejoinder, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{128} Id.; Annex 4 to the Rejoinder.
\textsuperscript{129} Annex 8 to the Reply.
\textsuperscript{130} Annexes 6 and 7 to the Response.
an affiliate of OIC – and a local chamber of commerce.\textsuperscript{131} In the Expert’s opinion, the Respondent has failed to evidence that ICRIC is a subsidiary, an affiliate or is otherwise under the umbrella of the OIC. This is also confirmed by the fact that nowhere does the OIC refer to ICRIC as a subsidiary or an affiliate thereof. Nor does ICRIC hold itself out as a subsidiary or an affiliate of the OIC. On its part, HalalWorld is a mere affiliate of ICRIC and, for the same reasons, it cannot be considered as a subsidiary or an affiliate of the OIC.

103. In light of the foregoing, it has not been established whether the OIC favors or disfavors the Respondent’s application for the String. Consequently, the Expert is of the opinion that the OIC remains neutral as to the registration of the String by the Respondent.

104. Notably, the OIC itself has not filed an objection. Dr. Alain Pellet, the Independent Objector, expressed in a report discussed by both Parties that

\begin{quote}
In the present case, the [Independent Objector] is of the opinion that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is an established institution representing and associated with a significant part of the targeted community. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is already fully aware of the controversial issues and is better placed than the IO to file an objection, if it deems it appropriate.\textsuperscript{132}
\end{quote}

105. In our case, as it is plainly evident, the OIC did not deem it appropriate to file a community objection itself. In the Expert’s opinion, this is a confirmation of OIC’s neutrality in this matter.

106. On a separate note, the Respondent places great emphasis on the number of letters of support to its position from individuals and organizations. However, regardless of the level of endorsement to Respondent’s application, the ultimate test under the Guidebook is whether there is substantial opposition and not whether there is a substantial

\textsuperscript{131} At the time, ICCIA was known as ICCI.

\textsuperscript{132} Annex 12 to the Response, last paragraph (emphasis added). Although this report relates to the “Islam” string, the Expert agrees that some of its conclusions may be extended to the String. The Independent Objector may file objections against “highly objectionable” gTLD applications to which no objection has been filed. The Independent Objector is limited to filing two types of objections: (i) Limited Public Interest objections and (ii) Community objections. The Independent Objector acts solely in the best interests of the public who use the global Internet. \textit{See Article 3.2.5} of the Guidebook.
level of support. Therefore, the Expert will focus exclusively on the letters of support to the Objector’s position.

107. The Expert observes that only the Objector has filed an objection against Respondent’s application. No other individual, organization or country – whether member of the OIC or not – has opposed Respondent’s application within ICANN’s relevant channel.

108. Some countries – such as India and Saudi Arabia – inquired about Respondent’s application and raised some early concerns in this regard. However, since such countries neither filed a separate objection nor subscribed that of the Objector, the Expert can draw the conclusion that they finally did not officially back a community objection to Respondent’s application. In fact, in Procedural Order No. 2 the Objector was instructed to submit additional letters of support but did not submit letters from these two countries. This is highly indicative of their lack of official support to the Objector’s community objection.

109. The Objector filed with the Reply letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman and Turkey, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council. The Gulf Cooperation Council is composed of the UAE, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar and Kuwait. Therefore, the Gulf Cooperation Council would only add to the list of supporting countries, at best, Saudi Arabia. However, the Expert has previously found in ¶ 108 above that the opposition of Saudi Arabia has not been evidenced. Consequently, the Objector has only evidenced support from 7 countries (including itself and excluding Saudi Arabia) out of a total of 57 which form the OIC.

110. Furthermore, the Objector has referred to nearly seventy comments to Respondent’s application of which, allegedly, the majority are against such application. However, no evidence of such comments has been provided to the Expert and thus the Objector has failed to meet its burden of proof in this regard.

133 Objection, pp. 6-7; Annexes 10 and 11 to the Response.
134 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-7 and 9 to the Reply.
135 See www.gcc-sg.org/eng/. See also Annex 7 to the Reply.
111. In accordance with the foregoing, the Expert finds that the “[n]umber of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the community”, which is the first factor in the “substantial opposition” subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, favors Respondent’s position.

112. The same is true for the second factor listed in the same subsection of the Guidebook. More precisely, the Guidebook finds relevant “[t]he representative nature of entities expressing opposition”. As has been evidenced, the Objector cannot speak for the OIC or any other member thereof. At best, the Objector could speak for the citizens of the UAE and the other 6 supporting countries only. There are around 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide, but the total Muslim population of the 7 opposing countries is 165 million, representing roughly 10.3% of the Muslims of the world. In the Expert’s opinion, this is not a substantial portion of the Muslims around the world for the purposes of sustaining a community objection. Therefore, the Expert finds that this factor favors the Respondent.

113. As to the “[l]evel of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition”, which is the third factor listed in the Guidebook, the Expert wishes not to minimize the authority of the Objector. However, Article 13 of the Telecom Law generally circumscribes the Objector’s functions and power’s within the territory of the UAE. Therefore, the Expert finds that the Objector does not have sufficient international weight – without the support of a substantial number of Muslim countries or the OIC itself – to globally represent the interests of the Islamic community throughout the world. For the avoidance of doubt, for the reasons given in ¶ 112 above, the Expert is of the opinion that the other six supporting countries cannot be considered as a substantial number.

114. Finally, as to the factor related to costs incurred by the Objector in expressing opposition, no other costs have been evidenced besides those related to the Centre’s filing fee and request for deposit of the estimated costs. The Expert will also assume some costs related with the Objector’s legal representation in this proceeding. All these

---

137 Calculation made using data from Annex 1 to the Rejoinder.
138 Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Costs incurred by objector in expressing opposition, including other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition”).
139 See ¶ 13, supra.
costs do not appear to be excessive in relation to the potential impact of a decision affecting a community of around 1.6 billion people. Additionally, the Objector has furnished no evidence of pursuing any “other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition”. Thus, this factor disfavors the Objector.

115. The Expert does not need to consider any other factors and is confident in reaching the conclusion that there is opposition to Respondent’s application to some extent, but such opposition is not substantial. Accordingly, the Objection must fail.

D. Is there a Strong Association between the Applied-for gTLD and the Community Represented by the Objector?

(a) Objector’s Position

116. The Objector sustains that the applied-for gTLD explicitly targets the Islamic community. In this regard, the Objector quotes the following passage from the Respondent’s application:

There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. They are a group whose origins are found some 1400 years in the past, their ethnicity often inextricably linked with their faith. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .HALAL gTLD will change this.

117. For the Objector, the Respondent is a commercial entity which does not “represent the whole or even a majority of the worldwide Muslim community and is not an appropriate authority in Islamic law to give advice in relation to what is and what is not ‘Halal’ in accordance with Islamic law”. In addition, the Objector argues that the letters of support furnished by Respondent: (i) come from a minority of the Islamic population and represent less than 5% of the world’s total Muslims; (ii) do not include many of the

140 Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Substantial Opposition” subsection).
141 Objection, p. 7.
142 Id. (quoting Annex 13 to Response, section 18(a)).
143 Id.
144 Id.
branches of Islam; and (iii) are not signed by current officials of governments or of International Organizations (such as the OIC).

(b) Respondent’s Position

118. In page 7 of the Response, the Respondent lists the four tests contained in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook and thereafter analyzes them one-by-one, except for the one that requires “a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string”. The Expert takes note of this omission.

119. In addition, in the conclusion of the Response, the Respondent stresses that the Objector has failed to “prove standing or three of the four elements of a Community Objection”. The omitted fourth element seems to be the association between the applied-for gTLD and the community represented by the Objector.

120. This is confirmed by the Respondent in another section of the Response, where it expressly acknowledges that the Objector “does not represent the global Muslim community to which the .Halal TLD will be targeted”.

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

121. The Respondent appears not to dispute the association between the String and the community represented by the Objector. However, this does not prevent the Expert from analyzing the issue.

122. According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Targeting” subsection), “[t]he objector must prove a strong association between the applied-for gTLD string and the community represented by the objector”. The last sentence of such subsection stipulates that, “[i]f 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”.

123. In section V.B(c) above, the Expert found that the relevant community is clearly defined. The question now is whether the String has a “strong association” with such community. The first salient fact is the identity of the terms. Indeed, the String is

---

145 Response, pp. 7-12.
146 Id., p. 12 (emphasis added).
147 Id., p. 5 (emphasis added).
precisely the word “Halal”, which has been proven to be a Muslim lifestyle free of sin. It is patently clear that Muslims in general and, especially those that follow the Halal lifestyle, will be identified by the String.

124. According to the foregoing, the last factor listed in the corresponding subsection of the Guidebook is met (i.e., “[a]ssociations by the public”). It is hard to imagine any Muslim – or even anyone familiar with Islam – who will not associate the String with Islam.

125. Moreover, according to the corresponding subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, another factor that the Expert may analyze is the “[s]tatements contained in application”. The statements contained in the application are very clarifying in this regard. In addition to the passage quoted at ¶ 116 above, Respondent’s application contains many other references that unequivocally result in that the targeted audience is the Islamic community. First and foremost, the Respondent has expressly recognized that “[t]he common understanding of Halal is still limited to religious needs and only applicable to Muslims”.148 In other words, the Respondent does not hesitate to recognize that Halal is highly specific to the Islamic community. Second, the Respondent has recognized that it will implement a policy under which registrants for second-level domains must agree “that they are either of Muslim faith, or have a clear interest in ameliorating the community”.149 Hence, all second level domain-holders will either be Muslim or will pledge to improve the Muslim community.

126. Other instances of statements in Respondent’s application that support the conclusion that there is a strong association between the String and the Muslim community are:

- “A robust gTLD has the power to bring together Muslims across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. There is not a .COM or .ORG equivalent of .HALAL--a domain that has universal appeal across a common religion”.150

148 Annex 13 to Response, section 18(a) (emphasis added).
149 Id., section 18(b).
150 Id., section 18(a).
• “The benefits of the .HALAL gTLD will be manifold, not just to registrants but also to tens of millions of Muslim internet users, as well as many others with an interest in or curiosity regarding Islam”.151

• “As it is rolled out, the .HALAL gTLD will rapidly develop as the gTLD of choice among Muslims in all countries. The demand for Islamic content from this group isn’t and won’t be satisfied by .COM or .ORG offerings within the current gTLDs and in fact has hampered collaboration and innovation. The Islamic people demand content that is tailored to their own unique needs and wants, under the umbrella of a dedicated gTLD”.152

• “The history of .COM will be of interest here, because .HALAL should grow quickly and face demand as high among the Muslim community as .COM has in the English-language online community”.153

127. Another factor contained in the “Targeting” subsection, namely the “[o]ther public statements by the applicant”, sheds light in this regard.154 In the Response, the Respondent explicitly acknowledges that the String will specifically target the Muslim community:

The ICRIC has provided a letter of support to the Applicant with respect to both the .Halal and .Islam TLDs. (Annex 6.) ICRIC operates the only Halal certification body to be recognised by all Islamic countries, HalalWorld, which provided a separate letter of support. (Annex 7.) This is a strong sign of support from this TLD’s target community.155

128. Elsewhere in the Response, the Respondent makes a similar concession when it states that the Objector “does not represent the global Muslim community to which the .Halal TLD will be targeted”.156 Additionally, the Respondent “concede[s] that the .Halal TLD is targeted generally to persons striving to live a Halal lifestyle”.157

129. The Respondent even provides letters of support from different Islamic organizations, including from organizations operating in the industry of Halal products

---

151 Id., section 18(b).
152 Id.
153 Id., section 18(c).
154 Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Targeting” subsection).
155 Response, p. 6.
156 Id., p. 5 (emphasis added).
157 Id., p. 7.
intended for Muslims. Therefore, the Respondent has conceded that the String will have effects in the Muslim community.

130. In sum, the Expert finds that there is a strong association between the String and the community represented by the Objector, which is the Muslim community.

E. Does the Application Create a Likelihood of Material Detriment?

(a) Objector’s Position

131. For the Objector, “there is clearly a level of certainty that [a] detrimental outcome will occur” because of the “obvious lack of community involvement and support” to Respondent’s application. The Objector explains that the obvious lack of support from the majority of the community will “most probably” result in that the String will “be dominated by a subgroup from the religion and will ignore the interests of the remaining majority”.

132. The Objector highlights that religion is an “extremely sensitive subject”. Since Islam includes different subgroups and sects, it would be very difficult to unite all of them under the same gTLD unless an organization that represents the community (or its majority) runs and supports said domain. For the Objector, the Respondent’s application fails to evidence any mechanisms that will effectively prevent abuses or misuses of the String, which is further exacerbated by the fact that the Respondent is not supported by the majority of the Muslim community. The Objector concludes that all this will result in damage to the reputation of the Muslim community.

(b) Respondent’s Position

133. The Respondent relies on the factors included in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Detriment” subsection). For the Respondent, the Objector “wholly fails to
provide any evidence by which the Applicant or the Panel could assess these factors". 166

The Respondent argues that the Objector mistakenly places emphasis on the lack of support and that it merely speculates on a possible dominance by a religious subgroup, which is totally unsupported because (i) Respondent has furnished substantial community support to its application; and (ii) allowing a dominance by a subgroup will make no sense from a business perspective. 167

134. Furthermore, the Respondent argues that it has repeatedly promised to operate the String “in the best interests of the community as a whole” and quotes its response to ICANN’s Government Advisory Committee’s Beijing Communiqué. 168 In such response, the Respondent pledged to implement measures “to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith or with a positive interest in the Muslim community” and expressed that it “will not tolerate radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith”. 169 The Respondent “will take immediate and severe action” if necessary and will establish “safeguards, keyword alerts, name selection polices, all governed by an Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections”. 170

135. The Respondent points out that it has drafted a “Governance Model for its TLDs”, 171 which led the Indian Government to withdraw its concerns about the String. 172 In addition, the Respondent explains that, as mentioned in the String application, it “will endeavor to the utmost in order to minimize the social costs to registrants of a .HALAL second-level domain”. 173 The Respondent highlights the adoption of a policy matrix and other recommendations, as well as a complaint resolution service, all of which are geared towards minimizing harm in TLDs. 174

166 Id. p. 10.
167 Id.
168 Id. (attached to the Response as Annex 11).
169 Id. (quoting Annex 11 to the Response).
170 Id. (quoting Annex 11 to the Response).
171 Annex 10 to the Response.
172 Response, p. 10.
173 Id., p. 11 (quoting Annex 13, section 18(c)).
174 Id.
136. The Respondent also explains that it has made a binding public interest commitment whereby certain requirements are imposed on the registry operator to foster transparency and to avoid misuses and abuses of the String.  

137. For the Respondent, all the above “documented efforts and intentions must outweigh [Objectors]’s rank speculation as to the applicant’s intentions”.  

138. On a separate note, the Respondent places strong emphasis on the fact that Dr. Alain Pellet, ICANN’s Independent Objector, “thoroughly reviewed the purported public opposition to the .Islam TLD, and found no basis for any objection”. For the Objector, Dr. Pellet’s conclusions – which favored the registration of “.Islam” – apply by extension to the String.  

139. Finally, the Respondent sustains that the “global Halal community is not dependent upon the DNS for its core activities”, which stands for “Domain Name System”, and that there “will be no damage to anyone, but instead the TLDs will operate to the benefit of the global Halal community”.  

(c) Expert’s Conclusion  

140. Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Detriment” subsection) requires that 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”. Notably, the Guidebook adds that “[a]n 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”.  

141. The Guidebook sets a high bar in order for the Expert to find any detriment:  

If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community

---

175 Id., pp. 11-12.  
176 Id., p. 12.  
177 Id., p. 10.  
178 Id., p. 12.
resulting from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD, the objection will fail. 179

142. In this case, as discussed in section V.C(c) above, there is some opposition from the community but such opposition is not substantial. The question now presented is the likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community. To reach an answer, the Expert will analyze the factors included in the relevant subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook.

143. The first factor in the Guidebook is:

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

144. The Expert finds particularly illustrating Dr. Pellet’s report to address this point. 180 Although this report is intended for the “Islam” application, some of his conclusions are applicable to the String. Dr. Pellet reviewed a number of binding and non-binding international instruments, both at global and regional levels, which deal with the freedom of religion. 181 The Expert notes that a common denominator of these instruments is the protection of freedom of religion and the freedom to manifest one’s religion. Of particular relevance is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948. Notably, the UAE has been a member of the United Nations since 1971. 182

145. As Dr. Pellet correctly mentions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights explicitly says:

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest

---

179 Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Detriment” subsection) (emphasis added).
180 A copy of this report is attached to the Response as Annex 12.
181 Annex 12 to the Response (Limited Public Interest Objection section, ¶¶ 5-10).
his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.\textsuperscript{183}

146. For the Expert, the registration of the String will contribute to promoting this objective, as it will become a vehicle for Muslims to express themselves and expand their faith across the world.

147. The possible damages asserted by the Objector, which have not been sufficiently evidenced, are outweighed by the necessity of promoting human rights, such as the freedom of religion and the opportunity for every individual to manifest its own religion. Therefore, this factor favors the Respondent.

148. The second factor in the Guidebook is:

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

149. The Objector has certainly not provided any evidence that the Respondent is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the Muslim community. On the contrary, the Respondent has promised to operate the String in a manner that will prevent “radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith”, and the Respondent “will take immediate and severe action against this should it occur”.\textsuperscript{184}

150. It has been evidenced that the Respondent intends to implement security measures to avoid the misuse or abuse of the String.\textsuperscript{185} In this regard, the Guidebook does

\textsuperscript{183} Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18 (emphasis added) (\textit{quoted} in Dr. Pellet’s report at Limited Public Interest Objection section, ¶ 6).
\textsuperscript{184} Annex 11 to the Response, p. 2. \textit{See also} Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(b) (“Equally, AGITSys will not tolerate radical content, nor will it tolerate content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promulgating either, and a black list will be created in an attempt to pre-empt any such attempts.”).
\textsuperscript{185} Annex 10 to the Response, pp. 13-18; Annex 2 to the Rejoinder, pp. 31-38; Annex 11 to the Response, p. 2; Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(b). Annex 10 to the Response relates to the “Islam” string, but the Respondent states that the “Halal” would virtually be the same. The Expert agrees that it would not be difficult to adapt this document to the “Halal” string. Further, the Respondent has furnished a new version of this document as Annex 2 to the Rejoinder which combines both “Halal” and “Islam”. \textit{See Annex 2 to the Rejoinder.}
not require that the measures be in place at this time, but rather that such measures be proposed (or an appearance of an intention to propose or implement them in the future).

151. Among these measures already proposed, the Respondent intends to:

- Design a multi stakeholder governing system (a/k/a “Policy Advisory Council), where Islamic governments, organizations and individuals will have representatives that will participate in the management of the String under direct supervision of a multinational Islamic organization or institute.\(^{186}\)
- Implement a strict policy under which not everyone will be eligible to apply for a second-level “.Halal” domain, but only those who meet certain requirements.\(^{187}\) Additionally, certain second-level domains will be restricted and all second-level domains will be subject to a policy of use.\(^{188}\)
- Impose penalties and suspensions upon violators of the user’s policy.\(^{189}\)
- Include one addendum to its Registry Agreement with ICANN whereby certain requirements will be imposed on the registry operator in order to promote transparency and avoid misuses or abuses.\(^{190}\)

152. In accordance with the above, the second factor favors the Respondent.

153. The third factor in the Guidebook is:

Interference with the core activities of the community that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string

154. The key language in this factor is “core activities”. In ¶ 65 above the Expert transcribed the five pillars or core principles of Islam. The Expert is of the opinion that the operation of the String will not, on its face, interfere with any of them. Nonetheless, as discussed above, the Respondent intends to implement policies and mechanisms to ensure that the integrity of Islam is preserved. Consequently, this factor favors the Respondent.

155. The fourth factor in the Guidebook is:

Dependence of the community represented by the objector on the DNS for its core activities

\(^{187}\) Annex 10 to the Response, pp. 16-17; Annex 2 to the Rejoinder, pp. 36-37.
\(^{189}\) Annex 10 to the Response, p. 18; Annex 2 to the Rejoinder, p. 38. See also Annex 13 to Response, section 18(b).
\(^{190}\) Response, pp. 11-12; Annex 14 to the Response.
156. The Respondent has stated that “[t]he global Halal community is not dependent upon the DNS for its core activities, namely practicing Islamic religion and living a Halal lifestyle”. The Objector has remained silent in this regard.

157. Islam originated around 1400 years ago, long before Internet was created. Therefore, the Islamic community is not dependent on the DNS. As a result, this factor favors the Respondent.

158. The fifth factor in the Guidebook is:

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

159. Neither of the Parties has argued a concrete or economic damage to the Islamic community. In fact, the Expert is of the opposite view. In line with ¶ 146 above, the Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the String may serve as a platform for the expansion of Halal products across the borders, which may be translated into increased profits for the participants in the Halal industry.

160. The sixth factor in the Guidebook is:

Level of certainty that alleged detrimental outcomes would occur

161. The Objector has not evidenced any immediate or imminent detriment. Rather, the Objector has speculated with some possible outcomes. In light of the foregoing, the Expert finds that the likeliness of detriment to the Islamic or Halal communities, though possible, is remote. As a consequence, this factor favors the Respondent.

162. In sum, the Expert concludes that the Objector has failed to prove the likelihood of any material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the Islamic community. For this reason, the Objection must fail.

191 Response, p. 12.
192 Annex 4 to the Response, p. 11.
193 Annex 18 to the Response, section 18(b).
VI.  **COSTS**

163. In accordance with Article 14(e) of the Procedure, the Centre shall refund to the prevailing party its advance payment of costs.

VII.  **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

164. Within the 45 day time-limit set forth in Article 21(a) of the Procedure, the Expert concludes as follows:

(i) the Objector has standing to file the Objection;
(ii) the community invoked by the Objector is clearly defined;
(iii) there is not substantial opposition from the community to Respondent’s application;
(iv) there is a strong association between the String and the community represented by the Objector;
(v) Respondent’s application does not create a likelihood of any material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the relevant community;
(vi) the Centre shall refund to the prevailing party its advance payment of costs; and
(vii) this Expert Determination shall be published in full.

165. For these reasons, the prevailing party is the Respondent and thus the Objection shall be dismissed.

VIII.  **DECISION**

166. For the above reasons and according to Article 21(d) of the Procedure, I hereby render the following Expert Determination:

(i) The Objection of the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates is dismissed;
(ii) Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. prevails; and
(iii) Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s advance payment of costs shall be refunded by the Centre to Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

* * * *
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix III</td>
<td>Means Appendix III to the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce, Schedule of expertise costs for proceedings under the new gTLD dispute resolution procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Means Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Means the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>Means Domain Name System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Means Bernardo M. Cremades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Determination</td>
<td>Means this expert determination rendered on October 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD</td>
<td>Means generic top level domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidebook</td>
<td>Means the gTLD Applicant Guidebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>Means Internet Corporation for Assigned Names &amp; Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Means International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Practice Note</td>
<td>Means the ICC Practice Note on the Administration of Cases under the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCIA</td>
<td>Means Islamic Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRIC</td>
<td>Means Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Means the community objection filed by the Objector against Respondent's application for the String on March 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objector</td>
<td>Means the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Means the Organization of Islamic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC’s Letter</td>
<td>Means the letter from the OIC dated January 29, 2013 (attached as Annex 1 to the Objection in English and as Annex 10 to the Reply in both Arabic and French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Means the Attachment to Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejoinder</td>
<td>Means the rejoinder to the Reply filed by the Respondent on August 12, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reply</strong></td>
<td>Means the reply to the Response filed by the Objector on August 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>Means Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Means the response to the Objection filed by the Respondent on May 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules</strong></td>
<td>Means the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>String</strong></td>
<td>Means the applied-for gTLD “.ISLAM” by the Applicant (Application No. 1-2130-23450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecom Law</strong></td>
<td>Means the UEA’s Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UAE</strong></td>
<td>Means the United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. This expert determination (the “Expert Determination”) is issued under the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “Rules”), supplemented by the ICC Practice Note on the Administration of Cases (the “ICC Practice Note”), and under the Attachment to Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”) of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”).

I. THE PARTIES AND THE EXPERT

A. Objector

2. The Objector is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Abdulrahman Almarzouqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>P.O.Box 26662, Sheikh Zayed Street, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Objector is represented herein by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Talal Abu Ghazaleh Legal Member to Talal Abu Ghazaleh Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Badr El-Dein Abdel Khalek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>A26 Smart Village, Km 28 Cairo/Alex DesertRoad, P.O.Box: 150 Smart Village 12577, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Cairo, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Objector has appointed its legal representative to receive all communications and notifications in the present proceeding.
### B. Respondent

5. The Respondent (also referred to as the Applicant) is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Mehdi Abbasnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Büyükdere Cad. Kırgülü Sk. Metrocity AVM, D Block, Floor 4, No.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>34394 Levent, Istanbul, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Respondent is represented herein by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rodenbaugh Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Rodenbaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>548 Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>San Francisco, California, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The Respondent has appointed its legal representative to receive all communications and notifications in the present proceeding.

### C. Expert

8. The Expert is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mr. Bernardo M. Cremades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>B. Cremades &amp; Asociados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Calle Goya 18 – Planta 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. APPLIED-FOR GTLD

9. The applied-for generic top level domain (“gTLD”) is “.ISLAM” (the “String”).

III. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

10. On March 13, 2013, the Objector filed a community objection against Respondent’s application for the String in accordance with Article 3.2.1 of the Guidebook and Article 2 of the Procedure (the “Objection”).

11. According to Article 3.2.1 of the Guidebook, a community objection is filed when “[t]here 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”.

12. Prior to filing the Objection, the Respondent had secured funding from the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names & Numbers (“ICANN”) to cover the objection filing fees and the advance payment costs payable to the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “Centre”).

13. On May 15, 2013, the Respondent filed a response disputing “both standing and grounds for the Objection” and “pray[ed] that it be dismissed” (the “Response”).

14. On June 12, 2013, the Chair of the Standing Committee of the Centre appointed Mr. Bernardo M. Cremades as Expert in accordance with Article 7 and Article 3(3) Appendix I of the Rules. On July 17, 2013, the Centre transferred the file to the Expert and confirmed in writing that: (i) the estimated costs had been paid in full by each Party; and (ii) the full constitution of the Expert Panel had taken effect as of that same day.

15. On July 18, 2013, the Expert issued Procedural Order No.1 directing both Parties to submit their views on certain procedural matters. The Parties replied on July 22, 2013. On July 23, 2013, the Expert issued Procedural Order No. 2 directing the Parties to submit additional evidence and allegations on very limited matters (Articles 17(a) and 18 in fine of the Procedure). The Expert also found that no hearing was necessary in this...

---

1 Objection, p. 3.
2 Email from ICANN to Mr. Abdulrahman Almarzouqi, dated March 12, 2013.
3 Response, p. 4.
4 Letter from the Centre to the Parties and Expert, dated July 17, 2013.
proceeding (Article 19 of the Procedure) and that the Expert Determination should be published in full (Article 21(g) of the Procedure).

16. On August 1, 2013, the Objector filed its reply memorial together with the additional evidence requested by the Expert (the “Reply”). On August 12, 2013, the Respondent filed its second memorial, together with the supporting evidence, in response to the Reply (the “Rejoinder”).

17. In the Rejoinder, the Respondent requested the Expert to disregard the section “Further points raised in the response” of the Reply because, in its opinion, it was outside the scope of Procedural Order No. 2. Alternatively, the Respondent requested additional time to reply to the new allegations of the Objector. On August 20, 2013, the Expert invited the Objector to comment on the Respondent’s request. The Objector submitted its comment on August 21, 2013. On August 22, 2013, the Expert issued Procedural Order No. 3 and refused to accept the section “Further points raised in the response” of the Reply. In the Expert’s opinion, the Objector did not sufficiently justify the reasons to disobey the Expert’s instructions contained in Procedural Order No. 2. For this reason, such portion of the Reply will not be taken into consideration by the Expert to render the Expert Determination. However, as will be seen below, the Expert’s reasoning would not be affected by such disregarded allegations.

18. In accordance with Articles 5(a) and 6(a) of the Procedure, as well as Articles 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 of the Guidebook, all of the Parties’ communications were submitted electronically in English, which is the official language of this proceeding. The Expert notes, however, that Annex 9 to the Response and Annex 3 to the Rejoinder contain portions in languages other than English. Likewise, the Objector filed with the Reply the Arabic and French versions of Annex 1 to the Objection. In all cases, the Expert does not consider it necessary to provide certified or official translations pursuant to Article 5(b) of the Procedure.

19. For all purposes, the place of the proceedings is Paris (France), where the Centre is located (Article 4(d) of the Procedure).

---

5 Rejoinder, p. 1.
6 Id.
IV. **OBJECTOR’S STANDING**

20. In this section, the Expert will summarize the Parties’ positions as to the Objector’s standing to file the Objection. Thereafter, the Expert will draw his conclusions in this regard.

A. **Objector’s Position**

21. As described in section I.A above, the Objector is the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates ("UAE"), which claims to be a governmental agency representing both the people and Government of said country. The Objector asserts that it is acting following an “invitation” of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation ("OIC"), of which the UAE is member, to file the Objection that triggered the present proceeding. Such “invitation” was furnished by the Objector in English as Annex 1 to the Objection and in both Arabic and French as Annex 10 to the Reply (collectively, “OIC’s Letter”). The English version of the OIC’s Letter provides in its relevant portion as follows:

> [T]he OIC would like to draw the attention to the fact that new applications were already submitted for new gTLDs and these new applications are being evaluated according to the consensus-based mechanism determined by ICANN. The period for submitting any objections, if any, has been expanded until 13th March 2013 for any group and/or community that holds objection on religious or ethical values. The OIC Member States may kindly like to avail of this opportunity to act quickly through their representation in the organs of the ICANN, to avoid any misuse and misrepresentation of gTLDs of concern to them, including the ones like .ISLAM or .HALAL.

22. Together with the Reply, the Objector submitted a draft resolution of the OIC and letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman

---

7 Objection, p. 4.
8 Id.
9 Annex 1 to the Objection, p. 1.
Turkey and Malaysia, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council. For these reasons, the Objector claims to represent a substantial portion of the Muslim community.

23. The Objector was incorporated by Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003 (the “Telecom Law”). The Objector argues that, since its inception, it has been charged with a “wide range of responsibilities related to the Telecommunications and Information Technology Sector, both within and outside the UAE.” The Objector lists a number of its “functions and powers” – none of which relate to religious or public policy matters – but fails to provide documental support. The Expert notes, however, that such functions and powers are contained in Article 13 of the Telecom Law.

24. In light of the foregoing, the Objector claims to be “an established institution associated with the Arabian and Islamic UAE community having an institutional purpose related to the benefit of the community.”

25. For the Objector, because the Respondent allegedly gained neither the support of the Muslim Community nor of the OIC, it lacks legitimacy to register the String. The Objector concludes by stating that, since religious matters are very sensitive, the Respondent – a commercial entity – should not be authorized to register or control a new gTLD of a religious nature.

B. Respondent’s Position

26. The Respondent takes the opposite view regarding the Objector’s standing to file the Objection. First, the Respondent sustains that the Objector is the regulatory authority of just one Islamic country – namely, the UAE – which “demonstrates no

---

10 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-9 to the Reply.
11 Objection, p. 4 (citing Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003). The Expert notes that the Objector has not provided an electronic copy of the Telecom Law. However, the Expert has been able to obtain a copy of the Telecom Law by following a link included in the Objection (p. 4). The incorporation of the Objector is set forth in Chapter 3 (Part 1) of the Telecom Law under the official name “General Authority for Regulating the Telecommunication Sector”.
12 Objection, p. 4.
13 Id., p. 5.
14 Id.
15 Id.
16 Id.
relevance to the global Muslim population". The Respondent adds that the Objector merely provides a domestic technical function within the UAE and that, far from defending a community interest, is pursuing its own commercial interest.

27. Second, the Respondent advances an argument based on Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, which provides in the part quoted by Respondent as follows:

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.

28. For the Respondent, the Objector has “no association whatsoever with any Muslim community, other than it is one of 57 member states of the [OIC]”. Furthermore, the Respondent criticizes the Objector for grasping support from OIC’s Letter, specifically because such letter does not contain an invitation from the OIC to its members to file an objection (but is rather a simple instruction to review ICANN’s new gTLD program and act if necessary).

29. Third, the Respondent points out that the OIC did not file an objection itself and that only the regulatory authority of one of its members (of a total of 57) filed an objection. Accordingly, for the Respondent, this represents no “semblance of the global Muslim community” and thus the Objector lacks standing. Had there been substantial opposition, either the OIC itself or a significant number of States would have filed an objection.

30. Fourth, the Respondent asserts that all the functions and powers mentioned by the Objector are circumscribed to the territory of the UAE and that, in any case, they are of technical nature without relationship whatsoever to the global community of Muslim

---

17 Response, p. 4.
18 Id. See also id., p. 6.
19 Id., p. 4.
20 Id.
21 Id., p. 5.
22 Id.
individuals.\textsuperscript{23} The Respondent adds that, even if the Objector were to have governmental authority within the UAE, it would only represent a small percentage \textit{(i.e., 0.01\%)} of the Muslims of the world as of 2009.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, the Respondent notes that the OIC did not entrust the Objector to act on its behalf or in the name of any other of its remaining 56 members.\textsuperscript{25} For this reason, in the Respondent’s opinion, the Objector only “purport[s] to represent less than 2\% of the OIC’s collective weight”, which does not amount to a representation of the “global Muslim community to which the .Islam TLD will be targeted.”\textsuperscript{26}

31. Finally, the Respondent argues that one of the OIC’s most relevant affiliates – the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”) – has endorsed Respondent’s application to register the String, which would support its argument that the Objector is not backed by the OIC, that the Objector does not represent any greater Muslim community than the UAE and, in sum, that it lacks standing overall.\textsuperscript{27}

C. Expert’s Conclusion

(a) Standard

32. Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook provides guidance on who may file a community objection. As the Respondent has correctly quoted in its Response, such article provides in its very first paragraph as follows:

\begin{quote}
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.
\end{quote}\textsuperscript{28}

33. The Guidebook provides some explanation regarding the main requirements set forth in the quoted passage. In this regard, the Guidebook states that, “[t]o qualify for standing for a community objection, the objector must prove both of the following”, which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Id., pp. 5-6.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4 (emphasis added).
\end{itemize}
makes abundantly clear that the two requirements that follow must be met. These two requirements are: (i) the objector must be an “established institution”; and (ii) the objector must have “an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community”. Each of them will be analyzed separately below.

34. For each requirement, the Guidebook lists some “factors” to steer the Expert’s judgment. As a threshold matter, the Expert will analyze the value of the “factors” outlined in Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook. In this regard, the Guidebook states that the “[f]actors that may be considered [by the Expert] in making its determination include, but are not limited to . . .”. The use of the optional term “may” instead of any other mandatory term clearly implies that the Expert has absolute discretion to apply or not the factors expressly included in the Guidebook. In addition, the final portion of the quoted passage – “but are not limited to” – opens the door to other factors not expressly listed in the Guidebook. This conclusion is also supported by the last paragraph of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, which states that the Expert “will perform a balancing of the factors listed above, as well as other relevant information, in making its determination”. The reference to “other relevant information” eliminates any doubt as to the orientative nature of the factors contained in the Guidebook.

35. All the above is consistent with the last phrase of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, which provides that “[i]t is not expected that an objector must demonstrate satisfaction of each and every factor considered in order to satisfy the standing requirements”.

(b) Analysis

36. As advanced, according to Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook, only “[e]stablished institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection”.

37. In relation to the question of whether the Objector is an established institution, the Expert will take into consideration several factors. First, the orientative factors outlined

29 Id. (emphasis added).
30 Id.
31 Emphasis added.
in Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook include “validation by a government” of the objector. In this case, the Objector was incorporated under Article 6 of the Telecom Law, which states as follows:

It is hereby established an independent public authority, called the “General Authority for Regulating the Telecommunication Sector” for the purpose of performing the functions and implementing the duties given to it under this Federal Law by Decree and its Executive Order.32

38. Furthermore, it is worthwhile noting that the Telecom Law was signed by Mr. Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan, the UAE’s President at the time.33

39. According to the Telecom Law, the Objector “shall have an independent legal personality and shall have full capacity to act accordingly and to perform legal actions in accordance with this Federal Law by Decree, including the capacity to enter into contracts of all types and to own and lease movable and immovable assets of all types and the capacity to sue”.34 Therefore, the Objector has an independent legal personality under UAE’s law and the capacity to sue, which most certainly includes the capacity to file the Objection.

40. Second, the Telecom Law was enacted in 2003, which is almost a decade ago. In the Expert’s view, this period of time is sufficient to consolidate a governmental agency. More importantly, this evidences that the Objector was not “established solely in conjunction with the gTLD application process”.35

41. For the foregoing reasons, the Expert finds that the Objector is an established institution for the purposes of filing the Objection.

42. The Expert will now turn to analyze whether the Objector is “associated with clearly delineated communities” or, in other words, whether it “has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community”, such as the Muslim community.36 The Expert notes

32 Telecom Law, Article 6.
33 Id., p. 34.
34 Id., Article 7.
35 Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4.
36 Id.
that, as opposed to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, the word association in Article 3.2.2.4 is not preceded by the adjective “strong”.\textsuperscript{37} As a consequence, in the Expert’s opinion, the threshold is lower for the purposes of Article 3.2.2.4 than for Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook.

43. The question of whether the Muslim community is “clearly delineated” will be dealt with in section V.B below. For the time being and for the sake of argument, the Expert will assume that it is a clearly delineated community, an assumption that will be confirmed below (see ¶¶ 62-67 below).

44. Each Party places a great deal of emphasis on its association or relationship with the relevant community. In a few words, the Objector claims to represent a number of Muslim countries and to have been invited by the OIC to file the Objection whereas the Respondent sustains that the Objector is acting solely on behalf of the Muslims of the UAE and that, on the contrary, the Respondent’s position is the one endorsed by the OIC though one of its affiliates (i.e., ICRIC). Additionally, the Respondent asserts that the Objector provides domestic technical functions with no relevance whatsoever to the relevant community.

45. In the Expert’s view, the threshold requires a “relationship” or an “association” with a clearly delineated community but does not require an objector – for the purpose of establishing standing – to represent a substantial portion, not to mention the majority, of the members of such community. Therefore, the discussion regarding whether the Objector represents a wider Muslim community than the one circumscribed to the UAE is irrelevant for the purpose of analyzing the Objector’s standing. The important question is whether the “relationship” or “association” between the Objector and UAE’s Muslim community in fact exists.

46. A few issues should be taken into consideration. First, under public international law, the government of a nation is entitled to represent the interests of its constituents. Second, it has been established that the Objector is a governmental entity with certain functions and powers.\textsuperscript{38} Among these functions and powers, the Objector has

\textsuperscript{37} According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, there should be “a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string”. Emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{38} See ¶¶ 37-41, supra. See also Telecom Law, Article 13.
been charged with registering and managing the UAE’s country code top-level domains (ccTLD).\(^3\) For these reasons, the Objector is undoubtedly a relevant governmental agency to represent the people of the UAE in proceedings dealing with the registration of domain names, including the String.

47. Indeed, the Objector provides services to the people of the UAE, a country with a population of 4.7 million (as of 2010).\(^4\) There is no doubt that the UAE is a Muslim country. This is evidenced by its membership to the OIC and Article 7 of the UAE’s Constitution:

Islam is the official religion of the Union. The Islamic Shari‘ah shall be a main source of legislation in the Union. The official language of the Union is Arabic.\(^4\)

48. The telecommunication services provided by the Objector in the UAE certainly benefit the people of the UAE, including its Muslim community. For this reason, the Expert is of the view that there is a relationship with the Muslim community. As a result, in the Expert’s opinion, two of the factors listed in the relevant subsection of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook are satisfied:

- “Institutional purpose related to the benefit of the associated community”; and
- “Performance of regular activities that benefit the associated community”.

49. In addition, the Expert is convinced that the Objector takes a leadership role in matters related to domain names within the territory of the UAE, which is part of another factor listed in the same subsection of the Guidebook.\(^4\) Hence, the Expert finds that three out of four factors of the relevant subsection of Article 3.2.2.4 of the Guidebook favor the Objector’s position.

---

\(^3\) Annex 1 to the Response.
\(^4\) Annex 3 to the Response.
\(^4\) See Constitution of the UAE at \(\text{http://www.refworld.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/wmain?page=category&category=LEGAL&publisher=&type=&coi=ARE&docid=48eca8132&skip=0}\). See also Annex 4 to the Response (map showing demographics of Islam at p. 19) and Annex 1 to the Rejoinder.
\(^4\) Guidebook, Article 3.2.2.4 (“The presence of mechanisms for participation in activities, membership, and leadership”).
50. In sum, in the Expert’s view, the Objector can be considered an established institution with an ongoing relationship with the Muslim community in the UAE. In section V.B below, the Expert will analyze whether the relevant community is “clearly delineated” for the purpose of this community objection.

V. SUBSTANCE OF THE OBJECTION

51. In this section, the Expert will consider the substance of the Objector’s community objection. First, the Expert will set the applicable standard. Thereafter, the Expert will analyze the Parties’ submissions point by point and will reach a number of conclusions.

A. Standard

52. Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook establishes the four tests that enable the Expert to “determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted”. Article 3.5.4 expresses the four tests as follows:

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.\(^{43}\)

53. The Expert notes that each one of the four tests transcribed is separated by the term “and”, which implies that each one of them must be met in order to sustain an objection. This is further confirmed by the last sentence of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, which states that “[t]he objector must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to

\(^{43}\) Id., Article 3.5.4 (emphasis added).
prevail”. This leaves no room for interpretation and evidences the high threshold that a community objection must satisfy.

54. The Expert observes that the Guidebook provides some explanation of the above-transcribed four tests. For each test, the Guidebook lists some “factors” to steer the Expert’s judgment. However, as with the factors relating to the standing discussed in ¶¶ 34-35 above, the language of the factors relating to each of the four tests is open. In particular, all factors set forth in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook are introduced with an optional language, such as “a panel could balance a number of factors to determine this” or “[f]actors that could be balanced by a panel to determine this include”. Once again, this proves the mere orientative nature of these factors.

55. Additionally, in all instances the Guidebook mentions that the factors included therein are not exhaustive (i.e., the Guidebook uses language in the fashion of “including but limited to” or “include but are not limited to”). Therefore, the Expert may weigh other factors if considered appropriate.

B. Is the Community Invoked by the Objector Clearly Defined?

(a) Objector’s Position

56. The Objector sustains that the “notion of ‘community’ is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s guidebook for the new gTLD program”.44 For the Objector, such notion “can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethnical, religious, linguistic or similar community”.45 In short, the Objector argues that a “community is a group of individuals who have something in common . . . or share common values. . . .”46

57. Hence, the notion of community includes the world’s total number of Muslims, which the Objector claims to be 1.4 to 1.6 billion people.47 For the Objector, these Muslims

---

44 Objection, p. 6.
45 Id.
46 Id.
47 Id.
are adherent to Islam and share common religious values and interests.\textsuperscript{48} As a result, they form a clearly delineated community.

(b) Respondent’s Position

58. The Respondent’s argument begins with the following caveat:

While Applicant would concede that the .Islam TLD is targeted generally to Muslim individuals throughout the globe, it will prove that there is no delineated community of global Muslims, there is no substantial opposition to the applications, and there is no likelihood of material detriment to anyone.\textsuperscript{49}

59. The Respondent quotes the factors set forth in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Community” subsection) to support the position that “[t]here are no formal boundaries around who can claim faith in Islam” and adds that “Islam is a religion open to anyone.”\textsuperscript{50}

60. The Respondent then draws a distinction between Catholicism and Islam in an attempt to evidence that there is no global hierarchy in Islam, mainly because there are different branches of Islam.\textsuperscript{51} Additionally, the Respondent points out that nobody “can claim to speak for all Muslims, or even a majority of them, particularly on such a topic as new gTLD applications”.\textsuperscript{52}

61. For these reasons, the Respondent concludes that the global Muslim community is not “clearly delineated”.\textsuperscript{53}

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

62. The subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook regulating the issue at bar provides that “[t]he objector must prove that the community expressing opposition can be regarded as a clearly delineated community”. The same subsection expresses that “[i]f opposition by a number of people/entities is found, but the group represented by the

\textsuperscript{48} Id.
\textsuperscript{49} Response, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{50} Id.
\textsuperscript{51} Id., pp. 7-8.
\textsuperscript{52} Id., p. 8.
\textsuperscript{53} Id.
objecor is not determined to be a clearly delineated community, the objection will fail”. Therefore, the threshold for this test is not whether a great number of people or entities oppose, as the Objector appears to suggest, but rather whether the community may in fact be clearly delineated.

63. Both the Objector and the Respondent concede that the world’s total population of Muslims is around 1.6 billion. This figure is confirmed by the Wikipedia articles submitted by Respondent.

64. The Expert finds that Muslims in general – regardless of the different branches of Islam – form a large group of individuals which share at least certain core values. Support for this consensus is found in a document submitted by Respondent, which evidences that all Muslims share at least the Five Pillars of Islam:

   The Pillars of Islam (arkan al-Islam; also arkan ad-din, “pillars of religion”) are five basic acts in Islam, considered obligatory for all believers. The Quran presents them as a framework for worship and a sign of commitment to the faith. They are (1) the shahadah (creed), (2) daily prayers (salat), (3) almsgiving (zakah), (4) fasting during Ramadan and (5) the pilgrimage to Mecca (hajj) at least once in a lifetime. The Shia and Sunni sects both agree on the essential details for the performance of these acts.

65. The Respondent agrees with the Expert in this regard, as evidenced in its application for the String (“[Muslims] are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core belief”). For this reason, the Respondent expressly recognized that the String will be “targeted” to the “the global Muslim community”. Therefore, even the Respondent

---

54 Objection, p. 6 (“All over the world there are approximately 50 countries having Muslim-majority. With over 1.4 to 1.6 billion followers amounting to approximately 25% of the earth’s population, Islam is the second-largest and one of the fastest-growing religions in the world.”); Response, p. 5 (“Whereas there were an estimated 1.57 billion Muslims in the world as of 2009. (Annex 4, Wikipedia article, p. 19.)”).


56 Annex 4 to the Response, p. 6 (emphasis added, footnotes omitted).

57 Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a). The Respondent further develops this point by expressly recognizing the following: “Religious concepts and practices include the five pillars of Islam, which are basic concepts and obligatory acts of worship, and following Islamic law, which touches on virtually every aspect of life and society, providing guidance on multifarious topics from banking and welfare, to warfare and the environment”. Id.

58 Response, p. 5.
acknowledges that the string will affect the Muslim community exclusively. On its part, the Objector has also recognized that all branches of Islam share certain common beliefs.\footnote{Reply, p. 1 ("Though all the Islamic groups share main common beliefs such as the reality of one God (Allah) and the existence of angels of Allah ... etc.").}

66. In view of the above, the Expert has no hesitation in finding that all Muslims, regardless of the branch of their faith, form a large, clearly delineated community of approximately 1.6 billion people. As a result, the Expert concludes that the community invoked by the Objector is clearly delineated.

67. As a final check, the above discussion supports the conclusion that all factors included in Article 3.5.4 of Guidebook ("Community" subsection) are fulfilled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Compliance with Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of public recognition of the group as a community at a local and/or global level.</td>
<td>Yes. Islam enjoys global recognition and is the second-largest religion in the world.\footnote{Annex 4 to the Response, p. 1.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of formal boundaries around the community and what persons or entities are considered to form the community.</td>
<td>Yes. Although there are different branches of Islam, all branches share the same core principles.\footnote{ld., p. 6.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of time the community has been in existence.</td>
<td>Yes. Islam was founded around approximately 1400 years ago.\footnote{ld., p. 11; Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(a).}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The global distribution of the community (this may not apply if the community is territorial).</td>
<td>Yes. Islam is widespread across the world, with special emphasis in certain areas of the globe.\footnote{ld., p. 19.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people or entities that make up the community.</td>
<td>Yes. The community is formed of approximately 1.6 billion individuals.\footnote{ld., p. 1; Annex 1 to the Rejoinder, p. 1.}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\section*{C. Is the Community Opposition to the Application Substantial?}

\subsection*{(a) Objector's Position}

68. The Objector sustains that “[a] substantial portion of the Muslim community is opposing the string .Islam”.\footnote{ld., p. 1; Annex 1 to the Rejoinder, p. 1.} Without providing documentary evidence in the Objection, the
Objector mentions that most of the one hundred comments regarding Respondent’s application for the String are against its registration. In addition, the Objector states that there have been early warnings from the UAE and India, together with expressions of concern by the Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Objector does not provide any evidence in support of such allegations.

69. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the Objector submitted together with the Reply letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman, Turkey and Malaysia, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council.

70. The Objector also claims to have the support of the OIC. In this regard, the Objector heavily relies on the OIC’s Letter, which claims to be an “invitation” from the OIC urging all its members to oppose and act against the registration of the String. For the Objector, the OIC “is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensur[es] to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various people of the world.”

71. In addition, the Objector submitted with the Reply a draft resolution of the OIC (to be voted in November 2013) pursuant to which the OIC will presumably oppose the registration of the String by the Respondent.

72. Per the Expert’s request in Procedural Orders No. 1 and 2, the Objector explained in the Reply the relation between the OIC and both ICRIC and HalalWorld (because, as discussed below, the Respondent claims that the latter two institutions support its position). As to ICRIC, the Objector sustains that “no ‘subsidiary’ or even ‘affiliation’ relation ever existed between OIC and ICRIC.” The Objector mentions that

---

65 Objection, p. 6 (emphasis omitted).
66 Id.
67 Id.
68 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-8 to the Reply.
69 Objection, pp. 4, 6. As noted, this “invitation” has been provided as Annex 1 to the Objection (in English) and as Annex 10 to the Rejoinder (in both French and Arabic).
70 Objection, p. 4.
71 Annex 9 to the Reply.
72 Reply, p. 1.
ICRIC neither appears listed as a subsidiary or affiliate of the OIC in the latter’s official website nor is there a link to ICRIC included in the section “OIC Organs and Institutions” of such webpage.\(^73\) Further, the Objector sustains that ICRIC’s website does not introduce the organization as an affiliate of the OIC, but rather merely mentions that ICRIC was “established through a Memorandum of Understanding between [the Islamic Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (ICCIA)] and the Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines. . . .”\(^74\) The Objector recognizes that ICCIA “is an affiliate organ of the OIC and represents the private sector of 57 member countries”.\(^75\) For the Objector, the fact that ICRIC was established through a Memorandum of Understanding between an affiliate of the OIC and a national chamber of commerce does not make ICRIC an affiliate of OIC and does not place ICRIC under OIC’s umbrella.\(^76\) On the contrary, for the Objector, ICRIC is an organization closely related to Iran.\(^77\)

73. For the Objector, after analyzing the Charter of the OIC, unless OIC’s Islamic Summit or the Council of Foreign Ministers recognize ICRIC as an affiliate or member of the OIC family, the Respondent cannot claim such relation.\(^78\) For the Objector, the same is true for HalalWorld.

74. As to HalalWorld, the Objector points out that it has not provided its support for the registration of the String (HalalWorld has only supported the string “.Halal”).\(^79\) The Objector sustains that HalalWorld is nothing more than an affiliate of ICRIC with no connection with OIC.\(^80\) For the Objector, neither the OIC nor the Islamic countries have entrusted HalalWorld with the task of issuing Halal certifications.\(^81\) Instead, there are many

\(^73\) Id. See Annexes 10-12 to the Reply.
\(^74\) Reply, p. 1 (emphasis omitted). See Annex 14 to the Reply. ICCA was formerly known as “ICCI”. Both Parties agree on this point. See Reply p. 2 and Rejoinder, p. 2.
\(^75\) Reply, p. 2.
\(^76\) Id.
\(^77\) Id.
\(^78\) Id., pp. 1-2. The Objector supports this statement on Articles 23 and 25 of the Charter of the OIC. See Annex 5 to the Response, Articles 23, 25.
\(^79\) Reply, p. 2.
\(^80\) Id.
\(^81\) Id. See Annex 17 to the Reply.
Halal certification bodies and the requirements for Halal food labeling vary from one country to another (which may differ from HalalWorld’s standards).  

75. For these reasons, the Objector claims to represent a substantial portion of the relevant community.

(b) Respondent’s Position

76. The Respondent, on its part, relies on the language of the Guidebook to support its position. First, the Respondent alleges to have presented “voluminous evidence and documented support from many community leaders and leadership organizations”, as well as a letter from the Ministry of ICT of Iran (Information Technology Organization), in support of its application for the String. These documents have been provided as Annexes 6 through 9 to the Response and Annexes 2 through 4 to the Rejoinder. The Respondent argues that support for its application generally comes from the following categories of entities:

1. Major Organizations / Associations / Leaders representing Muslim populations throughout the world -- from Belarus to Brazil, such as the ICRIC, HalalWorld, The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought, the ECO Cultural Institute, and Dr. Mahatir Bin Mohamed.

2. Islamic Institutes / NGOs in Muslim Countries -- some 17 of them, such as Islamic Unity Magazine, and The Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal, and Brasil Halal Foods.

3. Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic people -- three well-respected academics.

4. Newspapers / Media / Publications – eleven different popular media outlets.

77. Among the letters of support, the Respondent argues that the most relevant entity within the OIC – ICRIC – has fully endorsed the Respondent’s new gTLD

---

82 Reply, p. 2.
83 Response, p. 8.
84 Id.; Annex 4 to the Rejoinder.
85 Response, p. 6.
application. In this regard, the Respondent has furnished a letter of support to its application signed by ICRIC’s Director General. Therefore, “by logical extension, the [Objector] effectively admits that a majority of the global Muslim community supports the Applicant”. In addition, the Respondent claims to have furnished a positive letter from HalalWorld, a widespread Halal certification body operated by ICRIC.

78. Pursuant to the Expert’s instructions in Procedural Orders No. 1 and 2, the Respondent further explained in the Rejoinder the relation between the OIC and both ICRIC and HalalWorld. The Respondent places emphasis on the fact that ICRIC was established via a Memorandum of Understanding between ICCIA – an affiliate of OIC – and a local chamber of commerce in order to evidence ICRIC’s affiliation with the OIC. In addition, the Respondent points out that ICCIA’s Secretary General is a Vice Chairman of ICRIC and that ICRIC’s Board Members are appointed by ICCIA. As to HalalWorld, the Respondent first mentions that ICRIC operates HalalWorld. Then, citing Annex 17 to the Reply, the Respondent claims that HalalWorld’s “mandate stems from the OIC adoption of Halal Food Standards”.

79. Second, for the Respondent, the Objector refers in its Objection to around one hundred “unspecified public comments”, which are “unsupported with evidence of [the] same.” For this reason, the Respondent argues that the Expert should disregard such comments.

80. Third, the Respondent points out that neither India nor the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia – or anyone else besides the Objector – has filed objections to Respondent’s

---

86 Id., pp. 6, 8.
87 Annex 6 to the Response.
88 Response, p. 8.
89 Id., p. 6. See also Annex 7 to the Response.
90 Rejoinder, p. 2. As mentioned earlier, ICCA was formerly known as “ICCI”. Both Parties agree on this point. See id. and Reply p. 2.
91 Rejoinder, p. 2 (citing Annex 6 to the Response, p. 7).
92 Id.
93 Id. Notably, the Respondent does not attempt to evidence any direct relationship between HalalWorld and the OIC.
94 Response, p. 9.
95 Id.
application. The Respondent adds that only one of the 57 members of the OIC – namely, the UAE – has formally filed a community objection through the Objector, which would clearly indicate the lack of support for the Objection from the OIC.

81. In the Rejoinder, the Respondent argues that Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Turkey, Malaysia and the Gulf Cooperation Council, all of which have submitted letters of support to UAE’s objection, amount to a “small fraction of the global Muslim population”. As to Malaysia, the Respondent asserts that the email from the Malaysian representative does not even clearly support the Objection. In any case, the Respondent argues that all these countries cannot be deemed “substantial opposition”. In addition, for the Respondent, many Muslims live in non-OIC countries.

82. Moreover, the Respondent points out that the OIC is composed of 57 members and these 7 countries only amount to just over 10% of the OIC member countries (or roughly 6% of the Global Muslim population).

83. Finally, as to the OIC’s draft resolution submitted with the Reply, the Respondent elaborates a few arguments. For the Respondent, such draft is yet to be voted. In this regard, the Respondent points out that the OIC will presumably not reach a consensus. For this reason, a vote will be taken with no guarantees that the draft resolution will eventually be approved.

84. In sum, for Respondent, the Objection should fail because the Objector has failed to evidence substantial opposition to Respondent’s application.

---

96 Id., pp. 8-9.
97 Id., p. 9.
98 Rejoinder, p. 1. Surprisingly, the Respondent omits that Egypt also filed a letter of support to the Objector’s position (see Annex 1 to the Reply). However, the Expert considers this omission a bona fide error and not an attempt to mislead.
99 Id., n. 1.
100 Id., p. 1.
101 Id.
102 Id.
103 Id.
104 Id., pp. 1-2.
(c) **Expert’s Conclusion**

85. According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Substantial Opposition” subsection), “[t]he objector must prove substantial opposition within the community it has identified itself as representing”. The key element of this provision is “substantial opposition”. For this reason, quite unsurprisingly, the Guidebook concludes the same subsection by stating that, “[i]f some opposition within the community is determined, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection will fail”.

86. The Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the OIC is a political organization and not a religious one.\(^{105}\) However, the OIC is the second largest international organization after the United Nations,\(^{106}\) and among OIC’s objectives is “[t]o disseminate, promote and preserve the Islamic teachings and values based on moderation and tolerance, promote Islamic culture and safeguard Islamic heritage”.\(^{107}\) Therefore, the Expert agrees with the Objector that the OIC is a valid speaker for the world’s Muslim population.\(^{108}\)

87. The first question presented to the Expert is whether the OIC has urged its members to file an objection to Respondent’s application or has simply invited its members to review such application and act if necessary.

88. Article 38 of the Charter of the OIC states that the “[l]anguages of the Organisation shall be Arabic, English and French”.\(^{109}\) This Article does not establish that any language should prevail over the others and thus all of them are equally valid. As a consequence, if the versions of the OIC’s Letter written in two official languages are identical, but differ from the one written in a third official language, the former versions should prevail over the latter one.

---

\(^{105}\) See Rejoinder, p. 2.


\(^{107}\) Annex 5 to the Response, Article 1(11).

\(^{108}\) See Objection, p. 4 (“The [OIC] is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensur[es] to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various people of the world”).

\(^{109}\) Annex 5 to the Response, Article 38.
89. The Expert will now turn to analyze the versions of the OIC’s Letter written in the three official languages. At the outset, the Expert notes that the English and French versions of the OIC’s Letter are identical. As a result, regardless of the wording of the Arabic version, the language of the English and French versions must control the Expert’s findings. The English and French versions of OIC’s Letter say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[T]he OIC would like to draw the attention to the fact that new applications were already submitted for new gTLDs and these new applications are being evaluated according to the consensus-based mechanism determined by ICANN. The period for submitting any objections, if any, has been expanded until 13th March 2013 for any group and/or community that holds objection on religious or ethical values. The OIC Member States may kindly like to avail of this opportunity to act quickly through their representation in the organs of the ICANN to avoid any misuse and misrepresentation of gTLDs of concern to them, including the ones like ‘ISLAM or HALAL’.*&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;[L]’OIC voudrait attirer l’attention sur le fait que de nouvelles demandes ont déjà été soumises pour les nouveaux gTLD et ces nouvelles demandes sont en cours d’évaluation selon mécanisme de consensus établi par l’ICANN. Le délai pour la présentation d’éventuelles objections a été étendu jusqu’au 13 Mars 2013 pour tous les groupes et / ou communautés qui ont une objection sur des valeurs religieuses ou éthiques. Les États membres de l’OIC peuvent bien profiter de cette occasion pour agir rapidement à travers leur représentation dans les organes de l’ICANN afin d’éviter toute utilisation abusive et fausse déclaration de gTLD qui les concernent, y compris celles comme : ‘ISLAM ou HALAL’.*&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. After a careful review of the transcribed passage, the Expert concludes that the OIC directed its members to review Respondent’s application and, in case of concern, act through their representation in the organs of the ICANN. Ergo, the OIC neither endorsed nor opposed Respondent’s application and certainly did not openly instruct its members to file an objection thereto. Hence, the Expert is of the opinion that the OIC’s letter is not a statement of policy against Respondent’s application.

91. As a result of the above, there would be no need to analyze the Arabic version. However, for the sake of completeness, the Expert will briefly look into the Arabic version of the OIC’s Letter, which is slightly different to the other two. The literal translation into English of the relevant portion of the Arabic version is:

*110 Emphasis added.
*111 Emphasis added.
The OIC member States should seize this important opportunity to act quickly against any party that wishes to own the gTLDs that end with (.ISLAM) or (.HALAL). And encourages the member States to file within the time limit specified their objections, if any, to prevent any company or private institution from buying or registering the gTLD (.ISLAM) or (.HALAL) to avoid any complications that could lead to any disputes or the misuse of these gTLDs.\textsuperscript{112}

92. This language is clearly stronger than the English and French versions. However, by including the underlined words “if any”, the Expert finds that the OIC left to the member States the ultimate decision of filing an objection or not. Hence, the OIC anticipated that no objections may be filed by the member States should none of them chose to do so. This may be indicative of the intention behind this version of the letter, but the drafting could have easily been less ambiguous. In any case, a detailed discussion and analysis of this wording is irrelevant, as the Expert has already found that the English and French versions of the OIC Letter shall prevail.

93. As to OIC’s draft resolution submitted with the Reply, two points should be addressed in this Expert Determination. First, the Expert is of the opinion that it is a mere draft with no binding power. In this regard, the Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the approval of OIC’s draft resolution is yet to be seen.\textsuperscript{113} The resolution may not be adopted by a unanimous vote because it may find the opposition of at least Iran.\textsuperscript{114} Since the Objector has not furnished letters of support from the necessary majority of OIC’s members to pass such resolution, it is not evidenced that it will be approved for sure. Second, OIC’s draft resolution refers to a report from OIC’s General Secretariat on the matter which has not been submitted to the Expert by either Party.\textsuperscript{115} Without such report, the Expert cannot assess the recommendation of OIC’s General Secretariat to its member States on the position they should take when voting the OIC’s draft resolution. For these reasons, it remains unclear whether OIC’s draft resolution will finally be approved.

\textsuperscript{112} The Expert sought an independent translation of this passage from another member of his firm. Emphasis added.
\textsuperscript{113} Rejoinder, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{114} Annex 4 to the Rejoinder.
\textsuperscript{115} Annex 9 to the Reply.
94. The Respondent has provided a letter of support from ICRIC.\(^{116}\) The Parties disagree as to the relationship between ICRIC and the OIC, but both Parties agree that ICRIC was established by a Memorandum of Understanding between ICCIA – an affiliate of OIC – and a local chamber of commerce.\(^{117}\) In the Expert’s opinion, the Respondent has failed to evidence that ICRIC is a subsidiary, an affiliate or is otherwise under the umbrella of the OIC. This is also confirmed by the fact that nowhere does the OIC refer to ICRIC as a subsidiary or an affiliate thereof. Nor does ICRIC hold itself as a subsidiary or an affiliate of the OIC.

95. As to the letter from HalalWorld, the Expert agrees with the Objector that it only refers to the string ".Halal" and thus cannot be considered as a valid letter of support for the String.\(^{118}\) Therefore, there is no need to analyze the relationship between HalalWorld and the OIC.

96. In light of the foregoing, it has not been established whether the OIC favors or disfavors the Respondent’s application for the String. Consequently, the Expert is of the opinion that the OIC remains neutral as to the registration of the String by the Respondent.

97. Notably, the OIC itself has not filed an objection. Dr. Alain Pellet, the Independent Objector, expressed in a report discussed by both Parties that

In the present case, the [Independent Objector] is of the opinion that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is an established institution representing and associated with a significant part of the targeted community. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is already fully aware of the controversial issues and is better placed than the IO to file an objection, if it deems it appropriate.\(^{119}\)

\(^{116}\) Annex 6 to the Response.

\(^{117}\) At the time, ICCIA was known as ICCI.

\(^{118}\) See Annex 7 to the Response

\(^{119}\) Annex 12 to the Response, last paragraph (emphasis added). The Independent Objector may file objections against “highly objectionable” gTLD applications to which no objection has been filed. The Independent Objector is limited to filing two types of objections: (i) Limited Public Interest objections and (ii) Community objections. The Independent Objector acts solely in the best interests of the public who use the global Internet. See Article 3.2.5 of the Guidebook.
98. In our case, as it is plainly evident, the OIC did not deem it appropriate to file a community objection itself. In the Expert’s opinion, this is a confirmation of OIC’s neutrality in this matter.

99. On a separate note, the Respondent places great emphasis on the number of letters of support to its position from individuals and organizations. However, regardless of the level of endorsement to Respondent’s application, the ultimate test under the Guidebook is whether there is substantial opposition and not whether there is a substantial level of support. Therefore, the Expert will focus exclusively on the letters of support to the Objector’s position.

100. The Expert observes that only the Objector has filed an objection against Respondent’s application. No other individual, organization or country – whether member of the OIC or not – has opposed Respondent’s application within ICANN’s relevant channel.

101. Some countries – such as India and Saudi Arabia – inquired about Respondent’s application and raised some early concerns in this regard. However, since such countries neither filed a separate objection nor subscribed that of the Objector, the Expert can draw the conclusion that they finally did not officially back a community objection to Respondent’s application. In fact, in Procedural Order No. 2 the Objector was instructed to submit additional letters of support but did not submit letters from these two countries. This is highly indicative of their lack of official support to the Objector’s community objection.

102. The Objector filed with the Reply letters of support from governmental agencies of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Egypt, Oman, Turkey and Malaysia, as well as from the Gulf Cooperation Council. The Gulf Cooperation Council is composed of the UAE, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar and Kuwait. Therefore, the Gulf Cooperation

---

120 Objection, pp. 5-6; Annexes 10 and 11 to the Response.
121 Reply, p. 1. See also Annexes 1-8 to the Reply. For the avoidance of doubt, the Expert is satisfied that the email of the Malaysian representative sufficiently supports the Objector’s position. See Annex 4 to the Reply (“I would like to express my support [to] the UAE and other Islamic countries with regards to the application of .islam and .halal.”).
122 See www.gcc-sg.org/eng/. See also Annex 8 to the Reply.
Council would only add to the list of supporting countries, at best, Saudi Arabia. However, the Expert has previously found in ¶ 101 above that the opposition of Saudi Arabia has not been evidenced. Consequently, the Objector has only evidenced support from 8 countries (including itself and excluding Saudi Arabia) out of a total of 57 which form the OIC.

103. Furthermore, the Objector has referred to around one hundred comments to Respondent’s application of which, allegedly, the majority are against such application. However, no evidence of such comments has been provided to the Expert and thus the Objector has failed to meet its burden of proof in this regard.

104. In accordance with the foregoing, the Expert finds that the “[n]umber of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the community”, which is the first factor in the “substantial opposition” subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, favors Respondent’s position.

105. The same is true for the second factor listed in the same subsection of the Guidebook. More precisely, the Guidebook finds relevant “[t]he representative nature of entities expressing opposition”. As has been evidenced, the Objector cannot speak for the OIC or any other member thereof. At best, the Objector could speak for the citizens of the UAE and the other 7 supporting countries only. There are around 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide,\textsuperscript{123} but the total Muslim population of the 8 opposing countries is 207 million, representing roughly 13% of the Muslims of the world.\textsuperscript{124} In the Expert’s opinion, this is not a substantial portion of the Muslims around the world for the purposes of sustaining a community objection. Therefore, the Expert finds that this factor favors the Respondent.

106. As to the “[l]evel of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition”, which is the third factor listed in the Guidebook, the Expert wishes not to minimize the authority of the Objector. However, Article 13 of the Telecom Law generally circumscribes the Objector’s functions and power’s within the territory of the UAE. Therefore, the Expert finds that the Objector does not have sufficient international weight – without the support of a substantial number of Muslim countries or the OIC itself – to globally represent the interests of the Islamic community throughout the world. For the

\textsuperscript{123} Annex 4 to the Response, p. 1; Annex 1 to the Rejoinder, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{124} Calculaton made using data from Annex 1 to the Rejoinder.
avoidance of doubt, for the reasons given in ¶ 105 above, the Expert is of the opinion that
the other 7 supporting countries cannot be considered as a substantial number.

107. Finally, as to the factor related to costs incurred by the Objector in expressing
opposition,\textsuperscript{125} no other costs have been evidenced besides those related to the Centre’s
filling fee and request for deposit of the estimated costs, which have been paid by ICANN.\textsuperscript{126}
The Expert will also assume some costs related with the Objector’s legal representation in
this proceeding. All these costs do not appear to be excessive in relation to the potential
impact of a decision affecting a community of around 1.6 billion people. Additionally, the
Objector has furnished no evidence of pursuing any “other channels the objector may have
used to convey opposition”.\textsuperscript{127} Thus, this factor disfavors the Objector.

108. The Expert does not need to consider any other factors and is confident in
reaching the conclusion that there is opposition to Respondent’s application to some
extent, but such opposition is not substantial. Accordingly, the Objection must fail.

D. Is there a Strong Association between the Applied-for gTLD and the Community
Represented by the Objector?

(a) Objector’s Position

109. The Objector sustains that the applied-for gTLD explicitly targets the Islamic
community.\textsuperscript{128} In this regard, the Objector quotes the following passage from the
Respondent’s application:

There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide,
practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They
are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core
beliefs. They are a group whose origins are found some 1400
years in the past, their ethnicity often inextricably linked
with their faith. Hitherto, however, there has been no way
to easily unify them and their common

\textsuperscript{125} Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Substantial Opposition” subsection) (“Costs incurred by objector in expressing
opposition, including other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition”).

\textsuperscript{126} See ¶ 12, supra. See also Email from ICANN to Mr. Abdulrahman Almarzouqi, dated March 12, 2013.

\textsuperscript{127} Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Substantial Opposition” subsection).

\textsuperscript{128} Objection, p. 6.
appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this.\(^{129}\)

110. The Objector cites substantively Dr. Alain Pellet’s report, which mentions that the Respondent had acknowledged the sensitivity of the String.\(^{130}\) Moreover, in the Objector’s opinion, the governance platform designed by the Respondent for the String – which purports to include the OIC – is evidence that the String targets the Muslim community.\(^{131}\)

111. For the Objector, the fact that the Respondent is gathering letters of support from Islamic communities throughout the world is additional evidence that the String is targeting the Muslim community.\(^{132}\) In addition, the Objector argues that the letters of support furnished by Respondent:  
(i) come from a minority of the Islamic population and represent less than 5% of the world’s total Muslims;  
(ii) do not include many of the branches of Islam; and  
(iii) are not signed by current officials of governments or of International Organizations (such as the OIC).

\[\text{(b) Respondent’s Position}\]

112. In page 7 of the Response, the Respondent lists the four tests contained in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook and thereafter analyzes them one-by-one, except for the one that requires “a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string”.\(^{134}\) The Expert takes note of this omission.

113. In addition, in the conclusion of the Response, the Respondent stresses that the Objector has failed to “prove standing or three of the four elements of a Community Objection”.\(^{135}\) The omitted fourth element seems to be the association between the applied-for gTLD and the community represented by the Objector.

\(^{129}\) Id. (quoting Annex 13 to Response, section 18(a)).
\(^{130}\) Id.
\(^{131}\) Id.
\(^{132}\) Id.
\(^{133}\) Id.
\(^{134}\) Response, pp. 7-12.
\(^{135}\) Id., p. 12 (emphasis added).
114. This is confirmed by the Respondent in another section of the Response, where it expressly acknowledges that the Objector “does not represent the global Muslim community to which the .Islam TLD will be targeted”.136

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

115. The Respondent appears not to dispute the association between the String and the community represented by the Objector. However, this does not prevent the Expert from analyzing the issue.

116. According to Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Targeting” subsection), “[t]he objector must prove a strong association between the applied-for gTLD string and the community represented by the objector”. The last sentence of such subsection stipulates that, “[i]f 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”.

117. In section V.B(c) above, the Expert found that the relevant community is clearly defined. The question now is whether the String has a “strong association” with such community. The first salient fact is the identity of the terms. Indeed, the String is precisely the word “Islam”. It is patently clear that Muslims in general will be identified by the String.

118. According to the foregoing, the last factor listed in the corresponding subsection of the Guidebook is met (i.e., “[a]ssociations by the public”). It is hard to imagine anyone who will not associate the String with Islam.

119. Moreover, according to the corresponding subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook, another factor that the Expert may analyze is the “[s]tatements contained in application”. The statements contained in the application are very clarifying in this regard. In addition to the passage quoted at ¶ 109 above, Respondent’s application contains many other references that unequivocally result in that the targeted audience is the Islamic community. Indeed, other instances of statements in Respondent’s application that support the conclusion that there is a strong association between the String and the Muslim community are:

136 Id., p. 5 (emphasis added).
- “A robust gTLD has the power to bring together Muslims across national borders in a free-flowing exchange of information and commerce. There is not a .COM or .ORG equivalent of .ISLAM—a domain that has universal appeal across a common religion”.  

- “The .ISLAM gTLD will increasingly open up the vast resources of the Internet and the interconnectedness it brings to the Muslims community [sic], while stimulating the introduction of more information and resources among Muslims online”.  

- “The benefits of the .ISLAM gTLD will be manifold, not just to registrants but also to tens of millions of Muslim internet users, as well as many others with an interest in or curiosity regarding Islam”.  

- “As it is rolled out, the .ISLAM gTLD will rapidly develop as the gTLD of choice among Muslims in all countries. The demand for Islamic content from this group isn’t and won’t be satisfied by .COM or .ORG offerings within the current gTLDs and in fact has hampered collaboration and innovation. The Islamic people demand content that is tailored to their own unique needs and wants, under the umbrella of a dedicated gTLD”.  

- “The history of .COM will be of interest here, because .ISLAM should grow quickly and face demand as high among the Muslim community as .COM has in the English-language online community”.

120. Another factor contained in the “Targeting” subsection, namely the “[o]ther public statements by the applicant”, sheds light in this regard. In the Response, the Respondent explicitly acknowledges that the String will specifically target the Muslim community:

The ICRIC has provided a letter of support to the Applicant with respect to both the .Halal and .Islam TLDs. (Annex 6.) ICRIC operates the only Halal certification body to be recognised by all Islamic countries, HalalWorld, which provided a separate letter of support. (Annex 7.) This is a strong sign of support from this TLD’s target community.  

137 Id., section 18(a).  
138 Id.  
139 Id., section 18(b).  
140 Id.  
141 Id., section 18(c).  
142 Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Targeting” subsection).  
143 Response, p. 6.
121. Elsewhere in the Response, the Respondent makes a similar concession when it states that the Objector “does not represent the global Muslim community to which the .ISLAM TLD will be targeted”. Additionally, the Respondent “concede[s] that the .Islam TLD is targeted generally to Muslim individuals throughout the globe.”

122. The Respondent even provides letters of support from different Islamic organizations. Therefore, the Respondent has conceded that the String will have effects in the Muslim community.

123. In sum, the Expert finds that there is a strong association between the String and the community represented by the Objector, which is the Muslim community.

E. Does the Application Create a Likelihood of Material Detriment?

(a) Objector’s Position

124. For the Objector, “there is clearly a level of certainty that the alleged detrimental outcome[] will occur” because of the “obvious lack of community involvement and support” to Respondent’s application. The Objector explains that the obvious lack of support from the majority of the community will “most probably” result in that the String will “be dominated by a subgroup from the religion and will ignore the interests of the remaining majority”.

125. The Objector highlights that religion is an “extremely sensitive subject”. Since Islam includes different subgroups and sects, it would be very difficult to unite all of them under the same gTLD unless an organization that represents the community (or its majority) runs and supports said domain. For the Objector, the Respondent’s application fails to evidence any mechanisms that will effectively prevent abuses or misuses of the String, which is further exacerbated by the fact that the Respondent is not supported by the

---

144 Id., p. 5 (emphasis added).
145 Id., p. 7.
146 Id., p. 5. See also Annexes 6-9 to the Response and Annexes 2-3 to the Rejoinder.
147 Objection, p. 7.
148 Id.
149 Id., p. 8.
150 Id.
majority of the Muslim community.\textsuperscript{151} The Objector concludes that all this will result in damage to the reputation of the Muslim community.\textsuperscript{152}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(b)] \textbf{Respondent’s Position}
\end{enumerate}

126. The Respondent relies on the factors included in Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Detriment” subsection).\textsuperscript{153} For the Respondent, the Objector “wholly fails to provide any evidence by which the Applicant or the Panel could assess these factors”.\textsuperscript{154} The Respondent argues that the Objector mistakenly places emphasis on the lack of support and that it merely speculates on a possible dominance by a religious subgroup, which is totally unsupported because (i) Respondent has furnished substantial community support to its application; and (ii) allowing a dominance by a subgroup will make no sense from a business perspective.\textsuperscript{155}

127. Furthermore, the Respondent argues that it has repeatedly promised to operate the String “in the best interests of the community as a whole” and quotes its response to ICANN’s Government Advisory Committee’s Beijing Communiqué.\textsuperscript{156} In such response, the Respondent pledged to implement measures “to limit second-level domain registrations to those of Muslim faith or with a positive interest in the Muslim community” and expressed that it “will not tolerate radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith”.\textsuperscript{157} The Respondent “will take immediate and severe action” if necessary and will establish “safeguards, keyword alerts, name selection polices, all governed by an Acceptable Use Policy and post registration protections”.\textsuperscript{158}

128. The Respondent points out that it has drafted a “Governance Model for its TLDs”,\textsuperscript{159} which led the Indian Government to withdraw its concerns about the String.\textsuperscript{160} In

\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{151} Id.
\item\textsuperscript{152} Id.
\item\textsuperscript{153} Response, p. 9.
\item\textsuperscript{154} Id.
\item\textsuperscript{155} Id. p. 10.
\item\textsuperscript{156} Id. (attached to the Response as Annex 11).
\item\textsuperscript{157} Id. (quoting Annex 11 to the Response).
\item\textsuperscript{158} Id. (quoting Annex 11 to the Response).
\item\textsuperscript{159} Annex 10 to the Response.
\item\textsuperscript{160} Response, p. 10.
\end{enumerate}
addition, the Respondent explains that, as mentioned in the String application, it “will endeavor to the utmost in order to minimize the social costs to registrants of a .ISLAM second-level domain”.161 The Respondent highlights the adoption of a policy matrix and other recommendations, as well as a complaint resolution service, all of which are geared towards minimizing harm in TLDs.162

129. The Respondent also explains that it has made a binding public interest commitment whereby certain requirements are imposed on the registry operator to foster transparency and to avoid misuses and abuses of the String.163

130. For the Respondent, all the above “documented efforts and intentions must outweigh [Objectors]’s rank speculation as to the applicant’s intentions”.164

131. On a separate note, the Respondent places strong emphasis on the fact that Dr. Alain Pellet, ICANN’s Independent Objector, “thoroughly reviewed the purported public opposition to the .Islam TLD, and found no basis for any objection”.165

132. Finally, the Respondent sustains that the “global Muslim community is not dependent upon the DNS for its core activities”, which stands for “Domain Name System”, and that there “will be no damage to anyone, but instead the TLDs will operate to the benefit of the global Muslim community”.166

(c) Expert’s Conclusion

133. Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook (“Detriment” subsection) requires that 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”. Notably, the Guidebook adds that “[a]n 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”.

161 Id., p. 11 (quoting Annex 13, section 18(c)).
162 Id.
163 Id., pp. 11-12.
164 Id., p. 12.
165 Id., p. 10.
166 Id., p. 12. "DNS" means “Domain Name System".
134. The Guidebook sets a high bar in order for the Expert to find any detriment:

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.\(^{167}\)

135. In this case, as discussed in section V.C(c) above, there is some opposition from the community but such opposition is not substantial. The question now presented is the likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community. To reach an answer, the Expert will analyze the factors included in the relevant subsection of Article 3.5.4 of the Guidebook.

136. The first factor in the Guidebook is:

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

137. The Expert finds particularly illustrating Dr. Pellet’s report to address this point.\(^{168}\) Dr. Pellet reviewed a number of binding and non-binding international instruments, both at global and regional levels, which deal with the freedom of religion.\(^{169}\) The Expert notes that a common denominator of these instruments is the protection of freedom of religion and the freedom to manifest one’s religion. Of particular relevance is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948. Notably, the UAE has been a member of the United Nations since 1971.\(^{170}\)

138. As Dr. Pellet correctly mentions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights explicitly says:

\(^{167}\) Guidebook, Article 3.5.4 (“Detriment” subsection) (emphasis added).

\(^{168}\) A copy of this report is attached to the Response as Annex 12.

\(^{169}\) Annex 12 to the Response (Limited Public Interest Objection section, ¶¶ 5-10).

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.\(^{171}\)

139. For the Expert, the registration of the String will contribute to promoting this objective, as it will become a vehicle for Muslims to express themselves and expand their faith across the world.

140. The possible damages asserted by the Objector, which have not been sufficiently evidenced, are outweighed by the necessity of promoting human rights, such as the freedom of religion and the opportunity for every individual to manifest his or her own religion. Therefore, this factor favors the Respondent.

141. The second factor in the Guidebook is:

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

142. The Objector has certainly not provided any evidence that the Respondent is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the Muslim community. On the contrary, the Respondent has promised to operate the String in a manner that will prevent “radical content or criticism of Islam and the Muslim faith”, and the Respondent “will take immediate and severe action against this should it occur”.\(^{172}\)

143. It has been evidenced that the Respondent intends to implement security measures to avoid the misuse or abuse of the String.\(^{173}\) In this regard, the Guidebook does

\(^{171}\) Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18 (emphasis added) (quoted in Dr. Pellet’s report at Limited Public Interest Objection section, ¶ 6).

\(^{172}\) Annex 11 to the Response, p. 2. See also Annex 13 to the Response, section 18(b) (“Equally, AGITSys will not tolerate radical content, nor will it tolerate content that criticizes Islam and the Muslim faith. Immediate and severe action will be taken against registrants promulgating either, and a black list will be created in an attempt to pre-empt any such attempts.”).

not require that the measures be in place at this time, but rather that such measures be proposed (or an appearance of an intention to propose or implement them in the future).

144. Among these measures already proposed, the Respondent intends to:

- Design a multi stakeholder governing system (a/k/a “Policy Advisory Council), where Islamic governments, organizations and individuals will have representatives that will participate in the management of the String under direct supervision of a multinational Islamic organization or institute.  


- Implement a strict policy under which not everyone will be eligible to apply for a second-level “.Islam” domain, but only those who meet certain requirements.  

175 Annex 10 to the Response, pp. 16-17; Annex 2 to the Rejoinder, p. 34.

- Impose penalties and suspensions upon violators of the user’s policy.  

177 Annex 10 to the Response, p. 18; Annex 2 to the Rejoinder, p. 36. See also Annex 13 to Response, section 18(b).

- Include one addendum to its Registry Agreement with ICANN whereby certain requirements will be imposed on the registry operator in order to promote transparency and avoid misuses or abuses.  

178 Response, pp. 11-12; Annex 14 to the Response.

145. In accordance with the above, the second factor favors the Respondent.

146. The third factor in the Guidebook is:

Interference with the core activities of the community that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string

147. The key language in this factor is “core activities”. In ¶ 64 above the Expert transcribed the five pillars or core principles of Islam. The Expert is of the opinion that the operation of the String will not, on its face, interfere with any of them. Nonetheless, as discussed above, the Respondent intends to implement policies and mechanisms to ensure that the integrity of Islam is preserved. Consequently, this factor favors the Respondent.

148. The fourth factor in the Guidebook is:

Dependence of the community represented by the objector on the DNS for its core activities
149. The Respondent has stated that “[t]he global Muslim community is not dependent upon the DNS for its core activities”. The Objector has remained silent in this regard.

150. Islam originated around 1400 years ago, long before Internet was created. Therefore, the Islamic community is not dependent on the DNS. As a result, this factor favors the Respondent.

151. The fifth factor in the Guidebook is:

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

152. Neither of the Parties has argued a concrete or economic damage to the Islamic community. In fact, the Expert is of the opposite view. In line with ¶ 139 above, the Expert agrees with the Respondent in that the String may serve as a platform for the expansion of online Islamic resources.

153. The sixth factor in the Guidebook is:

Level of certainty that alleged detrimental outcomes would occur

154. The Objector has not evidenced any immediate or imminent detriment. Rather, the Objector has speculated with some possible outcomes. In light of the foregoing, the Expert finds that the likeliness of detriment to the Muslim community, though possible, is remote. As a consequence, this factor favors the Respondent.

155. In sum, the Expert concludes that the Objector has failed to prove the likelihood of any material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the Islamic community. For this reason, the Objection must fail.

---

179 Response, p. 12.
180 Annex 4 to the Response, p. 11.
181 Annex 18 to the Response, section 18(b).
VI. COSTS

156. In accordance with Article 14(e) of the Procedure, the Centre shall refund to the prevailing party its advance payment of costs.

VII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

157. Within the 45 day time-limit set forth in Article 21(a) of the Procedure, the Expert concludes as follows:

(i) the Objector has standing to file the Objection;
(ii) the community invoked by the Objector is clearly defined;
(iii) there is not substantial opposition from the community to Respondent’s application;
(iv) there is a strong association between the String and the community represented by the Objector;
(v) Respondent’s application does not create a likelihood of any material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the relevant community;
(vi) the Centre shall refund to the prevailing party its advance payment of costs; and
(vii) this Expert Determination shall be published in full.

158. For these reasons, the prevailing party is the Respondent and thus the Objection shall be dismissed.

VIII. DECISION

159. For the above reasons and according to Article 21(d) of the Procedure, I hereby render the following Expert Determination:

(i) The Objection of the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates is dismissed;
(ii) Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. prevails; and
(iii) Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.’s advance payment of costs shall be refunded by the Centre to Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

* * * *
Date: 24/October/2013

Signature: _____________________

Bernardo M. Cremades
Expert
Annex 9
Governmental Advisory Committee

Beijing, People’s Republic of China – 11 April 2013

GAC Communiqué – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Beijing during the week of 4 April 2013. Sixty-one (61) GAC Members participated in the meetings and eight (8) Observers. The GAC expresses warm thanks to the local hosts China Internet Network Information Center (CNNIC), China Organizational Name Administration Center (CONAC), and Internet Society of China for their support.

II. Internal Matters

1. New Members and Observers

The GAC welcomes Belarus, Cape Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, Lebanon, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to the Committee as members, and The World Meteorological Organisation as an Observer.

2. GAC Secretariat

Following a request for proposals, the GAC received presentations from two organizations and agreed that one such candidate should be providing secretariat services to the GAC, with the aim of becoming operational as soon as possible. Negotiations with such organization will start immediately after the Beijing meeting.

---

1 To access previous GAC advice, whether on the same or other topics, past GAC communiqués are available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Recent+Meetings and older GAC communiqués are available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Meetings+Archive.
3. **GAC Leadership**

The GAC warmly thanks the outgoing Vice-Chairs, Kenya, Singapore, and Sweden and welcomes the incoming Vice-Chairs, Australia, Switzerland and Trinidad & Tobago.

### III. Inter-constituencies Activities

1. **Meeting with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT 2)**

   The GAC met with the ATRT 2 and received an update on the current activities of the ATRT 2. The exchange served as an information gathering session for the ATRT 2 in order to hear GAC member views on the Review Team processes and areas of interest for governments. The GAC provided input on governmental processes and the challenges and successes that arose during the first round of reviews, and implementation of the GAC related recommendations of the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team.

2. **Board/GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG)**

   The Board–GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI–WG) met to discuss further developments on ATRT1 recommendations relating to the GAC, namely recommendations 11 and 12. In the context of Recommendation 11, the GAC and the Board have concluded the discussion and agreed on the details of the consultation process mandated per ICANN Bylaws, should the Board decide not to follow a GAC advice. With respect to Recommendation 12, on GAC Early Engagement, the BGRI-WG had a good exchange with the GNSO on mechanisms for the GAC to be early informed and provide early input to the GNSO PDP. The BGRI–WG intends to continue this discussion intersessionally and at its next meeting in Durban.

3. **Brand Registry Group**

   The GAC met with the Brand Registry Group and received information on its origins, values and missions.

4. **Law Enforcement**

   The GAC met with law enforcement representatives and received an update from Europol on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA).

***

The GAC warmly thanks the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2, the Brand Registry Group, Law Enforcement, and the ICANN Board who jointly met with the GAC as well
as all those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with the GAC in Beijing.

IV. GAC Advice to the ICANN Board

1. New gTLDs
   a. GAC Objections to Specific Applications
      i. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:
         i. The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:
            1. The application for .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)
            2. The application for .gcc (application number: 1-1936-2101)
      ii. With regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook:
            1. The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.
   b. Safeguard Advice for New gTLDs
      To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns the GAC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of strings (see Annex I).
   c. Strings for Further GAC Consideration
      In addition to this safeguard advice, that GAC has identified certain gTLD strings where further GAC consideration may be warranted, including at the GAC meetings to be held in Durban.
      i. Consequently, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings: .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa,.yun,.thai,.zulu,.wine,.vin

2 To track the history and progress of GAC Advice to the Board, please visit the GAC Advice Online Register available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Recent+Meetings
3 Module 3.1: “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.
4 Module 3.1: “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.
d. The GAC requests:

   i. a written briefing about the ability of an applicant to change the string applied for in order to address concerns raised by a GAC Member and to identify a mutually acceptable solution.

e. Community Support for Applications

The GAC advises the Board:

   i. that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information.

f. Singular and plural versions of the same string as a TLD

The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to potential consumer confusion.

Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to:

   i. Reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.

g. Protections for Intergovernmental Organisations

The GAC stresses that the IGOs perform an important global public mission with public funds, they are the creations of government under international law, and their names and acronyms warrant special protection in an expanded DNS. Such protection, which the GAC has previously advised, should be a priority.

This recognizes that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders, warranting special protection by ICANN in the DNS, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation.

The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues and commits to actively working with IGOs, the Board, and ICANN Staff to find a workable and timely way forward.

Pending the resolution of these implementation issues, the GAC reiterates its advice to the ICANN Board that:

   i. appropriate preventative initial protection for the IGO names and acronyms on the provided list be in place before any new gTLDs would launch.
2. Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)
   Consistent with previous communications to the ICANN Board
   
a. the GAC advises the ICANN Board that:
   
i. the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.

   The GAC also strongly supports the amendment to the new gTLD registry agreement that would require new gTLD registry operators to use only those registrars that have signed the 2013 RAA.

   The GAC appreciates the improvements to the RAA that incorporate the 2009 GAC-Law Enforcement Recommendations.

   The GAC is also pleased with the progress on providing verification and improving accuracy of registrant data and supports continuing efforts to identify preventative mechanisms that help deter criminal or other illegal activity. Furthermore the GAC urges all stakeholders to accelerate the implementation of accreditation programs for privacy and proxy services for WHOIS.

3. WHOIS

   The GAC urges the ICANN Board to:
   
a. ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are duly taken into account by the recently established Directory Services Expert Working Group.

   The GAC stands ready to respond to any questions with regard to the GAC Principles.

   The GAC also expects its views to be incorporated into whatever subsequent policy development process might be initiated once the Expert Working Group concludes its efforts.

4. International Olympic Committee and Red Cross / Red Crescent

   Consistent with its previous communications, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to:

   a. amend the provisions in the new gTLD Registry Agreement pertaining to the IOC/RCRC names to confirm that the protections will be made permanent prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs.
5. Public Interest Commitments Specifications

The GAC requests:

b. more information on the Public Interest Commitments Specifications on the basis of the questions listed in annex II.

V. Next Meeting

The GAC will meet during the period of the 47th ICANN meeting in Durban, South Africa.
ANNEX I

Safeguards on New gTLDs

The GAC considers that Safeguards should apply to broad categories of strings. For clarity, this means any application for a relevant string in the current or future rounds, in all languages applied for.

The GAC advises the Board that all safeguards highlighted in this document as well as any other safeguard requested by the ICANN Board and/or implemented by the new gTLD registry and registrars should:

- be implemented in a manner that is fully respectful of human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in international and, as appropriate, regional declarations, conventions, treaties and other legal instruments – including, but not limited to, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- respect all substantive and procedural laws under the applicable jurisdictions.
- be operated in an open manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination.

Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs

The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.

1. **WHOIS verification and checks** — Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in its gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will weight the sample towards registrars with the highest percentages of deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete records in the previous checks. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during the checks, triggering the registrar’s obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.

2. **Mitigating abusive activity** — Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

3. **Security checks** — While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. If Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.
4. **Documentation**—Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and actions taken as a result of its periodic WHOIS and security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.

5. **Making and Handling Complaints**—Registry operators will ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate or promote malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

6. **Consequences**—Consistent with applicable law and any related procedures, registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of the requirement that the domain name should not be used in breach of applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the domain name.

The following safeguards are intended to apply to particular categories of new gTLDs as detailed below.

**Category 1**

**Consumer Protection, Sensitive Strings, and Regulated Markets:**

The GAC Advises the ICANN Board:

- Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. The following safeguards should apply to strings that are related to these sectors:

  1. Registry operators will include in its acceptable use policy that registrants comply with all applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection, consumer protection (including in relation to misleading and deceptive conduct), fair lending, debt collection, organic farming, disclosure of data, and financial disclosures.
  2. Registry operators will require registrars at the time of registration to notify registrants of this requirement.
  3. Registry operators will require that registrants who collect and maintain sensitive health and financial data implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of those services, as defined by applicable law and recognized industry standards.
  4. Establish a working relationship with the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies, including developing a strategy to mitigate as much as possible the risks of fraudulent, and other illegal, activities.
5. Registrants must be required by the registry operators to notify to them a single point of contact which must be kept up-to-date, for the notification of complaints or reports of registration abuse, as well as the contact details of the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies in their main place of business.

In the current round the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that the above safeguards should apply to:

- **Children:**
  - .kid, .kids, .kinder, .game, .games, .juegos, .play, .school, .schule, .toys

- **Environmental:**
  - .earth, .eco, .green, .bio, .organic

- **Health and Fitness:**
  - .care, .diet, .fit, .fitness, .health, .healthcare, .heart, .hiv, .hospital, .med, .medical, .organic, .pharmacy, .rehab, .surgery, .clinic, .healthy (IDN Chinese equivalent), .dental, .dentist .doctor, .dds, .physio

- **Financial:**

- **Gambling:**
  - .bet, .bingo, .lotto, .poker, and .spreadbetting, .casino

- **Charity:**
  - .care, .gives, .giving, .charity (and IDN Chinese equivalent)

- **Education:**
  - degree, .mba, .university

- **Intellectual Property**
  - .audio, .book (and IDN equivalent), .broadway, .film, .game, .games, .juegos, .movie, .music, .software, .song, .tunes, .fashion (and IDN equivalent), .video, .app, .art, .author, .band, .beats, .cloud (and IDN equivalent), .data, .design, .digital, .download, .entertainment, .fan, .fans, .free, .gratis, .discount, .sale, .hiphop, .media, .news, .online, .pictures, .radio, .rip, .show, .theater, .theatre, .tour, .tours, .tvs, .video, .zip

- **Professional Services**
  - .abogado, .accountant, .accountants, .architect, .associates, .attorney, .broker, .brokers, .cpa, .doctor, .dentist, .dds, .engineer, .lawyer, .legal, .realtor, .realty, .vet

- **Corporate Identifiers:**
  - .corp, .gmbh, .inc, .limited, .llc, .llp, .ltd, .ltda, .ltd, .sarl, .srl, .sal

- **Generic Geographic Terms:**
  - .town, .city, .capital
• .reise, .reisen
• .weather
• .engineering
• .law
• **Inherently Governmental Functions**
  o .army, .navy, .airforce
• In addition, applicants for the following strings should develop clear policies and processes to minimise the risk of cyber bullying/harassment
  o .fail, .gripe, .sucks, .wtf

**The GAC further advises the Board:**

1. In addition, some of the above strings may require further targeted safeguards, to address specific risks, and to bring registry policies in line with arrangements in place offline. In particular, a limited subset of the above strings are associated with market sectors which have clear and/or regulated entry requirements (such as: financial, gambling, professional services, environmental, health and fitness, corporate identifiers, and charity) in multiple jurisdictions, and the additional safeguards below should apply to some of the strings in those sectors:

   6. At the time of registration, the registry operator must verify and validate the registrants’ authorisations, charters, licenses and/or other related credentials for participation in that sector.

   7. In case of doubt with regard to the authenticity of licenses or credentials, Registry Operators should consult with relevant national supervisory authorities, or their equivalents.

   8. The registry operator must conduct periodic post-registration checks to ensure registrants’ validity and compliance with the above requirements in order to ensure they continue to conform to appropriate regulations and licensing requirements and generally conduct their activities in the interests of the consumers they serve.

**Category 2**

**Restricted Registration Policies**

**The GAC advises the ICANN Board:**

1. **Restricted Access**
   o As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1

---

5 Austria, Germany, and Switzerland support requirements for registry operators to develop registration policies that allow only travel-related entities to register domain names. Second Level Domains should have a connection to travel industries and/or its customers
above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be appropriate for the types of risks associated with the TLD. The registry operator should administer access in these kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.

2. Exclusive Access

- For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.

- In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access

  - .antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts, .クラウド [cloud], .ストア [store], .セール [sale], .ファッション [fashion], .家電 [consumer electronics], .手表 [watches], .書籍 [book], .珠宝 [jewelry], .通販 [online shopping], .食品 [food]
ANNEX II

List of questions related to Public Interest Commitments Specifications

1. Could a third party intervene or object if it thinks that a public interest commitment is not being followed? Will governments be able to raise those sorts of concerns on behalf of their constituents?

2. If an applicant does submit a public interest commitment and it is accepted are they able to later amend it? And if so, is there a process for that?

3. What are ICANN’s intentions with regard to maximizing awareness by registry operators of their commitments?

4. Will there be requirements on the operators to maximize the visibility of these commitments so that stakeholders, including governments, can quickly determine what commitments were made?

5. How can we follow up a situation where an operator has not made any commitments? What is the process for amending that situation?

6. Are the commitments enforceable, especially later changes? Are they then going into any contract compliance?

7. How will ICANN decide whether to follow the sanctions recommended by the PIC DRP? Will there be clear and transparent criteria? Based on other Dispute Resolution Procedures what is the expected fee level?

8. If serious damage has been a result of the past registration policy, will there be measures to remediate the harm?
1. **Main Agenda**
   
a. **Consideration of Non-Safeguard Advice in the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s Beijing Communiqué**

   Rationale for Resolution 2013.06.04.NG01

   Whereas, the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) met during the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 46 meeting in Beijing and issued a Communiqué on 11 April 2013 (Beijing Communiqué);

   Whereas, on 18 April 2013, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned...
Names and Numbers) posted the Beijing Communiqué and officially notified applicants of the advice, 

Whereas, the NGPC met on 8 May 2013 to consider a plan for responding to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice on the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, transmitted to the Board through its Beijing Communiqué;

Whereas, the NGPC met on 18 May 2013 to further discuss and consider its plan for responding the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice in the Beijing Communiqué on the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program;

Whereas, the NGPC has considered the applicant responses submitted during the 21- day applicant response period, and the NGPC has identified nine (9) items of advice in the attached scorecard where its position is consistent with the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice in the Beijing Communiqué.

Whereas, the NGPC developed a scorecard to respond to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice in the Beijing Communiqué similar to the one used during the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and Board meetings in Brussels on 28 February and 1 March 2011, and has identified where the NGPC’s position is consistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice, noting those as "1A" items.

Whereas, the NGPC is undertaking this action pursuant to the authority granted to it by the Board on 10 April 2012, to exercise the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board’s authority for any and all issues that may arise relating to the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program.

Resolved (2013.06.04.NG01), the NGPC adopts the “NGPC Scorecard of 1As Regarding Non-Safeguard Advice in the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Beijing Communiqué” (4 June 2013), attached as Annex 1 (/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-04jun13-en.pdf) [PDF, 564 KB] to this Resolution, in response to the items of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice in the Beijing Communiqué as presented in the scorecard.
Rationale for Resolution 2013.06.04.NG01

Why the NGPC is addressing the issue?

Article XI, Section 2.1 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws
http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws#XI
(http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws#XI) permit the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) to "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." The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) issued advice to the Board on the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program through its Beijing Communiqué dated 11 April 2013. The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws require the Board to take into account the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice on public policy matters in the formulation and adoption of the polices. If the Board decides to take an action that is not consistent with the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice, it must inform the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and state the reasons why it decided not to follow the advice. The Board and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) will then try in good faith to find a mutually acceptable solution. If no solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision why the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice was not followed.

What is the proposal being considered?

The NGPC is being asked to consider accepting a discrete grouping of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice as described in the attached NGPC Scorecard of 1As Regarding Non-Safeguard Advice in the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Beijing Communiqué (4 June 2013), which includes nine (9) items of non-safeguard advice from the Beijing Communiqué as listed in the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Register of Advice. These items are those for which the NGPC has a position that is consistent with the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

On 18 April 2013, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) posted the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice and officially notified applicants of the advice,
(http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-18apr13-en) triggering the 21-day applicant
response period pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook Module 3.1 [http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/gac-advice-responses](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/gac-advice-responses). The NGPC has considered the applicant responses in formulating its response to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice as applicable.

To note, on 23 April 2013, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) initiated a public comment forum to solicit input on how the NGPC should address GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice regarding safeguards applicable to broad categories of new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) strings [http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/gac-safeguard-advice-23apr13-en.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/gac-safeguard-advice-23apr13-en.htm). The public comment forum on how the NGPC should address GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice regarding safeguards is open through 4 June 2013. These comments will serve as important inputs to the NGPC’s future consideration of the other elements of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice not being considered at this time in the attached scorecard.

**What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

As part of the 21-day applicant response period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) received 383 applicant response documents representing 745 unique applications. Twenty-three responses were withdrawn and eleven were submitted after the deadline. Applicants appear to generally support the spirit of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice. The responses expressed concerns that the advice was too broad in its reach and did not take into account individual applications. Some applicant responses expressed concern that some elements of the advice seem to circumvent the bottom-up, multi-stakeholder model, while others proposed that the NGPC reject specific elements of the advice. A review of the comments has been provided to the NGPC under separate cover. The complete set of applicant responses can be reviewed at: [http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/gac-advice-responses](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/gac-advice-responses).

**What significant materials did the Board review?**

As part of its deliberations, the NGPC reviewed the following materials and documents:

- GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Beijing Communiqué:
What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The Beijing Communiqué generated significant interest from applicants and resulted in many comments. The NGPC considered the applicant comments, the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice transmitted in the Beijing Communiqué, and the procedures established in the AGB.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The adoption of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice as provided in the attached scorecard will assist with resolving the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice in manner that permits the greatest number of new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applications to continue to move forward as soon as possible.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

There are no foreseen fiscal impacts associated with the adoption of this resolution.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

Approval of the proposed resolution will not impact security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System).

Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or ICANN (Internet...
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) posted the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice and officially notified applicants of the advice on 18 April 2013 http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-18apr13-en. This triggered the 21 day applicant response period pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook Module 3.1.

Published on 6 June 2013
ANNEX 1 to NGPC Resolution No. 2013.06.04.NG01

NGPC Scorecard of 1As Regarding Non-Safeguard Advice in the GAC Beijing Communiqué

4 June 2013

This document contains the NGPC’s response to the GAC Beijing Communiqué issued 11 April 2013 <http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en> for the non-safeguard advice items in the GAC Register of Advice where the NGPC has adopted a score of “1A” to indicate that its position is consistent with the GAC advice as described in the Scorecard. Refer to the GAC Register of Advice for the full text of each item of advice in the GAC Beijing Communiqué <https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/GAC+Register+of+Advice>. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAC Register #</th>
<th>Summary of GAC Advice</th>
<th>NGPC Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2013-04-11-Obj-Africa (Communiqué §1.a.i.1)</td>
<td>The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following application: .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if &quot;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.&quot; (AGB § 3.1) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1165-42560 for .africa will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN’s accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2013-04-11-Obj-GCC (Communiqué §1.a.i.2)</td>
<td>The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following application: .gcc (application number: 1-1936-2101)</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if &quot;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.&quot; (AGB § 3.1) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN’s accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>Summary of GAC Advice</td>
<td>NGPC Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2103-04-11-Religious Terms (Communiqué §1.a.ii)</td>
<td>The GAC Advises the Board that with regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook, the GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if &quot;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.” Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC stands ready to enter into dialogue with the GAC on this matter. We look forward to liaising with the GAC as to how such dialogue should be conducted. (Note a community objection has been filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .ISLAM and .HALAL. Because formal objections have been filed, these applications cannot move to the contracting phase until the objections are resolved.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>Summary of GAC Advice</td>
<td>NGPC Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. 2013-04-11-gTLDStrings (Communiqué §1.c) | In addition to this safeguard advice, the GAC has identified certain gTLD strings where further GAC consideration may be warranted, including at the GAC meetings to be held in Durban. Consequently, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings: .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin | 1A  The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that "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)" (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. In other words, ICANN will allow evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings for now.  
(Note: community objections have been filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .PERSIANGULF, .AMAZON, and .PATAGONIA. The application for .ZULU was withdrawn.) |
<p>| 5. 2013-04-11-CommunitySupport (Communiqué §1.e) | The GAC advises the Board that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information. | 1A  The NGPC accepts this advice. Criterion 4 for the Community Priority Evaluation process takes into account &quot;community support and/or opposition to the application&quot; in determining whether to award priority to a community application in a contention set. (Note however that if a contention set is not resolved by the applicants or through a community priority evaluation then ICANN will utilize an auction as the objective method for resolving the contention.) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAC Register #</th>
<th>Summary of GAC Advice</th>
<th>NGPC Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. 2013-04-11-PluralStrings (Communiqué §1.f)</td>
<td>The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to potential consumer confusion. Therefore the GAC advises the Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice and will consider whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 2013-04-11-RAA (Communiqué §2)</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The final draft of the RAA was posted for public comment on 22 April 2013. The new gTLD Registry Agreement was posted for public comment on 29 April 2013, and it requires all new gTLD registries to only use 2013 RAA registrars. The public comment reply period for the 2013 RAA closes on 4 June 2013. The NGPC intends to consider the 2013 RAA shortly thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 2013-04-11-WHOIS (Communiqué §3)</td>
<td>The GAC urges the ICANN Board to ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are duly taken into account by the recently established Directory Services Expert Working Group.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC notes that staff has confirmed that the GAC Principles have been shared with the Expert Working Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC advises the ICANN Board to amend the provisions in the new gTLD Registry Agreement pertaining to the IOC/RCRC names to confirm that the protections will be made permanent prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs.

The NGPC accepts the GAC advice. The proposed final version of the Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 includes protection for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes a list of names (provided by the IOC and RCRC Movement) that "shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD."

This protection was added pursuant to a NGPC resolution to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (204.11.26.NG03). The resolution recognized the GNSO's initiation of an expedited PDP. Until such time as the GNSO approves recommendations in the PDP and the Board adopts them, the NGPC's resolutions protecting IOC/RCRC names will remain in place. Should the GNSO submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations.
Annex 10
11 November 2013

Heather Dryden  
Chair, Governmental Advisory Committee  
11 November 2013  

Re: Letter from the Secretary General of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation  

Dear Heather,

As you know, on 4 November 2013, the Secretary General of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation submitted the attached letter with a copy to ICANN President and CEO Fadi Chehadé. The letter addresses the GAC’s advice concerning the new gTLD applications for .halal and .islam. As you also know, the New gTLD Program Committee entered into a dialogue with the GAC regarding these strings pursuant to the requirement of Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC however has not taken any final action on these strings while they remained subject to formal objections.

Now that the objection proceedings have concluded, the NGPC must decide what action to take on these strings. Before it does so, it will wait for any additional GAC input during the Buenos Aires meeting or resulting GAC Communiqué. The NGPC stands ready to discuss this matter further if additional dialog would be helpful.

Thank you for your attention.

Best regards,

Stephen D. Crocker  
Chair, ICANN Board of Directors
Dear Ms. Dryden,

I thank you for your kind letter dated 2nd October 2013 that confirms the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) becoming an Observer to the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

You are kindly aware that the OIC is the second largest intergovernmental organization with 57 Member States spread across four continents. It also has five observer members including the Russian Federation and the USA, the UK, France, Italy, Canada and Australia maintains official relations with the Organization through appointing Special Envoys. Besides, it is the sole official representative of the Muslim World representing 1.6 billion Muslim peoples around the World.

As such, I take this as my responsibility to bring to your kind attention our firm and clear position with regard to the use of Islamic terms such as: Islam and Halal gTLDs. The OIC took note of the “GAC Advice to the ICANN Board” incorporated in the GAC Communiqué dated 11 April, 2013 adopted at Beijing, People Republic of China. Specifically, the advice contained in Article 1/a/lvi with regard, to Module 3.1 part II of the applicant Guidebook, quote "the GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically Islam and Halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for Islam and Halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed” unquote.

To this end, the OIC feels that the observation of the GAC members about the lack of community involvement and support was based on absence of proper information. The involvement and support of the OIC as the sole official representative of 1.6 billion Muslims are tantamount to the involvement and support of the World Muslim populations. Moreover, to give this claim on Islam and Halal gTLDs more legal footing, the Foreign Ministers of 57 Muslim Member States of the OIC is going to adopt a resolution to the effect of protecting and having a united stand towards the use of the new gTLDs with Islamic identity. This Resolution will be adopted at the forthcoming OIC Council of Foreign Ministers Meeting (CFM) scheduled to be held in Conakry, Guinea on 9-11 December 2013.

In view of the above, the OIC would be happy to engage and fully cooperate with the GAC of ICANN to find an appropriate solution to this crucial issue. In the meantime, I would request you to kindly consider this letter as an official opposition of the Member States of the OIC towards probable authorization by the GAC allowing use of these new gTLDs. Islam and Halal by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.

I look forward to having your positive consideration on the issue as well as to engaging in further institutional cooperation between the OIC and ICANN.

Sincerely,

Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu

Ms. Heather Dryden
Chair, Governmental Advisory Committee
ICANN
CC: Mr. Fadi Chehadé (President and CEO of ICANN)
Dear Steve,

Thank you for your letter dated 11 November 2013 regarding the new gTLD applications for .islam and .halal, with reference to a recent letter from the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC).

You also state that the NGPC will await any further GAC input on this matter in Buenos Aires. This was brought up in the GAC in Buenos Aires and, as I trust you have noticed, the Buenos Aires Communiqué (section II.7) simply clarifies that the GAC concluded its discussions on these applications with the advice provided in the Beijing Communiqué.

Accordingly, no further GAC input on this matter can be expected. However, I understand that the OIC intends to hold a meeting December 9-11. Consequently, the OIC might choose to correspond further with the Board directly to convey any relevant outcomes from the meeting.

Very best regards,

Heather Dryden
Chair, Governmental Advisory Committee
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FINAL DECLARATION

________________________________________

In the matter of an Independent Review Process (IRP) pursuant to the Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Number's (ICANN’s) Bylaws, the International Dispute Resolution Procedures (ICDR Rules) and the Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR),

Between: DotConnectAfrica Trust;
(“Claimant” or “DCA Trust”)

Represented by Mr. Arif H. Ali, Ms. Meredith Craven, Ms. Erin Yates and Mr. Ricardo Ampudia of Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP located at 1300 Eye Street, NW, Suite 900, Washington, DC 2005, U.S.A.

And

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN);
(“Respondent” or “ICANN”)

Represented by Mr. Jeffrey A. LeVee and Ms. Rachel Zernik of Jones Day, LLP located at 555 South Flower Street, Fiftieth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071, U.S.A.

Claimant and Respondent will together be referred to as “Parties”.

IRP Panel

Prof. Catherine Kessedjian
Hon. William J. Cahill (Ret.)
Babak Barin, President
I. BACKGROUND

1. DCA Trust is a non-profit organization established under the laws of the Republic of Mauritius on 15 July 2010 with its registry operation – DCA Registry Services (Kenya) Limited – as its principal place of business in Nairobi, Kenya.

2. DCA Trust was formed with the charitable purpose of, among other things, advancing information technology education in Africa and providing a continental Internet domain name to provide access to internet services for the people of Africa and not for the public good.

3. In March 2012, DCA Trust applied to ICANN for the delegation of the .AFRICA top-level domain name in its 2012 General Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) Internet Expansion Program (the “New gTLD Program”), an internet resource available for delegation under that program.

4. ICANN is a non-profit corporation established on 30 September 1998 under the laws of the State of California, and headquartered in Marina del Rey, California, U.S.A. According to its Articles of Incorporation, ICANN was established for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole and is tasked with carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law, international conventions and local law.

5. On 4 June 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (“NGPC”) posted a notice that it had decided not to accept DCA Trust’s application.

6. On 19 June 2013, DCA Trust filed a request for reconsideration by the ICANN Board Governance Committee (“BGC”), which denied the request on 1 August 2013.

7. On 19 August 2013, DCA Trust informed ICANN of its intention to seek relief before an Independent Review Panel under ICANN’s Bylaws. Between August and October 2013, DCA Trust and ICANN participated in a Cooperative Engagement Process (“CEP”) to try and resolve the issues relating to DCA Trust’s application. Despite several meetings, no resolution was reached.

8. On 24 October 2013, DCA Trust filed a Notice of Independent Review Process with the ICDR in accordance with Article IV, Section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws.
9. In an effort to safeguard its rights pending the ongoing constitution of the IRP Panel, on 22 January 2014, DCA Trust wrote to ICANN requesting that it immediately cease any further processing of all applications for the delegation of the .AFRICA gTLD, failing which DCA Trust would seek emergency relief under Article 37 of the ICDR Rules.

10. DCA Trust also indicated that it believed it had the right to seek such relief because there was no standing panel as anticipated in the Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process (“Supplementary Procedures”), which could otherwise hear requests for emergency relief.

11. In response, on 5 February 2014, ICANN wrote:

Although ICANN typically is refraining from further processing activities in conjunction with pending gTLD applications where a competing applicant has a pending reconsideration request, ICANN does not intend to refrain from further processing of applications that relate in some way to pending independent review proceedings. In this particular instance, ICANN believes that the grounds for DCA's IRP are exceedingly weak, and that the decision to refrain from the further processing of other applications on the basis of the pending IRP would be unfair to others.

12. In its Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection subsequently submitted on 28 March 2014, DCA Trust pleaded, inter alia, that, in an effort to preserve its rights, in January 2014, DCA requested that ICANN suspend its processing of applications for .AFRICA during the pendency of this proceeding. ICANN, however, summarily refused to do so.

13. DCA Trust also submitted that “on 23 March 2014, DCA became aware that ICANN intended to sign an agreement with DCA's competitor (a South African company called ZACR) on 26 March 2014 in Beijing […] Immediately upon receiving this information, DCA contacted ICANN and asked it to refrain from signing the agreement with ZACR in light of the fact that this proceeding was still pending. Instead, according to ICANN’s website, ICANN signed its agreement with ZACR the very next day, two days ahead of plan, on 24 March instead of 26 March.”

14. According to DCA Trust, that same day, “ICANN then responded to DCA’s request by presenting the execution of the contract as a fait accompli, arguing that DCA should have sought to stop ICANN from proceeding with ZACR’s application, as ICANN had already informed DCA of its intention [to] ignore its obligations to participate in this proceeding in good faith.”
15. DCA Trust also submitted that on 25 March 2014, as per ICANN’s email to the ICDR, “ICANN for the first time informed DCA that it would accept the application of Article 37 of the ICDR Rules to this proceeding contrary to the express provisions of the Supplementary Procedures of ICANN has put in place for the IRP Process.”

16. In its Request, DCA Trust argued that it “is entitled to an accountability proceeding with legitimacy and integrity, with the capacity to provide a meaningful remedy. […] DCA has requested the opportunity to compete for rights to .AFRICA pursuant to the rules that ICANN put into place. Allowing ICANN to delegate .AFRICA to DCA’s only competitor – which took actions that were instrumental in the process leading to ICANN’s decision to reject DCA’s application – would eviscerate the very purpose of this proceeding and deprive DCA of its rights under ICANN’s own constitutive instruments and international law.”

17. Finally, among other things, DCA Trust requested the following interim relief:

   a. An order compelling ICANN to refrain from any further steps toward delegation of the .AFRICA gTLD, including but not limited to execution or assessment of pre-delegation testing, negotiations or discussions relating to delegation with the entity ZACR or any of its officers or agents; […]

18. On 24 April and 12 May 2014, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, a Decision on Interim Measures of Protection, and a list of questions for the Parties to answer.

19. In its 12 May 2014 Decision on Interim Measures of Protection, the Panel required ICANN to “immediately refrain from any further processing of any application for .AFRICA until [the Panel] heard the merits of DCA Trust’s Notice of Independent Review Process and issued its conclusions regarding the same”.

20. In the Panel’s unanimous view, among other reasons, it would have been “unfair and unjust to deny DCA Trust’s request for interim relief when the need for such a relief…[arose] out of ICANN’s failure to follow its own Bylaws and procedures.” The Panel also reserved its decision on the issue of costs relating to that stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.

21. On 27 May and 4 June 2015, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 2 and a Decision on ICANN’s request for Partial Reconsideration of certain portions of its Decision on Interim Measures of Protection.
22. In its 4 June 2014 Decision on ICANN’s request for Partial Reconsideration, the Panel unanimously concluded that ICANN’s request must be denied. In that Decision, the Panel observed:

9. After careful consideration of the Parties’ respective submissions, the Panel is of the unanimous view that ICANN’s Request must be denied for two reasons.

10. First, there is nothing in ICANN’s Bylaws, the International Dispute Resolution Procedures of the ICDR effective as at 1 June 2009 or the Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process that in any way address the Panel’s ability to address ICANN’s Request. The Panel has not been able to find any relevant guidance in this regard in any of the above instruments and ICANN has not pointed to any relevant provision or rule that would support its argument that the Panel has the authority to reconsider its Decision of 12 May 2014.

11. Moreover, ICANN has not pointed to any clerical, typographical or computation error or shortcoming in the Panel’s Decision and it has not requested an interpretation of the Panel’s Decision based on any ambiguity or vagueness. To the contrary, ICANN has asked the Panel to reconsider its prior findings with respect to certain references in its Decision that ICANN disagrees with, on the basis that those references are in ICANN’s view, inaccurate.

12. Second, even if the Panel were to reconsider based on any provision or rule available, its findings with respect to those passages complained of by ICANN as being inaccurate in its Decision – namely paragraphs 29 to 33 – after deliberation, the Panel would still conclude that ICANN has failed to follow its own Bylaws as more specifically explained in the above paragraphs, in the context of addressing which of the Parties should be viewed as responsible for the delays associated with DCA Trust’s Request for Interim Measures of Protection. It is not reasonable to construe the Bylaw proviso for consideration by a provider-appointed ad hoc panel when a standing panel is not in place as relieving ICANN indefinitely of forming the required standing panel. Instead, the provider appointed panel is properly viewed as an interim procedure to be used before ICANN has a chance to form a standing panel. Here, more than a year has elapsed, and ICANN has offered no explanation why the standing panel has not been formed, nor indeed any indication that formation of that panel is in process, or has begun, or indeed even is planned to begin at some point.

The Panel also reserved its decision on the issue of costs relating to that stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.

23. On 14 August 2014, the Panel issued a Declaration on the IRP Procedure (“2014 Declaration”) pursuant to which it (1) ordered a reasonable documentary exchange, (2) permitted the Parties to benefit from additional filings and supplementary briefing, (3) allowed a video hearing, and (4) permitted both Parties at the hearing to
challenge and test the veracity of any written statements made by witnesses.

The Panel also concluded that its Declaration on the IRP and its future Declaration on the Merits of the case were binding on the Parties. In particular, the Panel decided:

98. Various provisions of ICANN's Bylaws and the Supplementary Procedures support the conclusion that the Panel's decisions, opinions and declarations are binding. There is certainly nothing in the Supplementary Rules that renders the decisions, opinions and declarations of the Panel either advisory or non-binding.

[...]

100. Section 10 of the Supplementary Procedures resembles Article 27 of the ICDR Rules. Whereas Article 27 refers to “Awards”, section 10 refers to “Declarations”. Section 10 of the Supplementary Procedures, however, is silent on whether Declarations made by the IRP Panel are “final and binding” on the parties.

101. As explained earlier, as per Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 8 of the Bylaws, the Board of Directors of ICANN has given its approval to the ICDR to establish a set of operating rules and procedures for the conduct of the IRP set out in section 3. The operating rules and procedures established by the ICDR are the ICDR Rules as referred to in the preamble of the Supplementary Procedures. These Rules have been supplemented with the Supplementary Procedures.

102. This is clear from two different parts of the Supplementary Procedures. First, in the preamble, where the Supplementary Procedures state that: “These procedures supplement the International Centre for Dispute Resolution’s International Arbitration Rules in accordance with the independent review procedures set forth in Article IV, Section 3 of the ICANN Bylaws”.

103. And second, under section 2 entitled (Scope), that states that the “ICDR will apply these Supplementary Procedures, in addition to the INTERNATIONAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES, in all cases submitted to the ICDR in connection with the Article IV, Section 3(4) of the ICANN Bylaws”. It is therefore clear that ICANN intended the operating rules and procedures for the independent review to be an international set of arbitration rules supplemented by a particular set of additional rules.

104. There is also nothing inconsistent between section 10 of the Supplementary Procedures and Article 27 of the ICDR Rules.

105. One of the hallmarks of international arbitration is the binding and final nature of the decisions made by the adjudicators. Binding arbitration is the essence of what the ICDR Rules, the ICDR itself and its parent, the American Arbitration Association, offer. The selection of the ICDR Rules as the baseline set of procedures for IRP’s, therefore, points to a binding adjudicative process.
106. Furthermore, the process adopted in the Supplementary Procedures is an adversarial one where counsel for the parties present competing evidence and arguments, and a panel decides who prevails, when and in what circumstances. The panellists who adjudicate the parties’ claims are also selected from among experienced arbitrators, whose usual charter is to make binding decisions.

107. The above is further supported by the language and spirit of section 11 of ICANN's Bylaws. Pursuant to that section, the IRP Panel has the authority to summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious. Surely, such a decision, opinion or declaration on the part of the Panel would not be considered advisory.

[...]

110. ICANN points to the extensive public and expert input that preceded the formulation of the Supplementary Procedures. The Panel would have expected, were a mere advisory decision, opinion or declaration the objective of the IRP, that this intent be clearly articulated somewhere in the Bylaws or the Supplementary Procedures. In the Panel's view, this could have easily been done.

111. The force of the foregoing textual and construction considerations as pointing to the binding effect of the Panel's decisions and declarations are reinforced by two factors: 1) the exclusive nature of the IRP whereby the non-binding argument would be clearly in contradiction with such a factor; and, 2) the special, unique, and publicly important function of ICANN. As explained before, ICANN is not an ordinary private non-profit entity deciding for its own sake who it wishes to conduct business with, and who it does not. ICANN rather, is the steward of a highly valuable and important international resource.

[...]

115. Moreover, assuming for the sake of argument that it is acceptable for ICANN to adopt a remedial scheme with no teeth, the Panel is of the opinion that, at a minimum, the IRP should forthrightly explain and acknowledge that the process is merely advisory. This would at least let parties know before embarking on a potentially expensive process that a victory before the IRP panel may be ignored by ICANN. And, a straightforward acknowledgment that the IRP process is intended to be merely advisory might lead to a legislative or executive initiative to create a truly independent compulsory process. The Panel seriously doubts that the Senators questioning former ICANN President Stuart Lynn in 2002 would have been satisfied had they understood that a) ICANN had imposed on all applicants a waiver of all judicial remedies, and b) the IRP process touted by ICANN as the “ultimate guarantor” of ICANN accountability was only an advisory process, the benefit of which accrued only to ICANN. [Underlining is from the original decision.]

The Panel also reserved its decision on the issue of costs relating to that stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.
24. On 5 September and 25 September 2014, the Panel issued Procedural Orders No. 3 and No. 4. In Procedural Order No. 3, the Panel notably required the Parties to complete their respective filing of briefs in accordance with the IRP Procedure Guidelines by 3 November 2014 for DCA Trust and 3 December 2014 for ICANN.

25. In Procedural Order No. 4 dated 25 September 2014, the Panel reached a decision regarding document production issues.

26. On 3 November 2014 and 3 December 2014, the Parties filed their Memorial and Response Memorial on the Merits in accordance with the timetable set out in Procedural Order No. 3.

27. On 26 February 2015, following the passing away of the Hon. Richard C. Neal (Ret.) and confirmation by the ICDR of his replacement arbitrator, the Hon. William J. Cahill (Ret.), ICANN requested that this Panel consider revisiting the part of this IRP relating to the issue of hearing witnesses addressed in the Panel’s 2014 Declaration.

28. In particular, ICANN submitted that given the replacement of Justice Neal, Article 15.2 of the ICDR Rules together with the Supplementary Procedures permitted this IRP to in its sole discretion, determine “whether all or part” of this IRP should be repeated.

29. According to ICANN, while it was not necessary to repeat all of this IRP, since the Panel here had exceeded its authority under the Supplementary Procedures when it held in its 2014 Declaration that it could order live testimony of witnesses, the Panel should then at a minimum consider revisiting that issue.

30. According to ICANN, panelists derived “their powers and authority from the relevant applicable rules, the parties’ requests, and the contractual provisions agreed to by the Parties (in this instance, ICANN’s Bylaws, which establish the process of independent review). The authority of panelists is limited by such rules, submissions and agreements.”

31. ICANN emphasized that “compliance with the Supplementary Procedures [was] critical to ensure predictability for ICANN, applicants for and objectors to gTLD applications, and the entire ICANN community…”, and while “ICANN [was] committed to fairness and accessibility…ICANN [was] also committed to predictability and the like treatment of all applicants. For this Panel to change the rules
for this single applicant [did] not encourage any of these commitments.”

32. ICANN also pleaded that, DCA specifically agreed to be bound by the Supplementary Procedures when it initially submitted its application, the Supplementary Procedures apply to both ICANN and DCA alike, ICANN is now in the same position when it comes to testing witness declarations and finally, in alternative dispute resolution proceedings where cross examination of witnesses is allowed, parties often waive cross-examination.

33. Finally, ICANN advanced that:

[T]he Independent Review process is an alternative dispute resolution procedure adapted to the specific issues to be addressed pursuant to ICANN’s Bylaws. The process cannot be transformed into a full-fledged trial without amending ICANN’s Bylaws and the Supplementary Procedures, which specifically provide for a hearing that includes counsel argument only. Accordingly, ICANN strongly urges the Panel to follow the rules for this proceeding and to declare that the hearing in May will be limited to argument of counsel.

34. On 24 March 2015, the Panel issued its Declaration on ICANN’s Request for Revisiting of the 14 August Declaration on the IRP Procedure following the Replacement of Panel Member. In that Declaration, the newly constituted Panel unanimously concluded that it was not necessary for it to reconsider or revisit its 2014 Declaration.

35. In passing and not at all as a result of any intended or inadvertent reconsideration or revisiting of its 2014 Declaration, the Panel referred to Articles III and IV of ICANN’s Bylaws and concluded:

Under the general heading, Transparency, and title “Purpose”, Section 1 of Article III states: “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.” Under the general heading, Accountability and Review, and title “Purpose”, Section 1 of Article IV reads: “In carrying out its mission as set out in these Bylaws, ICANN should be accountable to the community for operating in a manner that is consistent with these Bylaws, and with due regard for the core values set forth in Article I of these Bylaws.” In light of the above, and again in passing only, it is the Panel’s unanimous view, that the filing of fact witness statements (as ICANN has done in this IRP) and limiting telephonic or in-person hearings to argument only is inconsistent with the objectives setout in Articles III and IV setout above.

The Panel again reserved its decision on the issue of costs relating to that stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.
36. On 24 March and 1 April 2015, the Panel rendered Procedural Orders No. 5 and 6, in which, among other things, the Panel recorded the Parties’ “agreement that there will no cross-examination of any of the witnesses” at the hearing of the merits.

37. On 20 April 2015, the Panel rendered its Third Declaration on the IRP Procedure. In that Declaration, the Panel decided that the hearing of this IRP should be an in-person one in Washington, D.C. and required all three witnesses who had filed witness statements to be present at the hearing.

38. The Panel in particular noted that:

13. [...] Article IV, Section 3, and Paragraph 4 of ICANN’s Bylaws (reproduced above) – the Independent Review Process – was designed and set up to offer the Internet community, an accountability process that would ensure that ICANN acted in a manner consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

14. Both ICANN’s Bylaws and the Supplementary Rules require an IRP Panel to examine and decide whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. As ICANN’s Bylaws explicitly put it, an IRP Panel is “charged with comparing contested actions of the Board [...]”, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

15. The IRP is the only independent third party process that allows review of board actions to ensure their consistency with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. As already explained in this Panel’s 14 August 2014 Declaration on the IRP Procedure (“August 2014 Declaration”), the avenues of accountability for applicants that have disputes with ICANN do not include resort to the courts. Applications for gTLD delegations are governed by ICANN’s Guidebook, which provides that applicants waive all right to resort to the courts:

“Applicant hereby releases ICANN [...] from any and all claims 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, 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 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 ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM.”

Thus, assuming that the foregoing waiver of any and all judicial remedies is valid and enforceable, then the only and ultimate “accountability” remedy for an applicant is the IRP.

16. Accountability requires an organization to explain or give reasons for its activities, accept responsibility for them and to disclose the results in a transparent manner.
21. In order to keep the costs and burdens of independent review as low as possible, ICANN’s Bylaws, in Article IV, Section 3 and Paragraph 12, suggests that the IRP Panel conduct its proceedings by email and otherwise via the Internet to the maximum extent feasible, and where necessary the IRP Panel may hold meetings by telephone. Use of the words “should” and “may” versus “shall” are demonstrative of this point. In the same paragraph, however, ICANN’s Bylaws state that, “in the unlikely event that a telephonic or in-person hearing is convened, the hearing shall be limited to argument only; all evidence, including witness statements, must be submitted in writing in advance.”

22. The Panel finds that this last sentence in Paragraph 12 of ICANN’s Bylaws, unduly and improperly restricts the Panel’s ability to conduct the “independent review” it has been explicitly mandated to carry out in Paragraph 4 of Section 3 in the manner it considers appropriate.

23. How can a Panel compare contested actions of the Board and declare whether or not they are consistent with the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, without the ability to fact find and make enquiries concerning those actions in the manner it considers appropriate?

24. How can the Panel, for example, determine, if the Board acted without conflict of interest, exercised due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of it, or exercised independent judgment in taking decisions, if the Panel cannot ask the questions it needs to, in the manner it needs to or considers fair, just and appropriate in the circumstances?

25. How can the Panel ensure that the parties to this IRP are treated with equality and that each party has the right to be heard and is given a fair opportunity to present its case with respect to the mandate the Panel has been given, if as ICANN submits, “ICANN’s Bylaws do not permit any examination of witnesses by the parties or the Panel during the hearing”?

26. The Panel is unanimously of the view that it cannot. The Panel is also of the view that any attempt by ICANN in this case to prevent it from carrying out its independent review of ICANN Board’s actions in the manner that the Panel considers appropriate under the circumstances deprives the accountability and review process set out in the Bylaws of any meaning.

27. ICANN has filed two ‘Declarations’ in this IRP, one signed by Ms. Heather Dryden, a Senior Policy Advisor at the International Telecommunications Policy and Coordination Directorate at Industry Canada, and Chair of ICANN Government Advisory Committee from 2010 to 2013, and the other by Mr. Cherine Chalaby, a member of the Board of Directors of ICANN since 2010. Mr. Chalaby is also, since its inception, one of three members of the Subcommittee on Ethics and Conflicts of ICANN’s Board of Governance Committee.

28. In their respective statements, both individuals have confirmed that they “have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in [their] declaration and [are] competent to testify to these matters if called as a witness.”
29. In his Declaration, Mr. Chalaby states that “all members of the NGPC were asked to and did specifically affirm that they did not have a conflict of interest related to DCA’s application for .AFRICA when they voted on the GAC advice. In addition, the NGPC asked the BGC to look into the issue further, and the BGC referred the matter to the Subcommittee. After investigating the matter, the Subcommittee concluded that Chris Disspain and Mike Silber did not have conflicts of interest with respect to DCA’s application for .AFRICA.”

30. The Panel considers it important and useful for ICANN’s witnesses, and in particular, Mr. Chalaby as well as for Ms. Sophia Bekele Eshete to be present at the hearing of this IRP.

31. While the Panel takes note of ICANN’s position depicted on page 2 of its 8 April 2015 letter, the Panel nonetheless invites ICANN to reconsider its position.

32. The Panel also takes note of ICANN’s offer in that same letter to address written questions to its witnesses before the hearing, and if the Panel needs more information after the hearing to clarify the evidence presented during the hearing. The Panel, however, is unanimously of the view that this approach is fundamentally inconsistent with the requirements in ICANN’s Bylaws for it to act openly, transparently, fairly and with integrity.

33. As already indicated in this Panel’s August 2014 Declaration, analysis of the propriety of ICANN’s decisions in this case will depend at least in part on evidence about the intentions and conduct of ICANN’s top personnel. Even though the Parties have explicitly agreed that neither will have an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses of the other in this IRP, the Panel is of the view that ICANN should not be allowed to rely on written statements of its top officers attesting to the propriety of their actions and decisions without an opportunity for the Panel and thereafter DCA Trust’s counsel to ask any follow-up questions arising out of the Panel’s questions of ICANN’s witnesses. The same opportunity of course will be given to ICANN to ask questions of Ms. Bekele Eshete, after the Panel has directed its questions to her.

34. The Parties having agreed that there will be no cross-examination of witnesses in this IRP, the procedure for asking witnesses questions at the hearing shall be as follows:

   a) The Panel shall first have an opportunity to ask any witness any questions it deems necessary or appropriate;

   b) Each Party thereafter, shall have an opportunity to ask any follow-up questions the Panel permits them to ask of any witness.

The Panel again reserved its decision on the issue of costs relating to that stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.

39. On 27 April and 4 May 2015, the Panel issued its Procedural Order No. 7 and 8, and on that last date, it held a prehearing conference call with the Parties as required by the ICDR Rules. In Procedural
Order No. 8, the Panel set out the order of witness and party presentations agreed upon by the Parties.

40. On 18 May 2015, and in response to ZA Central Registry’s (ZACR) request to have two of its representatives along with a representative from the African Union Commission (AUC) attend at the IRP hearing scheduled for 22 and 23 May 2015 in Washington, D.C., the Panel issued its Procedural Order No. 9, denying the requests made by ZACR and AUC to be at the merits hearing of this matter in Washington, D.C.

41. In a letter dated 11 May 2015, ZACR and AUC’s legal representative had submitted that both entities had an interest in this matter and it would be mutually beneficial for the IRP to permit them to attend at the hearing in Washington, D.C.

42. ZACR’s legal representative had also argued that “allowing for interests of a materially affected party such as ZACR, the successful applicant for the dotAfrica gTLD, as well as broader public interests, to be present enhances the legitimacy of the proceedings and therefore the accountability and transparency of ICANN and its dispute resolution procedures.”

43. For the Panel, Article 20 of the ICDR Rules, which applied in this matter, stated that the hearing of this IRP was “private unless the parties agree otherwise”. The Parties in this IRP did not consent to the presence of ZACR and AUC. While ICANN indicated that it had no objection to the presence of ZACR and AUC, DCA Trust was not of the same view. Therefore, ZACR and AUC were not permitted to attend.

44. The in-person hearing of the merits of this IRP took place on 22 and 23 May 2015 at the offices of Jones Day LLP in Washington, D.C. All three individuals who had filed witness statements in this IRP, namely Ms. Sophia Bekele Eshete, representative for DCA Trust, Ms. Heather Dryden and Mr. Cherine Chalaby, representatives for ICANN, attended in person and answered questions put to them by the Panel and subsequently by the legal representatives of both Parties. In attendance at the hearing was also Ms. Amy Stathos, Deputy General Counsel of ICANN.

45. The proceedings of the hearing were reported by Ms. Cindy L. Sebo of TransPerfect Legal Solutions, who is a Registered Merit Real-Time Court Reporter.
46. On the last day of the hearing, DCA Trust was asked by the Panel to clearly and explicitly articulate its prayers for relief. In a document entitled Claimant’s Final Request for Relief which was signed by the Executive Director of DCA Trust, Ms. Sophia Bekele and marked at the hearing as Hearing Exhibit 4, DCA Trust asked the Panel to:

Declare that the Board violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) by:

- Discriminating against DCA and wrongfully assisting the AUC and ZACR to obtain rights to the .AFRICA gTLD;
- Failing to apply ICANN’s procedures in a neutral and objective manner, with procedural fairness when it accepted the GAC Objection Advice against DCA; and
- Failing to apply its procedures in a neutral and objective manner, with procedural fairness when it approved the BGC’s recommendation not to reconsider the NGPC’s acceptance of the GAC Objection Advice against DCA;

And to declare that:

- DCA is the prevailing party in this IRP and, consequently, shall be entitled to its costs in this proceeding; and
- DCA is entitled to such other relief as the Panel may find appropriate under the circumstances described herein.

Recommend, as a result of each of these violations, that:

- ICANN cease all preparations to delegate the .AFRICA gTLD to ZACR;
- ICANN permit DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process and be granted a period of no less than 18 months to obtain Government support as set out in the AGB and interpreted by the Geographic Names Panel, or accept that the requirement is satisfied as a result of the endorsement of DCA Trust’s application by UNECA; and
- ICANN compensate DCA for the costs it has incurred as a result of ICANN’s violations of its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and AGB.

47. In its response to DCA Trust’s Final Request for Relief, ICANN submitted that, “the Panel should find that no action (or inaction) of the ICANN Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, and accordingly none of DCA’s requested relief is appropriate.”

48. ICANN also submitted that:

DCA urges that the Panel issue a declaration in its favor…and also asks that the Panel declare that DCA is the prevailing party and entitled to its costs. Although ICANN believes that the evidence does not support the
declarations that DCA seeks, ICANN does not object to the form of DCA’s requests.

At the bottom of DCA’s Final Request for Relief, DCA asks that the Panel recommend that ICANN cease all preparations to delegate the .AFRICA gTLD to ZACR, and that ICANN permit DCA’s application to proceed and give DCA no less than 18 additional months from the date of the Panel’s declaration to attempt to obtain the requisite support of the countries in Africa. ICANN objects to that appropriateness of these requested recommendations because they are well outside the Panel’s authority as set forth in the Bylaws.

[...]

Because the Panel’s authority is limited to declaring whether the Board’s conduct was inconsistent with the Articles or the Bylaws, the Panel should limit its declaration to that question and refrain from recommending how the Board should then proceed in light of the Panel’s declaration. Pursuant to Paragraph 12 of that same section of the Bylaws, the Board will consider the Panel’s declaration at its next meeting, and if the Panel has declared that the Board’s conduct was inconsistent with the Articles or the Bylaws, the Board will have to determine how to act upon the opinion of the Panel.

By way of example only, if the Panel somehow found that the unanimous NGPC vote on 4 June 2013 was not properly taken, the Board might determine that the vote from that meeting should be set aside and that the NGPC should consider the issue anew. Likewise, if the Panel were to determine that the NGPC did not adequately consider the GAC advice at [the] 4 June 2013 meeting, the Board might require that the NGPC reconsider the GAC advice.

In all events, the Bylaws mandate that the Board has the responsibility of fashioning the appropriate remedy once the Panel has declared whether or not it thinks the Board’s conduct was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The Bylaws do not provide the Panel with the authority to make any recommendations or declarations in this respect.

49. In response to ICANN’s submissions above, on 15 June 2015, DCA Trust advanced that the Panel had already ruled that its declaration on the merits will be binding on the Parties and that nothing in ICANN’s Bylaws, the Supplementary Procedures or the ICDR Rules applicable in these proceedings prohibits the Panel from making a recommendation to the ICANN Board of Directors regarding an appropriate remedy. DCA Trust also submitted that:

According to ICANN’s Bylaws, the Independent Review Process is designed to provide a remedy for “any” person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board. Further, “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. Indeed, the ICANN New gTLD Program Committee, operating under the delegated authority of the ICANN Board, itself suggested that DCA could seek relief through ICANN’s accountability
mechanisms or, in other words, the Reconsideration process and the Independent Review Process. If the IRP mechanism – the mechanism of last resort for gTLD applicants – is intended to provide a remedy for a claimant materially injured or harmed by Board action or inaction, and it serves as the only alternative to litigation, then naturally the IRP Panel may recommend how the ICANN Board might fashion a remedy to redress such injury or harm.

50. On 25 June 2015, the Panel issued its Procedural Order No. 10, directing the Parties to by 1 July 2015 simultaneously file their detailed submissions on costs and their allocation in these proceedings.

51. The additional factual background and reasons in the above decisions, procedural orders and declarations rendered by the Panel are hereby adopted and incorporated by reference in this Final Declaration.

52. On 1 and 2 July 2015, the Parties filed their respective positions and submissions on costs.

II. BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PARTIES’ POSITIONS ON THE MERITS & REQUEST FOR RELIEF

53. According to DCA Trust and as elaborated on in its Memorial on Merits dated 3 November 2014, the central dispute between it and ICANN in this IRP may be summarized as follows:

32. By preventing DCA’S application from proceeding through the new gTLD review process and by coordinating with the AUC and others to ensure that the AUC obtained the rights to .AFRICA, ICANN breached its obligations of independence, transparency and due process contained in its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, including its obligation to conduct itself consistent with its duty of good faith under relevant principles of international law.

54. According to DCA Trust, among other things, “instead of functioning as a disinterested regulator of a fair and transparent gTLD application process, ICANN used its authority and oversight over that process to assist ZACR and to eliminate its only competitor, DCA, from the process.”

55. DCA Trust also advanced that, “as a result, ICANN deprived DCA of the right to compete for .AFRICA in accordance with the rules ICANN established for the new gTLD program, in breach of the Applicant Guidebook (“AGB”) and ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.”
56. In its 3 December 2014 Response to DCA's Memorial on the Merits, among other things, ICANN submitted that, “ICANN's conduct with respect to DCA's application for .AFRICA was fully consistent with ICANN’s Bylaws, its Articles of Incorporation and the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN also pleaded that it acted through open and transparent processes, evaluated DCA's application for .AFRICA in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Guidebook, and followed the procedures set forth in its Bylaws in evaluating DCA’s Request for Reconsideration.”

57. ICANN advanced that, “DCA is using this IRP as a mean to challenge the right of African countries to support a specific (and competing) application for .AFRICA, and to rewrite the Guidebook.”

58. ICANN also added that, “ICANN provided assistance to those who requested, cooperated with governmental authorities, and respected the consensus advice issued by the GAC, which speaks on behalf of the governments of the world.”

59. In its Final Request for Relief filed on 23 May 2015, DCA Trust asked this Panel to:

1. Declare that the Board violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Applicant Guidebook (AGB);
2. Declare that DCA Trust is the prevailing party in this IRP and, consequently entitled to its costs in this proceeding; and
3. Recommend as a result of the Board violations a course of action for the Board to follow going forward.

60. In its response letter of 1 June 2015, ICANN confirmed that it did not object to the form of DCA Trust’s requests above, even though it believes that the evidence does not support the declarations that DCA Trust seeks. ICANN did, however, object to the appropriateness of the request for recommendations on the ground that they are outside of the Panel’s authority as set forth in the Bylaws.

III. THE ISSUES RAISED AND THE PANEL’S DECISION

61. After carefully considering the Parties’ written and oral submissions, perusing the three witness statements filed and hearing viva voce the testimonies of the witnesses at the in-person hearing of this IRP in Washington, D.C., the Panel answers the following four questions put to it as follows:
1. Did the Board act or fail to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook?

Answer: Yes.

2. Can the IRP Panel recommend a course of action for the Board to follow as a consequence of any declaration that the Board acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook (AGB)?

Answer: Yes.

3. Who is the prevailing party in this IRP?

Answer: DCA Trust

4. Who is responsible for bearing the costs of this IRP and the cost of the IRP Provider?

Answer: ICANN, in full.

Summary of Panel’s Decision

For reasons explained in more detail below, and pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (c) of ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel declares that both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of DCA Trust relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

Furthermore, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel recommends that ICANN continue to refrain from delegating the .AFRICA gTLD and permit DCA Trust’s application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process.

Finally, DCA Trust is the prevailing party in this IRP and ICANN is responsible for bearing, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, Article 11 of Supplementary Procedures and Article 31 of the ICDR Rules, the totality of the costs of this IRP and the totality of the costs of the IRP Provider.

As per the last sentence of Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, DCA Trust and ICANN shall each bear their own expenses. The Parties shall also each bear their own legal representation fees.
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES AND REASONS FOR THE PANEL’S DECISION

1) Did the Board act or fail to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook?

62. Before answering this question, the Panel considers it necessary to quickly examine and address the issue of “standard of review” as referred to by ICANN in its 3 December 2014 Response to DCA’s Memorial on the Merits or the “law applicable to these proceedings” as pleaded by DCA Trust in its 3 November 2014 Memorial on the Merits.

63. According to DCA Trust:

30. The version of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and its Bylaws in effect at the time DCA filed its Request for IRP applies to these proceedings. [Articles of Incorporation of Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (21 November 1998) and Bylaws of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (11 April 2013)]. ICANN’s agreement with the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications & Information Administration ("NTIA"), the “Affirmation of Commitments,” is also instructive, as it explains ICANN’s obligations in light of its role as regulator of the Domain Name System (“DNS”). The standard of review is a de novo “independent review” of whether the actions of the Board violated the Bylaws, with focus on whether the Board acted without conflict of interest, with due diligence and care, and exercised independent judgment in the best interests of ICANN and its many stakeholders. (Underlining added).

31. All of the obligations enumerated in these documents are to be carried out first in conformity with “relevant principles of international law” and second in conformity with local law. As explained by Dr. Jack Goldsmith in his Expert Report submitted in ICM v. ICANN, the reference to “principles of international law” in ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation should be understood to include both customary international law and general principles of law.

64. In response, ICANN submits that:

11. The IRP is a unique process available under ICANN’s Bylaws for persons or entities that claim to have been materially and adversely affected by a decision or action of the ICANN Board, but only to the extent that Board action was inconsistent with ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles. This IRP Panel is tasked with providing its opinion as to whether the challenged Board actions violated ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles. ICANN’s Bylaws specifically identify the deferential standard of review that the IRP Panel must apply when evaluating the actions of the ICANN Board, focusing on:
a. Did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?;

b. Did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and

c. Did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

12. DCA disregards the plain language of ICANN’s Bylaws and relies instead on the IRP Panel’s declaration in a prior Independent Review proceeding, *ICM v. ICANN*. However, *ICM* was decided in 2010 under a previous version of ICANN’s Bylaws. In its declaration, the *ICM* Panel explicitly noted that ICANN’s then-current Bylaws “did not specify or imply that the [IRP] process provided for should (or should not) accord deference to the decisions of the ICANN Board.” As DCA acknowledges, the version of ICANN’s Bylaws that apply to this proceeding are the version as amended in April 2013. The current Bylaws provide for the deferential standard of review set forth above. [Underlining is added]

65. For the following reasons, the Panel is of the view that the standard of review is a *de novo*, objective and independent one examining whether the Board acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

66. ICANN is not an ordinary California nonprofit organization. Rather it has a large international purpose and responsibility to coordinate and ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems.

67. Indeed, Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation require 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.” ICANN’s Bylaws also impose duties on it to act in an open, transparent and fair manner with integrity.

68. ICANN’s Bylaws (as amended on 11 April 2013) which both Parties explicitly agree that applies to this IRP, reads in relevant parts as follows:

**ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW**

**Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS**
1. In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 2 of this Article, ICANN shall have in place a separate process for independent third-party review of Board actions alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

[...]

4. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Process Panel [...], which shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The IRP Panel must apply a defined standard of review to the IRP request, focusing on:

a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?

b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and

c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

69. Section 8 of the Supplementary Procedures similarly subject the IRP to the standard of review set out in subparagraphs a., b., and c., above, and add:

If a requestor demonstrates that the ICANN Board did not make a reasonable inquiry to determine it had sufficient facts available, ICANN Board members had a conflict of interest in participating in the decision, or the decision was not an exercise in independent judgment, believed by the ICANN Board to be in the best interests of the company, after taking account of the internet community and the global public interest, the requestor will have established proper grounds for review.

70. In the Panel’s view, Article IV, Section 3, and Paragraph 4 of ICANN’s Bylaws (reproduced above) – the Independent Review Process – was designed and set up to offer the Internet community, a *de novo, objective and independent* accountability process that would ensure that ICANN acted in a manner consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

71. Both ICANN’s Bylaws and the Supplementary Rules require an IRP Panel to *examine* and *decide* whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. As ICANN’s Bylaws explicitly put it, an IRP Panel is *charged with comparing contested actions of the Board [...], and with declaring* whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
72. The IRP is the only independent third party process that allows review of board actions to ensure their consistency with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. As already explained in this Panel’s 14 August 2014 Declaration on the IRP Procedure (“August 2014 Declaration”), the avenues of accountability for applicants that have disputes with ICANN do not include resort to the courts. Applications for gTLD delegations are governed by ICANN’s Guidebook, which provides that applicants waive all right to resort to the courts:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN [...] from any and all claims 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, 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 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 ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM.

73. Thus, assuming that the foregoing waiver of any and all judicial remedies is valid and enforceable, then the only and ultimate “accountability” remedy for an applicant is the IRP.

74. As previously decided by this Panel, such accountability requires an organization to explain or give reasons for its activities, accept responsibility for them and to disclose the results in a transparent manner.

75. Such accountability also requires, to use the words of the IRP Panel in the Booking.com B.V. v. ICANN (ICDR Case Number: 50-20-1400-0247), this IRP Panel to “objectively” determine whether or not the Board’s actions are in fact consistent with the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and Guidebook, which this Panel, like the one in Booking.com “understands as requiring that the Board’s conduct be appraised independently, and without any presumption of correctness.”

76. The Panel therefore concludes that the “standard of review” in this IRP is a de novo, objective and independent one, which does not require any presumption of correctness.

77. With the above in mind, the Panel now turns it mind to whether or not the Board in this IRP acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent
with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook.

**DCA Trust’s Position**

78. In its 3 November 2014 Memorial on the Merits, DCA Trust criticizes ICANN for variety of shortcomings and breaches relating to the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and Applicant Guidebook. DCA Trust submits:

32. By preventing DCA’s application from proceeding through the new gTLD review process and by coordinating with the AUC and others to ensure that the AUC obtained the rights to .AFRICA, ICANN breached its obligations of independence, transparency and due process contained in its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, including its obligation to conduct itself consistent with its duty of good faith under relevant principles of international law.

79. DCA Trust also pleads that ICANN breached its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws by discriminating against DCA Trust and failing to permit competition for the .AFRICA gTLD, ICANN abused it Regulatory authority in its differential treatment of the ZACR and DCA Trust applications, and in contravention of the rules for the New gTLD Program, ICANN colluded with AUC to ensure that the AUC would obtain control over .AFRICA.

80. According to DCA Trust:

34. ICANN discriminated against DCA and abused its regulatory authority over new gTLDs by treating it differently from other new gTLD applicants without justification or any rational basis— particularly relative to DCA’s competitor ZACR—and by applying ICANN’s policies in an unpredictable and inconsistent manner so as to favor DCA’s competitor for .AFRICA. ICANN staff repeatedly disparaged DCA and portrayed it as an illegitimate bidder for .AFRICA, and the Board failed to stop the discriminatory treatment despite protests from DCA.

35. Moreover, ICANN staff worked with InterConnect to ensure that ZACR, but not DCA, would be able to pass the GNP evaluation, even going so far as to draft a letter supporting ZACR for the AUC to submit back to ICANN. While ICANN staff purported to hold DCA to the strict geographic support requirement set forth in the AGB, once DCA was removed from contention for .AFRICA, ICANN staff immediately bypassed these very same rules in order to allow ZACR’s application to pass the GNP evaluation. After DCA’s application was pulled from processing on 7 June 2013, ICANN staff directed InterConnect to equate the AUC’s support for ZACR’s application as support from 100% of African governments. This was a complete change of policy for ICANN, which had insisted (until DCA’s application was no longer being considered) that the AUC endorsement was not material to the geographic requirement.
36. However, none of the AUC statements ZACR submitted were adequate endorsements under the AGB, either. ICANN staff then took the remarkable step of drafting the AUC endorsement letter in order to enable ZACR to pass review. The Director of gTLD Operations, Trang Nguyen, personally composed an endorsement letter corresponding to all the AGB requirements for Commissioner Ibrahim’s signature. Once Commissioner Ibrahim responded with a signed, stamped copy of the letter incorporating minor additions, ICANN staff rushed to pass ZACR’s application just over one week later.

37. In its Response to the GAC Advice rendered against its application, DCA raised concerns that the two .AFRICA applications had been treated differently, though at the time it had no idea of just how far ICANN was going or would go to push ZACR’s application through the process. Apparently the NGPC failed to make any inquiry into those allegations. .AFRICA was discussed at one meeting only, and there is no rationale listed for the NGPC’s decision in the “Approved Resolutions” for the 4 June 2013 meeting. An adequate inquiry into ICANN staff’s treatment of DCA’s and ZACR’s application—even simply asking the Director of gTLD Operations whether there was any merit to DCA’s concerns—would have revealed a pattern of discriminatory behavior against DCA and special treatment by both ICANN staff and the ICANN Board in favor of ZACR’s application.

38. In all of these acts and omissions, ICANN breached the AGB and its own Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, which require it to act in good faith, avoid discriminating against any one party, and ensure open, accurate and unbiased application of its policies. Furthermore, ICANN breached principles of international law by failing to exercise its authority over the application process in good faith and committing an abuse of right by ghost-writing an endorsement letter for ZACR and the AUC, and then decreeing that the letter was all that would be needed for ZACR to pass. Finally, the Board’s failure to inquire into the actions of its staff, even when on notice of the myriad of discriminatory actions, violates its obligation to comply with its Bylaws with appropriate care and diligence.

81. DCA Trust submits that the NGPC breached ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws by failing to apply ICANN’s Procedures in a neutral and objective manner with procedural fairness, when it accepted the GAC Objection Advice against DCA Trust, the NGPC should have investigated questions about the GAC Objection Advice being obtained through consensus, and the NGPC should have consulted with an independent expert about the GAC advice given that the AUC used the GAC to circumvent the AGB’s community objection procedures.

82. According to DCA Trust:

44. The decision of the NGPC, acting pursuant to the delegated authority of the ICANN Board, to accept the purported “consensus” GAC Objection Advice, violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Article III § 1 of its Bylaws, requiring transparency, consistency and fairness. ICANN ignored
the serious issues raised by DCA and others with respect to the rendering and consideration of the GAC Objection Advice, breaching its obligation to operate “to the maximum extent possible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” It also breaches ICANN’s obligation under Article 4 of its Articles of Incorporation to abide by principles of international law, including good faith application of rules and regulations and the prohibition on the abuse of rights.

45. The NGPC gave undue deference to the GAC and failed to investigate the serious procedural irregularities and conflicts of interest raised by DCA and others relating to the GAC’s Objection Advice on .AFRICA. ICANN had a duty under principles of international law to exercise good faith and due diligence in evaluating the GAC advice rather than accepting it wholesale and without question, despite having notice of the irregular manner in which the advice was rendered. Importantly, ICANN was well aware that the AUC was using the GAC to effectively reserve .AFRICA for itself, pursuant to ICANN’s own advice that it should use the GAC for that purpose and contrary to the New gTLD Program objective of enhancing competition for TLDs. The AUC’s very presence on the GAC as a member rather than an observer demonstrates the extraordinary lengths ICANN took to ensure that the AUC was able to reserve .AFRICA for its own use notwithstanding the new gTLD application process then underway.

46. The ICANN Board and staff members had actual knowledge of information calling into question the notion that there was a consensus among the GAC members to issue the advice against DCA’s application, prohibiting the application of the rule in the AGB concerning consensus advice (which creates a “strong presumption” for the Board that a particular application “should not proceed” in the gTLD evaluation process). The irregularities leading to the advice against DCA’s application included proposals offered by Alice Munyua, who no longer represented Kenya as a GAC advisor at the time, and the fact that the genuine Kenya GAC advisor expressly refused to endorse the advice. Finally, the ICANN Board knew very well that the AUC might attempt to use the GAC in an anticompetitive manner, since it was ICANN itself that informed the AUC it could use the GAC to achieve that very goal.

47. At a bare minimum, this information put ICANN Board and staff members on notice that further investigation into the rationale and support for the GAC’s decision was necessary. During the very meeting wherein the NGPC accepted the Objection Advice, the NGPC acknowledged that due diligence required a conversation with the GAC, even where the advice was consensus advice. The evidence shows that ICANN simply decided to push through the AUC’s appointed applicant in order to allow the AUC to control .AFRICA, as it had previously requested.

48. Even if the GAC’s Objection Advice could be characterized as “consensus” advice, the NGPC’s failure to consult with an independent expert about the GAC’s Objection Advice was a breach of ICANN’s duty to act to the “maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner
and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” The AGB specifically provides that when the Board is considering any form of GAC advice, it “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.”

49. Given the unique circumstances surrounding the applications for .AFRICA—namely that one applicant was the designee of the AUC, which wanted to control .AFRICA without competition—ICANN should not have simply accepted GAC Objection Advice, proposed and pushed through by the AUC. If it was in doubt as to how to handle GAC advice sponsored by DCA’s only competitor for .AFRICA, it could have and should have consulted a third-party expert in order to obtain appropriate guidance. Its failure to do so was, at a minimum, a breach of ICANN’s duty of good faith and the prohibition on abuse of rights under international law. In addition, in light of the multiple warning signs identified by DCA in its Response to the GAC Objection Advice and its multiple complaints to the Board, failure to consult an independent expert was certainly a breach of the Board’s duty to ensure its fair and transparent application of its policies and its duty to promote and protect competition.

83. DCA Trust also submits that the NGPC breached ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws by failing to apply its procedures in a neutral and objective manner, with procedural fairness, when it approved the BGC’s recommendation not to reconsider the NGPC’s acceptance of the GAC Objection Advice against DCA.

84. According to DCA Trust:

50. Not only did the NGPC breach ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and its Bylaws by accepting the GAC’s Objection Advice, but the NGPC also breached ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and its Bylaws by approving the BGC’s recommendation not to reconsider the NGPC’s earlier decision to accept the GAC Objection Advice. Not surprisingly, the NGPC concluded that its earlier decision should not be reconsidered.

51. First, the NGPC’s decision not to review its own acceptance of the GAC Objection Advice lacks procedural fairness, because the NGPC literally reviewed its own decision to accept the Objection Advice. It is a well-established general principle of international law that a party cannot be the judge of its own cause. No independent viewpoint entered into the process. In addition, although Mr. Silber recused himself from the vote on .AFRICA, he remained present for the entire discussion of .AFRICA, and Mr. Disspain apparently concluded that he did not feel conflicted, so both participated in the discussion and Mr. Disspain voted on DCA’s RFR.

52. Second, the participation of the BGC did not provide an independent intervention into the NGPC’s decision-making process, because the BGC is primarily a subset of members of the NGPC. At the time the BGC made its recommendation, the majority of BGC members were also members of the NGPC.
53. Finally, the Board did not exercise due diligence and care in accepting the BGC’s recommendation, because the BGC recommendation essentially proffered the NGPC’s inadequate diligence in accepting the GAC Objection Advice in the first place, in order to absolve the NGPC of the responsibility to look into any of DCA’s grievances in the context of the Request for Review. The basis for the BGC’s recommendation to deny was that DCA did not state proper grounds for reconsideration, because failure to follow correct procedure is not a ground for reconsideration, and DCA did not identify the actual information an independent expert would have provided, had the NGPC consulted one. Thus, the BGC essentially found that the NGPC did not fail to take account of material information, because the NGPC did not have before it the material information that would have been provided by an independent expert’s viewpoint. The BGC even claimed that if DCA had wanted the NGPC to exercise due diligence and consult an independent expert, DCA should have made such a suggestion in its Response to the GAC Objection Advice. Applicants should not have to remind the Board to comply with its Bylaws in order for the Board to exercise due diligence and care.

54. ICANN’s acts and omissions with respect to the BGC’s recommendation constitute further breaches of ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, including its duty to carry out its activities in good faith and to refrain from abusing its position as the regulator of the DNS to favor certain applicants over others.

85. Finally, DCA Trust pleads that:

[As] a result of the Board’s breaches of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and general principles of international law, ICANN must halt the process of delegating .AFRICA to ZACR and ZACR should not be permitted to retain the rights to .AFRICA it has procured as a result of the Board’s violations. Because ICANN’s handling of the new gTLD application process for .AFRICA was so flawed and so deeply influenced by ICANN’s relationships with various individuals and organizations purporting to represent “the African community,” DCA believes that any chance it may have had to compete for .AFRICA has been irremediably lost and that DCA’s application could not receive a fair evaluation even if the process were to be re-set from the beginning. Under the circumstances, DCA submits that ICANN should remove ZACR’s application from the process altogether and allow DCA’s application to proceed under the rules of the New gTLD Program, allowing DCA up to 18 months to negotiate with African governments to obtain the necessary endorsements so as to enable the delegation and management of the .AFRICA string.

ICANN’s Position

86. In its Response to DCA’s Memorial on the Merits filed on 3 December 2014 (“ICANN Final Memorial”), ICANN submits that:

2. [...] Pursuant to ICANN’s New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), applications for strings that represent geographic regions—such as “Africa”—require the support of at least 60% of the respective national governments in the relevant region. As DCA has acknowledged on
multiple occasions, including in its Memorial, DCA does not have the requisite governmental support; indeed, DCA now asks that ICANN be required to provide it with eighteen more months to try to gather the support that it was supposed to have on the day it submitted its application in 2012.

3. DCA is using this IRP as a means to challenge the right of African countries to support a specific (and competing) application for .AFRICA, and to rewrite the Guidebook. The Guidebook provides that countries may endorse multiple applications for the same geographic string. However, in this instance, the countries of Africa chose to endorse only the application submitted by ZA Central Registry (“ZACR”) because ZACR prevailed in the Request for Proposal (“RFP”) process coordinated by the African Union Commission (“AUC”), a process that DCA chose to boycott. There was nothing untoward about the AUC’s decision to conduct an RFP process and select ZACR, nor was there anything inappropriate about the African countries’ decision to endorse only ZACR’s application.

4. Subsequently, as they had every right to do, GAC representatives from Africa urged the GAC to issue advice to the ICANN Board that DCA’s application for .AFRICA not proceed (the “GAC Advice”). One or more countries from Africa—or, for that matter, from any continent—present at the relevant GAC meeting could have opposed the issuance of this GAC Advice, yet not a single country stated that it did not want the GAC to issue advice to the ICANN Board that DCA’s application should not proceed. As a result, under the GAC’s rules, the GAC Advice was “consensus” advice.

5. GAC consensus advice against an application for a new gTLD creates a “strong presumption” for ICANN’s Board that the application should not proceed. In accordance with the Guidebook’s procedures, the Board’s New gTLD Program Committee (the “NGPC”) considered the GAC Advice, considered DCA’s response to the GAC Advice, and properly decided to accept the GAC Advice that DCA’s application should not proceed. As ZACR’s application for .AFRICA subsequently passed all evaluation steps, ICANN and ZACR entered into a registry agreement for the operation of .AFRICA. Following this Panel’s emergency declaration, ICANN has thus far elected not to proceed with the delegation of the .AFRICA TLD into the Internet root zone.

6. DCA’s papers contain much mudslinging and many accusations, which frankly do not belong in these proceedings. According to DCA, the entire ICANN community conspired to prevent DCA from being the successful applicant for .AFRICA. However, the actions that DCA views as nefarious were, in fact, fully consistent with the Guidebook. They also were not actions taken by the Board or the NGPC that in any way violated ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles, the only issue that this IRP Panel is tasked with assessing.

87. ICANN submits that the Board properly advised the African Union’s member states of the Guidebook Rules regarding geographic strings, the NGPC did not violate the Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation by accepting the GAC Advice, the AUC and the African GAC members properly supported the .AFRICA applicant chosen through the RFP
process, the GAC issued consensus advice opposing DCA’s application and the NGPC properly accepted the consensus GAC Advice.

88. According to ICANN:

13. DCA’s first purported basis for Independent Review is that ICANN improperly responded to a 21 October 2011 communiqué issued by African ministers in charge of Communication and Information Technologies for their respective countries (“Dakar Communiqué”). In the Dakar Communiqué, the ministers, acting pursuant to the Constitutive Act of the African Union, committed to continued and enhanced participation in ICANN and the GAC, and requested that ICANN’s Board take numerous steps aimed at increasing Africa’s representation in the ICANN community, including that ICANN “include [‘Africa’] and its representation in any other language on the Reserved Names List in order [for those strings] to enjoy [] special legislative protection, so [they could be] managed and operated by the structure that is selected and identified by the African Union.”

14. As DCA acknowledges, in response to the request in the Dakar Communiqué that .AFRICA (and related strings) be reserved for an operator of the African ministers’ own choosing, ICANN advised that .AFRICA and its related strings could not be placed on the Reserved Names List because ICANN was “not able to take actions that would go outside of the community-established and documented guidelines of the program.” Instead, ICANN explained that, pursuant to the Guidebook, “protections exist that w[ould] allow the African Union and its member states to play a prominent role in determining the outcome of any application for these top-level domain name strings.”

15. It was completely appropriate for ICANN to point the AU member states to the publicly-stated Guidebook protections for geographic names that were put in place to address precisely the circumstance at issue here—where an application for a string referencing a geographic designation did not appear to have the support of the countries represented by the string. DCA argues that ICANN was giving “instructions . . . as to how to bypass ICANN’s own rules,” but all ICANN was doing was responding to the Dakar Communiqué by explaining the publicly-available rules that ICANN already had in place. This conduct certainly did not violate ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles.

16. In particular, ICANN explained that, pursuant to the Guidebook, “Africa” constitutes a geographic name, and therefore any application for .AFRICA would need: (i) documented support from at least 60% of the national governments in the region; and (ii) no more than one written statement of objection . . . from “relevant governments in the region and/or from public authorities associated with the continent and region.” Next, ICANN explained that the Guidebook provides an opportunity for the GAC, whose members include the AU member states, to provide “Early Warnings” to ICANN regarding specific gTLD applications. Finally, ICANN explained that there are four formal objection processes that can be initiated by the public, including the Community Objection process, which may be filed where 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. Each of these explanations was factually accurate and based on publicly available information. Notably, ICANN did not mention the possibility of GAC consensus advice against a particular application (and, of course, such advice could not have occurred if even a single country had voiced its disagreement with that advice during the GAC meeting when DCA’s application was discussed).

17. DCA’s objection to ICANN’s response to the Dakar Communiqué reflects nothing more than DCA’s dissatisfaction with the fact that African countries, coordinating themselves through the AUC, opposed DCA’s application. However, the African countries had every right to voice that opposition, and ICANN’s Board acted properly in informing those countries of the avenues the Guidebook provided them to express that opposition.

18. In another attempt to imply that ICANN improperly coordinated with the AUC, DCA insinuates that the AUC joined the GAC at ICANN’s suggestion. ICANN’s response to the Dakar Communiqué does not even mention this possibility. Further, in response to DCA’s document requests, ICANN searched for communications between ICANN and the AUC relating to the AUC becoming a voting member of the GAC, and the search revealed no such communications. This is not surprising given that ICANN has no involvement in, much less control over, whether the GAC grants to any party voting membership status, including the AUC; that decision is within the sole discretion of the GAC. ICANN’s Bylaws provide that membership in the GAC shall be open to “multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations, on the invitation of the [GAC] through its Chair.” In any event, whether the AUC was a voting member of the GAC is irrelevant to DCA’s claims. As is explained further below, the AUC alone would not have been able to orchestrate consensus GAC Advice opposing DCA’s application.

19. DCA’s next alleged basis for Independent Review is that ICANN’s NGPC improperly accepted advice from the GAC that DCA’s application should not proceed. However, nearly all of DCA’s Memorial relates to conduct of the AUC, the countries of the African continent, and the GAC. None of these concerns is properly the subject of an Independent Review proceeding because they do not implicate the conduct of the ICANN Board or the NGPC. The only actual decision that the NGPC made was to accept the GAC Advice that DCA’s application for .AFRICA should not proceed, and that decision was undoubtedly correct, as explained below.

20. Although the purpose of this proceeding is to test whether ICANN’s Board (or, in this instance, the NGPC) acted in conformance with its Bylaws and Articles, ICANN addresses the conduct of third parties in the next few sections because that additional context demonstrates that the NGPC’s decision to accept the GAC Advice—the only decision reviewable here—was appropriate in all aspects.

21. After DCA’s application was posted for public comment (as are all new gTLD applications), sixteen African countries—Benin, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda—submitted GAC Early Warnings regarding DCA’s application.
Early Warnings are intended to “provide[] applicant[s] with an indication that the[ir] application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more governments.” These African countries used the Early Warnings to notify DCA that they had requested the AUC to conduct an RFP for .AFRICA, that ZACR had been selected via that RFP, and that they objected to DCA’s application for .AFRICA. They further notified DCA that they did not believe that DCA had the requisite support of 60% of the countries on the African continent.

22. DCA minimizes the import of these Early Warnings by arguing that they did not involve a “permissible reason” for objecting to DCA’s application. But DCA does not explain how any of these reasons was impermissible, and the Guidebook explicitly states that Early Warnings “may be issued for any reason.” DCA demonstrated the same dismissive attitude towards the legitimate concerns of the sixteen governments that issued Early Warnings by arguing to the ICANN Board and the GAC that the objecting governments had been “teleguided (or manipulated).”

23. In response to these Early Warnings, DCA conceded that it did not have the necessary level of support from African governments and asked the Board to “waive th[e] requirement [that applications for geographic names have the support of the relevant countries] because of the confusing role that was played by the African Union.” DCA did not explain how the AUC’s role was “confusing,” and DCA ignored the fact that, pursuant to the Guidebook, the AUC had every right to promote one applicant over another. The AUC’s decision to promote an applicant other than DCA did not convert the AUC’s role from proper to improper or from clear to confusing.

24. Notably, long before the AUC opposed DCA’s application, DCA itself recognized the AUC’s important role in coordinating continent-wide technology initiatives. In 2009, DCA approached the AUC for its endorsement prior to seeking the support of individual African governments. DCA obtained the AUC’s support at that time, including the AUC’s commitment to “assist[] in the coordination of [the] initiative with African Ministers and Governments.”

25. The AUC, however, then had a change of heart (which it was entitled to do, particularly given that the application window for gTLD applications had not yet opened and would not open for almost two more years). On 7 August 2010, African ministers in charge of Communication and Information Technologies for their respective countries signed the Abuja Declaration. In that declaration, the ministers requested that the AUC coordinate various projects aimed at promoting Information and Communication Technologies projects on the African continent. Among those projects was “setting[] up the structure and modalities for the [i]mplementation of the DotAfrica Project.”

26. Pursuant to that mandate, the AUC launched an open RFP process, seeking applications from private organizations (including DCA) interested in operating the .AFRICA gTLD. The AUC notified DCA that “following consultations with relevant stakeholders . . . [it] no longer endorse[d] individual initiatives [for .AFRICA].” Instead, “in coordination with the Member States . . . the [AUC] w[ould] go through [an] open [selection]
process”—hardly an inappropriate decision (and not a decision of ICANN or its Board). DCA then refused to participate in the RFP process, thereby setting up an inevitable clash with whatever entity the AUC selected. When DCA submitted its gTLD application in 2012 and attached its 2009 endorsement letter from the AUC, DCA knew full well (but did not disclose) that the AUC had retracted its support.

27. In sum, the objecting governments’ concerns were the result of DCA’s own decision to boycott the AUC’s selection process, resulting in the selection of a different applicant, ZACR, for .AFRICA. Instead of addressing those governments’ concerns, and instead of obtaining the necessary support of 60% of the countries on the African continent, DCA asked ICANN to re-write the Guidebook in DCA’s favor by eliminating the most important feature of any gTLD application related to a geographic region—the support of the countries in that region. ICANN, in accordance with its Bylaws, Articles and Guidebook, properly ignored DCA’s request to change the rules for DCA’s benefit.

28. At its 10 April 2013 meeting in Beijing, the GAC advised ICANN that DCA’s application for .AFRICA should not proceed. As noted earlier, the GAC operates on the basis of consensus: if a single GAC member at the 10 April 2013 meeting (from any continent, not just from Africa) had opposed the advice, the advice would not have been considered “consensus.” As such, the fact that the GAC issued consensus GAC Advice against DCA’s application shows that not a single country opposed that advice. Most importantly, this included Kenya: Michael Katundu, the GAC Representative for Kenya, and Kenya’s only official GAC representative, was present at the 10 April 2013 Beijing meeting and did not oppose the issuance of the consensus GAC Advice.

29. DCA attempts to argue that the GAC Advice was not consensus advice and relies solely on the purported email objection of Sammy Buruchara, Kenya’s GAC advisor (as opposed to GAC representative). As a preliminary matter (and as DCA now appears to acknowledge), the GAC’s Operating Principles require that votes on GAC advice be made in person. Operating Principle 19 provides that:

If a Member’s accredited representative, or alternate representative, is not present at a meeting, then it shall be taken that the Member government or organisation is not represented at that meeting. Any decision made by the GAC without the participation of a Member’s accredited representative shall stand and nonetheless be valid.

Similarly, Operating Principle 40 provides:

One third of the representatives of the Current Membership with voting rights shall constitute a quorum at any meeting. A quorum shall only be necessary for any meeting at which a decision or decisions must be made. The GAC may conduct its general business face-to-face or online.

25. DCA argues that Mr. Buruchara objected to the GAC Advice via email, but even if objections could be made via email (which they cannot), Mr. Katundu, Kenya’s GAC representative who was in Beijing at the GAC
meeting, not Mr. Buruchara, Kenya’s GAC advisor, was authorized to speak on Kenya’s behalf. Accordingly, under the GAC rules, Mr. Buruchara’s email exchanges could not have constituted opposition to the GAC Advice.

26. And, tellingly, DCA did not submit a declaration from Mr. Buruchara, which might have provided context or support for DCA’s argument.

27. Notably, immediately prior to becoming Kenya’s GAC advisor, Mr. Buruchara had served as the chairman of DCA’s Strategic Advisory Board. But despite Mr. Buruchara’s close ties with DCA and with Ms. Bekele, the Kenyan government had: (i) endorsed the Abuja Declaration; (ii) supported the AUC’s processes for selecting the proposed registry operator; and (iii) issued an Early Warning objecting to DCA’s application.

In other words, the Kenyan government was officially on record as supporting ZACR’s application and opposing DCA’s application, regardless of what Mr. Buruchara was writing in emails.

28. Furthermore, correspondence produced by DCA in this proceeding (but not referenced in either of DCA’s briefs) shows that, despite Ms. Bekele’s and Mr. Buruchara’s efforts to obtain the support (or at least non-opposition) of the Kenyan government, the Kenyan government had rescinded its earlier support of DCA in favor of ZACR. For example, in February 2013, Ms. Bekele emailed a Kenyan government official asking that Kenya issue an Early Warning regarding ZACR’s application. The official responded that he would have to escalate the matter to the Foreign Ministry because the Kenyan president “was part of the leaders of the AU who endorsed AU to be the custodian of dot Africa.” On 10 April 2013, Ms. Bekele emailed Mr. Buruchara, asking him to make further points objecting to the proposed GAC advice. Mr. Buruchara responded that he was unable to do so because the Kenyan government had been informed (erroneously informed, according to Mr. Buruchara), that Mr. Buruchara was “contradict[ing] the Heads of State agreement in Abuja.” On 8 July 2013,
Mr. Buruchara explained to Ms. Bekele that he “stuck [his] neck out for DCA inspite [sic] of lack of Govt support.”

30. Because DCA did not submit a declaration from Mr. Buruchara (and because Ms. Bekele’s declaration is, of course, limited to her own interpretation of email correspondence drafted by others), the Panel is left with a record demonstrating that: (i) Mr. Buruchara was not authorized by the Kenyan government to oppose the GAC Advice; and (iii) the actual GAC representative from Kenya (Mr. Katundu) attended the 10 April 2013 meeting in Beijing and did not oppose the issuance of the consensus GAC Advice that DCA’s application for .AFRICA should not proceed.

31. In short, DCA’s primary argument in support of this Independent Review proceeding—that the GAC should not have issued consensus advice against DCA’s application—is not supported by any evidence and is, instead, fully contradicted by the evidence. And, of course, Independent Review proceedings do not test whether the GAC’s conduct was appropriate (even though in this instance there is no doubt that the GAC appropriately issued consensus advice).

32. As noted above, pursuant to the Guidebook, GAC consensus advice that a particular application should not proceed creates a “strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.” The ICANN Board would have been required to develop a reasoned and well-supported rationale for not accepting the consensus GAC Advice; no such reason existed at the time the NGPC resolved to accept that GAC Advice (5 June 2013), and no such reason has since been revealed. The consensus GAC Advice against DCA’s application was issued in the ordinary course, it reflected the sentiment of numerous countries on the African continent, and it was never rescinded.

33. DCA’s objection to the Board’s acceptance of the GAC Advice is twofold. First, DCA argues that the NGPC failed to investigate DCA’s allegation that the GAC advice was not consensus advice. Second, DCA argues that the NGPC should have consulted an independent expert prior to accepting the advice. DCA also argued in its IRP Notice that two NGPC members had conflicts of interest when they voted to accept the GAC Advice, but DCA does not pursue that argument in its Memorial (and the facts again demonstrate that DCA’s argument is incorrect).

34. As to the first argument, the Guidebook provides that, when the Board receives GAC advice regarding a particular application, it publishes that advice and notifies the applicant. The applicant is given 21 days from the date of the publication of the advice to submit a response to the Board. Those procedures were followed here. Upon receipt of the GAC Advice, ICANN posted the advice and provided DCA with an opportunity to respond. DCA submitted a lengthy response explaining “[w]hy DCA Trust disagree[d]” with the GAC Advice. A primary theme was that its application had been unfairly blocked by the very countries whose support the Guidebook required DCA to obtain, and that the AUC should not have been allowed to endorse an applicant for .AFRICA. DCA argued that it had been
unfairly “victimized” and “muzzled into insignificance” by the “collective power of the governments represented at ICANN,” and that “the issue of government support [should] be made irrelevant in the process so that both contending applications for .Africa would be allowed to move forward . . . .” In other words, DCA was arguing that the AUC’s input was inappropriate, and DCA was requesting that ICANN change the Guidebook requirement regarding governmental support for geographic names in order to accommodate DCA. ICANN’s NGPC reviewed and appropriately rejected DCA’s arguments.

35. One of DCA’s three “supplementary arguments,” beginning on page 10 of its response to the GAC Advice, was that there had been no consensus GAC advice, in part allegedly evidenced by Mr. Buruchara’s (incomplete) email addressed above. DCA, however, chose not to address the fact that: (i) DCA lacked the requisite support of the African governments; (ii) Mr. Buruchara was not the Kenyan GAC representative; (iii) Mr. Buruchara was not at the Beijing meeting; (iv) the government of Kenya had withdrawn any support it may have previously had for DCA’s application; and (iv) the actual Kenyan GAC representative (Mr. Katundu) was at the ICANN meeting in Beijing and did not oppose the issuance of the GAC Advice against DCA’s application for .AFRICA. All of these facts were well known to DCA at the time of its response to the GAC Advice.

36. The NGPC’s resolution accepting the GAC Advice states that the NGPC considered DCA’s response prior to accepting the GAC Advice, and DCA presents no evidence to the contrary. DCA’s disagreement with the NGPC’s decision does not, of course, demonstrate that the NGPC failed to exercise due diligence in determining to accept the consensus GAC Advice.

37. As to DCA’s suggestion that the NGPC should have consulted an independent expert, the Guidebook provides that it is within the Board’s discretion to decide whether to consult with an independent expert:

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 NGPC clearly did not violate its Bylaws, Articles or Guidebook in deciding that it did not need to consult any independent expert concerning the GAC Advice. Because DCA’s challenge to the GAC Advice was whether one or more countries actually had opposed the advice, there was no reason for the NGPC to retain an “expert” on that subject, and DCA has never stated what useful information an independent expert possibly could have provided.

89. ICANN also submits that the NGPC properly denied DCA’s request for reconsideration, ICANN’s actions following the acceptance of the GAC Advice are not relevant to the IRP, and in any event they were not improper, the ICANN staff directed the ICC to treat the two
African applications consistently, and ICANN staff did not violate any policy in drafting a template letter at the AUC request.

90. According to ICANN:

38. DCA argues that the NGPC improperly denied DCA’s Reconsideration Request, which sought reconsideration of the NGPC’s acceptance of the GAC Advice. Reconsideration is an accountability mechanism available under ICANN’s Bylaws and administered by ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“BGC”). DCA’s Reconsideration Request asked that the NGPC’s acceptance of the GAC Advice be rescinded and that DCA’s application be reinstated. Pursuant to the Bylaws, reconsideration of a Board (or in this case NGPC) action is appropriate only where the NGPC took an action “without consideration of material information” or in “reliance on false or inaccurate material information.”

39. In its Reconsideration Request, DCA argued (as it does here) that the NGPC failed to consider material information by failing to consult with an independent expert prior to accepting the GAC Advice. The BGC noted that DCA had not identified any material information that the NGPC had not considered, and that DCA had not identified what advice an independent expert could have provided to the NGPC or how such advice might have altered the NGPC’s decision to accept the GAC Advice. The BGC further noted that, as discussed above, the Guidebook is clear that the decision to consult an independent expert is at the discretion of the NGPC.

40. DCA does not identify any Bylaws or Articles provision that the NGPC violated in denying the Reconsideration Request. Instead, DCA simply disagrees with the NGPC’s determination that DCA had not identified any material information on which the NGPC failed to rely. That disagreement is not a proper basis for a Reconsideration Request or an IRP. DCA also argues (again without citing to the Bylaws or Articles) that, because the NGPC accepted the GAC Advice, the NGPC could not properly consider DCA’s Reconsideration Request. In fact, the DCA’s Reconsideration Request was handled exactly in the manner prescribed by ICANN’s Bylaws: the BGC—a separate Board committee charged with considering Reconsideration Requests—reviewed the material and provided a recommendation to the NGPC. The NGPC then reviewed the BGC’s recommendation and voted to accept it. In short, the various Board committees conducted themselves exactly as ICANN’s Bylaws require.

41. The NGPC accepted the GAC Advice on 4 June 2013. As a result, DCA’s application for .AFRICA did not proceed. In its Memorial, DCA attempts to cast aspersions on ICANN’s evaluation of ZACR’s application, but that evaluation has no bearing on whether the NGPC acted consistently with its Bylaws and Articles in handling the GAC advice related to DCA’s application. Indeed, the evaluation of ZACR’s application did not involve any action by ICANN’s Board (or NGPC), and is therefore not a proper basis for Independent Review. Although the actions of ICANN’s staff are not relevant to this proceeding, ICANN addresses DCA’s allegations for the sake of thoroughness and because the record demonstrates that ZACR’s application was evaluated fully in conformance with the Guidebook requirements.
42. DCA alleges that “ICANN staff worked with [the ICC] to ensure that ZACR, but not DCA, would be able to pass the GNP evaluation.” DCA’s argument is based on false and unsupported characterizations of the ICC’s evaluation of the two .AFRICA applications.

43. First, DCA claims (without relevant citation) that ICANN determined that the AUC’s endorsement would count as an endorsement from each of the AU’s member states only after ICANN had stopped processing DCA’s application. In fact, the record indicates that ICANN accepted the ICC’s recommendation that the AUC’s endorsement would qualify as an endorsement from each of the AU’s member states while DCA’s application was still in contention, at a time when the recommendation had the potential to benefit both applicants for .AFRICA (had DCA also in fact received the AUC’s support).

44. The Guidebook provides that the Geographic Names Panel is responsible for “verifying the relevance and authenticity of supporting documentation.” Accordingly, it was the ICC’s responsibility to evaluate how the AUC’s endorsement should be treated. The ICC recommended that the AUC’s endorsement should count as an endorsement from each of the AU’s member states. The ICC’s analysis was based on the Abuja Declaration, which the ICC interpreted as “instruct[ing] the [AUC] to pursue the DotAfrica project, and in [the ICC’s] independent opinion, provide[d] suitable evidence of support from relevant governments or public authorities.” The evidence shows that ICANN accepted the ICC’s recommendation before the NGPC accepted the GAC Advice regarding DCA’s application— in a 26 April 2013 email discussing the preparation of clarifying questions regarding the AUC’s letters of support, ICANN explained to the ICC that “if the applicant(s) is/are unable to obtain a revised letter of support from the AU [], they may be able to fulfill the requirements by approaching the individual governments.”

45. DCA also claims that ICANN determined that endorsements from the UNECA would not be taken into account for geographic evaluations. This simply is not true. Pursuant to the ICC’s advice, the UNECA’s endorsement was taken into account. Like the AUC, the UNECA had signed letters of support for both DCA and ZACR. The ICC advised that because the UNECA was specifically named in the Abuja Declaration, it too should be treated as a relevant public authority. ICANN accepted the ICC’s advice.

46. DCA argues that, after ICANN had stopped processing DCA’s application, ICANN staff improperly assisted the AUC in drafting a support letter for ZACR. As is reflected in the clarifying questions the ICC drafted regarding the endorsement letters submitted on behalf of each of the two .AFRICA applications, the Guidebook contains specific requirements for letters of support from governments and public authorities. In addition to “clearly express[ing] the government’s or public authority’s support for or non- objection to the applicant’s application,” letters must “demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding of the string being requested and its intended use” and 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 . . . “. In light of these specific requirements, the Guidebook even includes a sample letter of support.
47. The first letter of support that the AUC submitted for ZACR’s application did not follow the correct format and resulted in a clarifying question from the ICC. As a result, the AUC requested ICANN staff’s assistance in drafting a letter that conformed to the Guidebook’s requirements. ICANN staff drafted a template based on the sample letter of support in the Guidebook, and the AUC then made significant edits to that template. DCA paints this cooperation as nefarious, but there was absolutely nothing wrong with ICANN staff assisting the AUC, assistance that DCA would certainly have welcomed, and which ICANN would have provided, had the AUC been supporting DCA instead of ZACR.

91. Finally, ICANN submits:

50. ICANN’s conduct with respect to DCA’s application for .AFRICA was fully consistent with ICANN’s Bylaws, its Articles of Incorporation and the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN acted through open and transparent processes, evaluated DCA’s application for .AFRICA in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Guidebook, and followed the procedures set forth in its Bylaws in evaluating DCA’s Request for Reconsideration. ICANN provided assistance to those who requested, cooperated with governmental authorities, and respected the consensus advice issued by the GAC, which speaks on behalf of the governments of the world.

51. DCA knew, as did all applicants for new gTLDs, that some of the applications would be rejected. There can only be one registry operator for each gTLD string, and in the case of strings that relate to geographic regions, no application can succeed without the significant support of the countries in that region. There is no justification whatsoever for DCA’s repeated urging that the support (or lack thereof) of the countries on the African continent be made irrelevant to the process.

52. Ultimately, the majority of the countries in Africa chose to support another application for the .AFRICA gTLD, and decided to oppose DCA’s application. At a critical time, no country stood up to defend DCA’s application. These countries—and the AUC—had every right to take a stand and to support the applicant of their choice. In this instance, that choice resulted in the GAC issuing consensus advice, which the GAC had every right to do. Nothing in ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles, or in the Guidebook, required ICANN to challenge that decision, to ignore that decision, or to change the rules so that the input of the AUC, much less the GAC, would become irrelevant. To the contrary, the AUC’s role with respect to the African community is critical, and it was DCA’s decision to pursue a path at odds with the AUC that placed its application in jeopardy, not anything that ICANN (or ICANN’s Board or the NGPC) did. The NGPC did exactly what it was supposed to do in this circumstance, and ICANN urges this IRP Panel to find as such. Such a finding would allow the countries of Africa to soon provide their citizens with what all parties involved believe to be a very important step for Africa—access to .AFRICA on the internet.
The Panel's Decision

92. The Panel in this IRP, has been asked to determine whether, in the case of the application of DCA Trust for the delegation of the .AFRICA top-level domain name in its 2012 General Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) Internet Expansion Program (the “New gTLD Program”), the Board acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook?

93. After reviewing the documentation filed in this IRP, reading the Parties’ respective written submissions, reading the written statements and listening to the testimony of the three witnesses brought forward, listening to the oral presentations of the Parties' legal representatives at the hearing in Washington, D.C., reading the transcript of the hearing, and deliberating, the Panel is of the unanimous view that certain actions and inactions of the ICANN Board (as described below) with respect to the application of DCA Trust relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

94. ICANN is bound by its own Articles of Incorporation to act fairly, neutrally, non-discriminatorily and to enable competition. Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation sets this out explicitly:

4. The Corporation shall 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. To this effect, the Corporation shall cooperate as appropriate with relevant international organizations.

95. ICANN is also bound by its own Bylaws to act and make decisions “neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”

96. These obligations and others are explicitly set out in a number of provisions in ICANN’s Bylaws:

ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE (Council of Registrars) VALUES

Section 2. CORE (Council of Registrars) VALUES

In performing its mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):
1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

[...]

7. Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

8. Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.

9. Acting 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.

10. Remaining accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s effectiveness.

11. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account governments’ or public authorities' recommendations.

These core values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may provide useful and relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated; and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, situations will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven core values simultaneously is not possible. Any ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) body making a recommendation or decision shall exercise its judgment to determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand, and to determine, if necessary, an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values.

ARTICLE II: POWERS

Section 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.

Section 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 III: TRANSPARENCY

Section 1. PURPOSE

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. [Underlining and bold is that of the Panel]

97. As set out in Article IV (Accountability and Review) of ICANN’s Bylaws, in carrying out its mission as set out in its Bylaws, ICANN should be accountable to the community for operating in a manner that is consistent with these Bylaws and with due regard for the core values set forth in Article I of the Bylaws.

98. As set out in Section 3 (Independent Review of Board Actions) of Article IV, “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. In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and casually connected to the Board’s alleged violation of the Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board’s action.”

99. In this IRP, among the allegations advanced by DCA Trust against ICANN, is that the ICANN Board, and its constituent body, the GAC, breached their obligation to act transparently and in conformity with procedures that ensured fairness. In particular, DCA Trust criticizes the ICANN Board here, for allowing itself to be guided by the GAC, a body “with apparently no distinct rules, limited public records, fluid definitions of membership and quorums” and unfair procedures in dealing with the issues before it.

100. According to DCA Trust, ICANN itself asserts that the GAC is a “constituent body.” The exchange between the Panel and counsel for ICANN at the in-person hearing in Washington, D.C. is a living proof of that point.

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

Are you saying we should only look at what the Board does? The reason I’m asking is that your -- the Bylaws say that ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate, to the maximum extent feasible, in an open and transparent manner. Does the constituent bodies include, I don’t know,
GAC or anything? What is "constituent bodies"?

MR. LEVEE:

Yeah. What I'll talk to you about tomorrow in closing when I lay out what an IRP Panel is supposed to address, the Bylaws are very clear. Independent Review Proceedings are for the purpose of testing conduct or inaction of the ICANN Board. They don't apply to the GAC. They don't apply to supporting organizations. They don't apply to Staff.

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

So you think that the situation is a -- we shouldn't be looking at what the constituent -- whatever the constituent bodies are, even though that's part of your Bylaws?

MR. LEVEE:

Well, when I say not -- when you say not looking, part of DCA's claims that the GAC did something wrong and that ICANN knew that.

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

So is GAC a constituent body?

MR. LEVEE:

It is a constituent body, to be clear --

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

Yeah.

MR. LEVEE:

-- whether -- I don't think an IRP Panel -- if the only thing that happened here was that the GAC did something wrong --

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

Right.

MR. LEVEE:

-- an IRP Panel would not be -- an Independent Review Proceeding is not supposed to address that, whether the GAC did something wrong.

Now, if ICANN knew -- the Board knew that the GAC did something wrong, and that's how they link it, they say, Look, the GAC did something wrong, and ICANN knew it, the Board -- if the Board actually knew it, then we're dealing with Board conduct.

The Board knew that the GAC did not, in fact, issue consensus advice. That's the allegation. So it's fair to look at the GAC's conduct.
The Panel is unanimously of the view that the GAC is a constituent body of ICANN. This is not only clear from the above exchange between the Panel and counsel for ICANN, but also from Article XI (Advisory Committees) of ICANN’s Bylaws and the Operating Principles of the GAC. Section 1 (General) of Article XI of ICANN’s Bylaws states:

The Board may create one or more Advisory Committees in addition to those set forth in this Article. 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 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 2, under the heading, Specific Advisory Committees states:

There shall be at least the following Advisory Committees:

1. Governmental Advisory Committee
   a. The Governmental 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.

Section 6 of the preamble of GAC’s Operating Principles is also relevant. That Section reads as follows:

The GAC commits itself to implement efficient procedures in support of ICANN and to provide thorough and timely advice and analysis on relevant matters of concern with regard to government and public interests.

According to DCA Trust, based on the above, and in particular, Article III (Transparency), Section 1 of ICANN’s Bylaws, therefore, the GAC was bound to the transparency and fairness obligations of that provision to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness”, but as ICANN’s own witness, Ms. Heather Dryden acknowledged during the hearing, the GAC did not act with transparency or in a manner designed to insure fairness.

Mr. ALI:

Q. But what was the purpose of the discussion at the Prague meeting with respect to AUC? If there really is no difference or distinction between voting/nonvoting, observer or whatever might be the opposite of observer,
or the proper terminology, what was -- what was the point?

THE WITNESS:

A. I didn't say there was no difference. The issue is that there isn't GAC agreement about what are the -- the rights, if you will, of -- of entities like the AUC. And there might be in some limited circumstances, but it's also an extremely sensitive issue. And so not all countries have a shared view about what those -- those entities, like the AUC, should be able to do.

Q. So not all countries share the same view as to what entities, such as the AUC, should be able to do. Is that what you said? I'm sorry. I didn't --

A. Right, because that would only get clarified if there is a circumstance where that link is forced. In our business, we talk about creative ambiguity. We leave things unclear so we don't have conflict.

103. As explained by ICANN in its Closing Presentation at the hearing, ICANN’s witness, Ms. Heather Dryden also asserted that the GAC Advice was meaningless until the Board acted upon it. This last point is also clear from examining Article I, Principle 2 and 5 of ICANN GAC’s Operating Principles. Principle 2 states that “the GAC is not a decision making body” and Principle 5 states that “the GAC shall have no legal authority to act for ICANN”.

MR. ALI:

Q. I would like to know what it is that you, as the GAC Chair, understand to be the consequences of the actions that the GAC will take --

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

The GAC will take?

MR. ALI:

Q. -- the GAC will take -- the consequences of the actions taken by the GAC, such as consensus advice?

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

There you go.

THE WITNESS:

That isn't my concern as the Chair. It's really for the Board to interpret the outputs coming from the GAC.

104. Ms. Dryden also stated that the GAC made its decision without providing any rationale and primarily based on politics and not on potential violations of national laws and sensitivities.
ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

So, basically, you're telling us that the GAC takes a decision to object to an applicant, and no reasons, no rationale, no discussion of the concepts that are in the rules?

THE WITNESS:

I'm telling you the GAC did not provide a rationale. And that was not a requirement for issuing a GAC --

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

But you also want to check to see if the countries are following the right -- following the rules, if there are reasons for rejecting this or it falls within the three things that my colleague's talking about.

THE WITNESS:

The practice among governments is that governments can express their view, whatever it may be. And so there's a deference to that.

That's certainly the case here as well.

105. ICANN was bound by its Bylaws to conduct adequate diligence to ensure that it was applying its procedures fairly. Section 1 of Article III of ICANN's Bylaws, require it and its constituent bodies to operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness. The Board must also as per Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 4 exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of it.

106. In this case, on 4 June 2013, the NGPC accepted the GAC Objection Advice to stop processing DCA Trust's application. On 1 August 2013, the BGC recommended to the NGPC that it deny DCA Trust's Request for Reconsideration of the NGPC’s 4 June 2013 decision, and on 13 August 2013, the NGPC accepted the BGC's recommendation (i.e., the NGPC declined to reconsider its own decision) without any further consideration.

107. In this case, ICANN through the BGC was bound to conduct a meaningful review of the NGPC’s decision. According to ICANN's Bylaws, Article IV, Section 2, the Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The [BGC] shall have the authority to, among other things, conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate, and request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from others.
108. Finally, the NGPC was not bound by – nor was it required to give deference to – the decision of the BGC.

109. The above, combined with the fact that DCA Trust was never given any notice or an opportunity in Beijing or elsewhere to make its position known or defend its own interests before the GAC reached consensus on the GAC Objection Advice, and that the Board of ICANN did not take any steps to address this issue, leads this Panel to conclude that both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of DCA Trust relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were not procedures designed to insure the fairness required by Article III, Sec. 1 above, and are therefore inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

110. The following excerpt of exchanges between the Panel and one of ICANN’s witnesses, Ms. Heather Dryden, the then Chair of the GAC, provides a useful background for the decisions reached in this IRP:

PRESIDENT BARIN:
But be specific in this case. Is that what happened in the .AFRICA case?

THE WITNESS:
The decision was very quick, and --

PRESIDENT BARIN:
But what about the consultations prior? In other words, were -- were you privy to --

THE WITNESS:
No. If -- if colleagues are talking among themselves, then that's not something that the GAC, as a whole, is -- is tracking or -- or involved in. It's really those interested countries that are.

PRESIDENT BARIN:
Understood. But I assume -- I also heard you say, as the Chair, you never want to be surprised with something that comes up. So you are aware of -- or you were aware of exactly what was happening?

THE WITNESS:
No. No. You do want to have a good sense of where the problems are, what's going to come unresolved back to the full GAC meeting, but that's -- that's the extent of it.
And that's the nature of -- of the political process.

Redacted - GAC Designated Confidential Information

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:
Okay.

THE WITNESS:
-- that question was addressed via having that meeting.

PRESIDENT BARIN:
And what's your understanding of what -- what the consequence of that decision is or was when you took it? So what happens from that moment on?

THE WITNESS:
It's conveyed to the Board, so all the results, the agreed language coming out of GAC is conveyed to the Board, as was the case with the communiqué from the Beijing meeting.

PRESIDENT BARIN:
And how is that conveyed to the Board?

THE WITNESS:
Well, it's a written document, and usually Support Staff are forwarding it to Board Staff.

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:
Could you speak a little bit louder? I don't know whether I am tired, but I --

THE WITNESS:
Okay. So as I was saying, the document is conveyed to the Board once it's concluded.

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

When you say “the document”, are you referring to the communiqué?

**THE WITNESS:**

Yes.

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

Okay. And there are no other documents?

**THE WITNESS:**

The communiqué --

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

In relation to .AFRICA. I'm not interested in any other.

**THE WITNESS:**

Yes, it's the communiqué.

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

And it's prepared by your staff? You look at it?

**THE WITNESS:**

Right --

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

And then it's sent over to --

**THE WITNESS:**

-- right, it's agreed by the GAC in full, the contents.

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**

And then sent over to the Board?

**THE WITNESS:**

And then sent, yes.

**PRESIDENT BARIN:**
And what happens to that communiqué? Does the Board receive that and say, Ms. Dryden, we have some questions for you on this, or --

THE WITNESS:

Not really. If they have questions for clarification, they can certainly ask that in a meeting. But it is for them to receive that and then interpret it and -- and prepare the Board for discussion or decision.

PRESIDENT BARIN:

Okay. And in this case, you weren't asked any questions or anything?

THE WITNESS:

I don't believe so. I don't recall.

PRESIDENT BARIN:

Any follow-ups, right?

THE WITNESS:

Right.

PRESIDENT BARIN:

And in the subsequent meeting, I guess the issue was tabled. The Board meeting that it was tabled, were you there?

THE WITNESS:

Yes. I don't particularly recall the meeting, but yes.

[...]

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

Can I turn your attention to Paragraph 5 of your declaration?

Here, you basically repeat what is in the ICANN Guidebook literature, whatever. These are the exact words, actually, that you use in your declaration in terms of why there could be an objection to an applicant -- to a specific applicant. And you use three criteria: problematic, potentially violating national law, and raise sensitivities.

Now, I'd like you to, for us -- for our benefit, to explain precisely, as concrete as you can be, what those three concepts -- how those three concepts translate in the DCA case. Because this must have been discussed in order to get this very quick decision that you are mentioning. So I'd like to understand, you know, because these are the criteria -- these are the three criteria; is that correct?
THE WITNESS:

That is what the witness statement says, but the link to the GAC and the role that I played in terms of the GAC discussion did not involve me interpreting those three things. In fact, the GAC did not provide rationale for the consensus objection.

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

No.

But, I mean, look, the GAC is taking a decision which -- very quickly -- I'm using your words, "very quickly" -- erases years and years and years of work, a lot of effort that have been put by a single applicant. And the way I understand the rules is that the -- the GAC advice -- consensus advice against that applicant are -- is based on those three criteria. Am I wrong in that analysis?

THE WITNESS:

I'm saying that the GAC did not identify a rationale for those governments that put forward a string or an application for consensus objection. They might have identified their reasons, but there was not GAC agreement about those reasons or -- or -- or -- or rationale for that. We had some discussion earlier about Early Warnings. So Early Warnings were issued by individual countries, and they indicated their rationale. But, again, that's not a GAC view.

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

So, basically, you're telling us that the GAC takes a decision to object to an applicant, and no reasons, no rationale, no discussion of the concepts that are in the rules?

THE WITNESS:

I'm telling you the GAC did not provide a rationale. And that was not a requirement for issuing a GAC --

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

But you also want to check to see if the countries are following the right -- following the rules, if there are reasons for rejecting this or it falls within the three things that my colleague's talking about.

THE WITNESS:

The practice among governments is that governments can express their view, whatever it may be. And so there's [...] deference to that. That's certainly the case here as well. The -- if a country tells -- tells the GAC or says it has a concern, that's not really something that -- that's evaluated, in the sense you mean, by the other governments. That's not the way governments work with each other.
HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

So you don't go into the reasons at all with them?

THE WITNESS:

To issue a consensus objection, no.

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

Okay. ---

[...]

PRESIDENT BARIN:

I have one question for you. We spent, now, a bit of time or a considerable amount of time talking to you about the process, or the procedure leading to the consensus decision.

Can you tell me what your understanding is of why the GAC consensus objection was made finally?

[...]

But in terms of the .AFRICA, the decision -- the issue came up, the agenda -- the issue came up, and you made a decision, correct?

THE WITNESS:

The GAC made a decision.

PRESIDENT BARIN:

Right. When I say “you”, I mean the GAC.

Do you know -- are you able to express to us what your understanding of the substance behind that decision was? I mean, in other words, we've spent a bit of time dealing with the process.

Can you tell us why the decision happened?

THE WITNESS:

The sum of the GAC’s advice is reflected in its written advice in the communiqué. That is the view to GAC. That's -- that's --

[...]

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

I just want to come back to the point that I was making earlier. To your Paragraph 5, you said -- you answered to me saying that is my declaration, but it was not exactly what's going on. Now, we are here to --
at least the way I understand the Panel’s mandate, to make sure that the rules have been obeyed by, basically. I’m synthesizing. So I don’t understand how, as the Chair of the GAC, you can tell us that, basically, the rules do not matter -- again, I’m rephrasing what you said, but I’d like to give you another opportunity to explain to us why you are mentioning those criteria in your written declaration, but, now, you’re telling us this doesn’t matter.

If you want to read again what you wrote, or supposedly wrote, it's Paragraph 5.

THE WITNESS:

I don’t need to read again my declaration. Thank you. The header for the GAC’s discussions throughout was to refer to strings or applications that were controversial or sensitive. That’s very broad. And –

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

I’m sorry. You say the rules say problematic, potentially violate national law, raise sensitivities. These are precise concepts.

THE WITNESS:

Problematic, violate national law -- there are a lot of laws -- and sensitivities does strike me as being quite broad.

[…]

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

Okay. So we are left with what? No rules?

THE WITNESS:

No rationale with the consensus objections.

That’s the -- the effect.

ARBITRATOR KESSEDJIAN:

I’m done.

HONORABLE JUDGE CAHILL:

I’m done.

PRESIDENT BARIN:

So am I.
111. The Panel understands that the GAC provides advice to the ICANN Board on matters of public policy, especially in cases where ICANN activities and policies may interact with national laws or international agreements. The Panel also understands that GAC advice is developed through consensus among member nations. Finally, the Panel understands that although the ICANN Board is required to consider GAC advice and recommendations, it is not obligated to follow those recommendations.

112. Paragraph IV of ICANN’s Beijing, People’s Republic of China 11 April 2013 Communiqué [Exhibit C-43] under the heading “GAC Advice to the ICANN Board” states:

IV. GAC Advice to the ICANN Board
1. New gTLDs
   a. GAC Objections to the Specific Applications
      i. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:
         i. The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:
            1. The application for .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)

Footnote 3 to Paragraph IV.1. (a)(i)(i) above in the original text adds, “Module 3.1: 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.” A similar statement in this regard can be found in paragraph 5 of Ms. Dryden’s 7 February 2014 witness statement.

113. In light of the clear “Transparency” obligation provisions found in ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel would have expected the ICANN Board to, at a minimum, investigate the matter further before rejecting DCA Trust’s application.

114. The Panel would have had a similar expectation with respect to the NGPC Response to the GAC Advice regarding .AFRICA which was expressed in ANNEX 1 to NGPC Resolution No. 2013.06.04.NG01 [Exhibit C-45]. In that document, in response to DCA Trust’s application, the NGPC stipulated:
The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that “if GAC advised 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. The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1165-42560 for .africa will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw [...] or seek relief according to ICANN’s accountability mechanisms (see ICANN’s Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.

115. Based on the foregoing, after having carefully reviewed the Parties’ written submissions, listened to the testimony of the three witness, listened to the oral submissions of the Parties in various telephone conference calls and at the in-person hearing of this IRP in Washington, D.C. on 22 and 23 May 2015, and finally after much deliberation, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (c) of ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel declares that both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of DCA Trust relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

116. As indicated above, there are perhaps a number of other instances, including certain decisions made by ICANN, that did not proceed in the manner and spirit in which they should have under the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

117. DCA Trust has criticized ICANN for its various actions and decisions throughout this IRP and ICANN has responded to each of these criticisms in detail. However, the Panel, having carefully considered these criticisms and decided that the above is dispositive of this IRP, it does not find it necessary to determine who was right, to what extent and for what reasons in respect to the other criticisms and other alleged shortcomings of the ICANN Board identified by DCA Trust.

2) Can the IRP Panel recommend a course of action for the Board to follow as a consequence of any declaration that the Board acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook?

118. In the conclusion of its Memorial on the Merits filed with the Panel on 3 November 2014, DCA Trust submitted that ICANN should remove ZACR’s application from the process altogether and allow DCA’s application to proceed under the rules of the New gTLD Program, allowing DCA up to 18 months to negotiate with African governments.
to obtain the necessary endorsements so as to enable the delegation and management of the .AFRICA string.

119. In its Final Request for Relief filed with the Panel on 23 May 2015, DCA Trust requested that this Panel recommend to the ICANN Board that it cease all preparations to delegate the .AFRICA gTLD to ZACR and recommend that ICANN permit DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process and be granted a period of no less than 18 months to obtain Government support as set out in the AGB and interpreted by the Geographic Names Panel, or accept that the requirement is satisfied as a result of the endorsement of DCA Trust’s application by UNECA.

120. DCA Trust also requested that this Panel recommend to ICANN that it compensate DCA Trust for the costs it has incurred as a result of ICANN’s violations of its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and AGB.

121. In its response to DCA Trust’s request for the recommendations set out in DCA Trust’s Memorial on the Merits, ICANN submitted that this Panel does not have the authority to grant the affirmative relief that DCA Trust had requested.

122. According to ICANN:

48. DCA’s request should be denied in its entirety, including its request for relief. DCA requests that this IRP Panel issue a declaration requiring ICANN to “rescind its contract with ZACR” and to “permit DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the application process.” Acknowledging that it currently lacks the requisite governmental support for its application, DCA also requests that it receive “18 months to negotiate with African governments to obtain the necessary endorsements.” In sum, DCA requests not only that this Panel remove DCA’s rival for .AFRICA from contention (requiring ICANN to repudiate its contract with ZACR), but also that it rewrite the Guidebook’s rules in DCA’s favor.

49. IRP Panels do not have authority to award affirmative relief. Rather, an IRP Panel is limited to stating its opinion as to “whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws” and recommending (as this IRP Panel has done previously) that the Board stay any action or decision, or take any interim action until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP Panel. The Board will, of course, give extremely serious consideration to the Panel’s recommendations.

123. In its response to DCA Trust’s amended request for recommendations filed on 23 May 2015, ICANN argued that because the Panel’s authority is limited to declaring whether the Board’s conduct was inconsistent with the Articles or the Bylaws, the Panel should limit its declaration to that question and refrain from
recommending how the Board should then proceed in light of the Panel’s declaration.

124. In response, DCA Trust submitted that according to ICANN’s Bylaws, the Independent Review Process is designed to provide a remedy for “any” person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board. Further, “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.

125. According to ICANN, “indeed, the ICANN New gTLD Program Committee, operating under the delegated authority of the ICANN Board, itself [suggests] that DCA could seek relief through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms or, in other words, the Reconsideration process and the Independent Review Process.” Furthermore:

If the IRP mechanism – the mechanism of last resort for gTLD applicants – is intended to provide a remedy for a claimant materially injured or harmed by Board action or inaction, and it serves as the only alternative to litigation, then naturally the IRP Panel may recommend how the ICANN Board might fashion a remedy to redress such injury or harm.

126. After considering the Parties’ respective submissions in this regard, the Panel is of the view that it does have the power to recommend a course of action for the Board to follow as a consequence of any declaration that the Board acted or failed to act in a manner inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Applicant Guidebook.

127. Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws states:

**ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW**
Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP.

128. The Panel finds that both the language and spirit of the above section gives it authority to recommend how the ICANN Board might fashion a remedy to redress injury or harm that is directly related and causally connected to the Board’s violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation.

129. As DCA Trust correctly points out, with which statement the Panel agrees, “if the IRP mechanism – the mechanism of last resort for
gTLD applicants – is intended to provide a remedy for a claimant materially injured or harmed by Board action or inaction, and it serves as the only alternative to litigation, then naturally the IRP Panel may recommend how the ICANN Board might fashion a remedy to redress such injury or harm.”

130. Use of the imperative language in Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, is clearly supportive of this point. That provision clearly states that the IRP Panel has the authority to recommend a course of action until such time as the Board considers the opinion of the IRP and acts upon it.

131. Furthermore, use of the word “opinion”, which means the formal statement by a judicial authority, court, arbitrator or “Panel” of the reasoning and the principles of law used in reaching a decision of a case, is demonstrative of the point that the Panel has the authority to recommend affirmative relief. Otherwise, like in section 7 of the Supplementary Procedures, the last sentence in paragraph 11 would have simply referred to the “declaration of the IRP”. Section 7 under the heading “Interim Measures of Protection” says in part, that an “IRP PANEL may recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the IRP declaration.”

132. The scope of Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws is clearly broader than Section 7 of the Supplementary Procedures.

133. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, therefore, the Panel recommends that ICANN continue to refrain from delegating the .AFRICA gTLD and permit DCA Trust’s application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process.

3) Who is the prevailing party in this IRP?

134. In its letter of 1 July 2015, ICANN submits that, “ICANN believes that the Panel should and will determine that ICANN is the prevailing party. Even so, ICANN does not seek in this instance the putative effect that would result if DCA were required to reimburse ICANN for all of the costs that ICANN incurred. This IRP was much longer [than] anticipated (in part due to the passing of one of the panelists last summer), and the Panelists’ fees were far greater than an ordinary IRP, particularly because the Panel elected to conduct a live hearing.”
135. DCA Trust on the other hand, submits that, “should it prevail in this IRP, ICANN should be responsible for all of the costs of this IRP, including the interim measures proceeding.” In particular, DCA Trust writes:

On March 23, 2014, DCA learned via email from a supporter of ZA Central Registry ("ZACR"), DCA’s competitor for .AFRICA, that ZACR would sign a registry agreement with ICANN in three days’ time (March 26) to be the registry operator for .AFRICA. The very same day, we sent a letter on behalf of DCA to ICANN’s counsel asking ICANN to refrain from executing the registry agreement with ZACR in light of the pending IRP proceedings. See DCA’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, Annex I (28 Mar. 2014). Instead, ICANN entered into the registry agreement with ZACR the very next day—two days ahead of schedule. [...] Later that same day, ICANN responded to DCA’s request by treating the execution of the contract as a fait accompli and, for the first time, informed DCA that it would accept the application of Rule 37 of the 2010 [ICDR Rules], which provides for emergency measures of protection, even though ICANN’s Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process expressly provide that Rule 37 does not apply to IRPs. A few days later, on March 28, 2014, DCA filed a Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection with the ICDR. ICANN responded to DCA’s request on April 4, 2014. An emergency arbitrator was appointed by the ICDR; however, the following week, the original panel was fully constituted and the parties’ respective submissions were submitted to the Panel for its review on April 13, 2014. After a teleconference with the parties on April 22 and a telephonic hearing on May 5, the Panel ruled that “ICANN must immediately refrain from any further processing of any application for .AFRICA” during the pendency of the IRP. Decision on Interim Measures of Protection, ¶ 51 (12 May 2014).

136. A review of the various procedural orders, decisions, and declarations in this IRP clearly indicates that DCA Trust prevailed in many of the questions and issues raised.

137. In its letter of 1 July 2015, DCA Trust refers to several instances in which ICANN was not successful in its position before this Panel. According to DCA Trust, the following are some examples, “ICANN’s Request for Partial Reconsideration, ICANN’s request for the Panel to rehear the proceedings, and the evidentiary treatment of ICANN’s written witness testimony in the event it refused to make its witnesses available for questioning during the merits hearing.”

138. The Panel has no doubt, as ICANN writes in its letter of 1 July 2015, that the Parties’ respective positions in this IRP “were asserted in good faith.” According to ICANN, “although those positions were in many instances diametrically opposed, ICANN does not doubt that DCA believed in the credibility of the positions that it took, and
[ICANN believes] that DCA feels the same about the positions ICANN took.”

139. The above said, after reading the Parties’ written submissions concerning the issue of costs and deliberation, the Panel is unanimously of the view that DCA Trust is the prevailing party in this IRP.

4) **Who is responsible for bearing the costs of this IRP and the cost of the IRP Provider?**

140. DCA Trust submits that ICANN should be responsible for all costs of this IRP, including the interim measures proceeding. Among other arguments, DCA Trust submits:

This is consistent with ICANN’s Bylaws and Supplementary Procedures, which together provide that in ordinary circumstances, the party not prevailing shall be responsible for all costs of the proceeding. Although ICANN’s Supplementary Procedures do not explain what is meant by “all costs of the proceeding,” the ICDR Rules that apply to this IRP provide that “costs” include the following:

(a) the fees and expenses of the arbitrators;

(b) the costs of assistance required by the tribunal, including its experts;

(c) the fees and expenses of the administrator;

(d) the reasonable costs for legal representation of a successful party; and

(e) any such costs incurred in connection with an application for interim or emergency relief pursuant to Article 21.

Specifically, these costs include all of the fees and expenses paid and owed to the ICDR, including the filing fees DCA paid to the ICDR (totaling $4,750), all panelist fees and expenses, including for the emergency arbitrator, incurred between the inception of this IRP and its final resolution, legal costs incurred in the course of the IRP, and all expenses related to conducting the merits hearing (e.g., renting the audiovisual equipment for the hearing, printing hearing materials, shipping hard copies of the exhibits to the members of the Panel).

Although in “extraordinary” circumstances, the Panel may allocate up to half of the costs to the prevailing party, DCA submits that the circumstances of this IRP do not warrant allocating costs to DCA should it prevail. The reasonableness of DCA’s positions, as well as the meaningful contribution this IRP has made to the public dialogue about both ICANN’s accountability mechanisms and the appropriate deference owed by ICANN to its Governmental Advisory Committee, support a full award of costs to
To the best of DCA’s knowledge, this IRP was the first to be commenced against ICANN under the new rules, and as a result there was little guidance as to how these proceedings should be conducted. Indeed, at the very outset there was controversy about the applicable version of the Supplemental Rules as well as the form to be filed to initiate a proceeding. From the very outset, ICANN adopted positions on a variety of procedural issues that have increased the costs of these proceedings. In DCA’s respectful submission, ICANN’s positions throughout these proceedings are inconsistent with ICANN’s obligations of transparency and the overall objectives of the IRP process, which is the only independent accountability mechanism available to parties such as DCA.

DCA Trust also submits that ICANN’s conduct in this IRP increased the duration and expense of this IRP. For example, ICANN failed to appoint a standing panel, it entered into a registry agreement with DCA’s competitor for .AFRICA during the pendency of this IRP, thereby forcing DCA Trust to request for interim measures of protection in order to preserve its right to a meaningful remedy, ICANN attempted to appeal declarations of the Panel on procedural matters where no appeal mechanism was provided for under the applicable procedures and rules, and finally, ICANN refused only a couple of months prior to the merits hearing, to make its witnesses available for viva voce questioning at the hearing.

ICANN in response submits that, “both the Bylaws and the Supplementary Procedures provide that, in the ordinary course, costs shall be allocated to the prevailing party. These costs include the Panel’s fees and the ICDR’s fees, [they] would also include the costs of the transcript.”

ICANN explains on the other hand that this case was extraordinary and this Panel should exercise its discretion to have each side bear its own costs as this IRP “was in many senses a first of its kind.” According to ICANN, among other things:

This IRP was the first associated with the Board’s acceptance of GAC advice that resulted in the blocking of an application for a new gTLD under the new gTLD Program;

This was the first IRP associated with a claim that one or more ICANN Board members had a conflict of interest with a Board vote; and

This was the first (and still only) IRP related to the New gTLD Program that involved a live hearing, with a considerable amount of debate associated with whether to have a hearing.
144. After reading the Parties’ written submissions concerning the issue of costs and their allocation, and deliberation, the Panel is unanimous in deciding that DCA Trust is the prevailing party in this IRP and ICANN shall bear, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, Article 11 of Supplementary Procedures and Article 31 of the ICDR Rules, the totality of the costs of this IRP and the totality of the costs of the IRP Provider.

145. As per the last sentence of Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, however, DCA Trust and ICANN shall each bear their own expenses, and they shall also each bear their own legal representation fees.

146. For the avoidance of any doubt therefore, the Panel concludes that ICANN shall be responsible for paying the following costs and expenses:

   a) the fees and expenses of the panelists;
   b) the fees and expenses of the administrator, the ICDR;
   c) the fees and expenses of the emergency panelist incurred in connection with the application for interim emergency relief sought pursuant to the Supplementary Procedures and the ICDR Rules; and
   d) the fees and expenses of the reporter associated with the hearing on 22 and 23 May 2015 in Washington, D.C.

147. The above amounts are easily quantifiable and the Parties are invited to cooperate with one another and the ICDR to deal with this part of this Final Declaration.

V. DECLARATION OF THE PANEL

148. Based on the foregoing, after having carefully reviewed the Parties’ written submissions, listened to the testimony of the three witness, listened to the oral submissions of the Parties in various telephone conference calls and at the in-person hearing of this IRP in Washington, D.C. on 22 and 23 May 2015, and finally after much deliberation, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (c) of ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel declares that both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of DCA Trust relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.

149. Furthermore, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 11 (d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, the Panel recommends that ICANN continue to
refrain from delegating the .AFRICA gTLD and permit DCA Trust's application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process.

150. The Panel declares DCA Trust to be the prevailing party in this IRP and further declares that ICANN is to bear, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, Article 11 of Supplementary Procedures and Article 31 of the ICDR Rules, the totality of the costs of this IRP and the totality of the costs of the IRP Provider as follows:

a) the fees and expenses of the panelists;
b) the fees and expenses of the administrator, the ICDR;
c) the fees and expenses of the emergency panelist incurred in connection with the application for interim emergency relief sought pursuant to the Supplementary Procedures and the ICDR Rules; and
d) the fees and expenses of the reporter associated with the hearing on 22 and 23 May 2015 in Washington, D.C.
e) As a result of the above, the administrative fees of the ICDR totaling US$4,600 and the Panelists’ compensation and expenses totaling US$403,467.08 shall be born entirely by ICANN, therefore, ICANN shall reimburse DCA Trust the sum of US$198,046.04

151. As per the last sentence of Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 18 of the Bylaws, DCA Trust and ICANN shall each bear their own expenses. The Parties shall also each bear their own legal representation fees.
The Panel finally would like to take this opportunity to fondly remember its collaboration with the Hon. Richard C. Neal (Ret. and now Deceased) and to congratulate both Parties’ legal teams for their hard work, civility and responsiveness during the entire proceedings. The Panel was extremely impressed with the quality of the written work presented to it and oral advocacy skills of the Parties’ legal representatives.

This Final Declaration has sixty-three (63) pages.

Date: Thursday, 9 July 2015.

Place of the IRP, Los Angeles, California.

Professor Catherine Kessedjian

William Cahill (Ret.)

Babak Bani, President
Annex 12
7 February 2014

Mehdi Abbasnia
Chairman & Managing Director
Asia Green IT System
No.11, 4th Floor, Block D, Metrocity Shopping Mall,
Kirgulu St., Buyukdere Ave., 34394,
Levent, Istanbul, Turkey

Re: AGIT new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL

Dear Mr. Abbasnia:

Thank you for your letter dated 30 December 2013. As you are aware, the ICANN Board received advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) in its Beijing Communiqué concerning the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL. Specifically, the GAC advised the ICANN Board:

that with regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook, the GAC recognizes that religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.

Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the Applicant Guidebook, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the applications.

I read with interest your commitment to the multistakeholder model discussed in your 30 December letter. You indicated that:

AGIT is willing to work with the OIC and other stakeholders to manage the .Islam and .Halal TLDs through a multi-stakeholder approach that would serve the best interests of Muslims all over the world and truly showcase the merits of ICANN's own multi-stakeholder, community-driven approach.

In an earlier letter dated 4 December 2013, you elaborated on the proposed governance mechanism for each of the applied-for TLDs as follows:

At the core of this governance mechanism is the Policy Advisory Council (PAC)
contemplated for each TLD. PACs will be deployed for both .ISLAM and .HALAL. They will serve as non-profit governing boards made up of leaders from many of the world’s various Muslim communities, governments, and organizations. The PACs will oversee policy development for the TLDs, to ensure they are coherent and consistent with Muslim interests. AGIT has invited the leading Muslim organisations, including the Organization for Islamic Cooperation (OIC), to become members of the PACs.

Despite these commitments, a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings .HALAL and .ISLAM. The Gulf Cooperation Council (25 July 2013: applications not supported by the community, applicants did not consult the community; believe that sensitive TLDs like these should be managed and operated by the community itself through a neutral body such as the OIC); the Republic of Lebanon (4 September 2013: management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral, non-governmental multistakeholder group); the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (19 December 2013: foreign ministers of 57 Muslim Member States supported a resolution opposing the strings; resolution was unanimously adopted); and the government of Indonesia (24 December 2013: strongly opposes approval of .islam) all voiced opposition to the AGIT applications.

There seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in your letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.

Thank you again for your support of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Crocker, Chair
ICANN Board of Directors
Approved Resolutions | Meeting of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program Committee

05 Feb 2014

1. **Main Agenda**
   a. Remaining Items from Beijing, Durban and Buenos Aires GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Advice: Updates and Actions
      Rationale for Resolution 2014.02.05.NG01
   b. Discussion of Report on String Confusion Expert Determinations
      Rationale for Resolution 2014.02.05.NG02
c. **Staff Update on Reassignment of Registry Agreements**

d. **Staff Update on Name Collision Framework**

1. **Main Agenda:**

a. **Remaining Items from Beijing, Durban and Buenos Aires GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Advice: Updates and Actions**

Whee eas, the GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) met du ng the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) 46 meet ng n Be j ng and issued a Commun qué on 11 Ap 2013 (Be j ng Commun qué).

Whee eas, the GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) met du ng the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) 47 meet ng n Du ban and issued a Communiqué on 18 Ju y 2013 (Du ban Communiqué).

Whee eas, the GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) met du ng the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) 48 meet ng n Buenos A es and issued a Communiqué on 20 Novembe 2013 (Buenos A es Communiqué).

Whee eas, the NGPC adopted sco eca ds to espond to ce ta n tems of the GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) s adv ce n the Be j ng Commun qué and the Du ban Commun qué, wh ch we e adopted on 4 June 2013, 10 Septembe 2013, and 28 Septembe 2013.

Whee eas, the NGPC has deve oped anothe te at on of the sco eca d to espond to ce ta n ema n ng tems of GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce n the Be j ng Commun qué and the Du ban Commun qué, and new adv ce n the Buenos A es Commun qué.

Whee eas, the NGPC s unde tak ng th s act on pu suant to the autho ty g anted to t by the Boa d on 10 Ap 2012, to exe c se the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) Boa d s autho ty fo any and a ssues that may a se at ng to the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am.
Resolved (2014.02.05.NG01), the NGPC adopts the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) Advice (Beijing, Du ban, Buenos Aires): Actions and Updates (5 Febuary 2014), attached as Annex 1 (/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf) [PDF, 371 KB] to this Resolution, in response to open items of Beijing, Du ban and Buenos Aires GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice as presented in the scorecard.

Rationale for Resolution 2014.02.05.NG01

According to Section 2.1 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws#XI, the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) is met to put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment, by way of specifically recommending action on new policy development or by extending existing processes. The GAC (Government Advisory Committee) issued advice to the Board on the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program through its Beijing Communiqué dated 11 April 2013, its Du ban Communiqué dated 18 July 2013, and its Buenos Aires Communiqué dated 20 November 2013. The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws require the Board to take into account the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice on public policy matters in the framing and adoption of processes. If the Board decides to take an action on that advice which is not consistent with the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice, it must inform the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) and state the reasons why this decision was not followed. The Board and the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) will then try to find a mutually acceptable solution. If no such solution can be found, the Board will state its reasons why the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice was not followed.

The NGPC has previously addressed items of the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice and Du ban advice, but the remaining items that the NGPC contemplates to work through. Add to this the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) issued new advice on its Buenos Aires Communiqué which states to the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program. The NGPC is being asked to consider accepting some of the remaining open items of the Beijing and Du ban GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice, and new items of Buenos Aires advice as described in the attached scorecard dated 28 January 2014.

As part of its consideration of the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) posted the GAC (Government Advisory Committee)
Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce and off c a y not f ed app cants of the adv ce, t gge ng the 21-
day app cant esponse pe od pu suant to the App cant Gu debook Modu e 3.1. The Be j ng GAC (Gove nmenta
Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce was posted on 18 Ap 2013
(http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-18apr13-en), the
Du ban GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce was posted on 1 August 2013
(http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-01aug13-en), and the
Buenos A es GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce was posted on 11 Decembe
2013. The comp ete set of app cant esponses a e p ov ded at:

In add t on, on 23 Ap 2013, ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s)
nt ated a pub c comment fo um to so c t nput on how the NGPC shou d add ess Be j ng GAC
(Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce ega d ng safegua ds app cab e to b oad
catego es of new gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) st ng
NGPC has cons de ed the app cant esponses n add t on to the commun ty feedback on how
ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) cou d m mp ement the GAC
(Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) s safegua d adv ce n the Be j ng Commun qu n
fo mu at ng ts esponse to the ema n ng terms of GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee)
adv ce.

As pa t of the app cant esponses, seve a of the app cants who we e subject to GAC
(Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) Catego y 1 Safegua d Adv ce have nd cated that they
suppo t the NGPC s p oposed m mp ement on p an, dated 29 Octobe 2013, and vo ced the
w ngness to comp y w th the safegua ds p oposed n the p an. On the othe hand, an
app cant noted that the NGPC s p an to espond to the GAC (Gove nmenta Adv so y
Comm ttee) s Catego y 1 Safegua d adv ce s a step back f om what the GAC (Gove nmenta
Adv so y Comm ttee) has asked fo w th ega d to ce ta n st ng. Othe s contended that the
app ed-fo st ng shou d not be st ed among the Catego y 1 Safegua d st ng. Some of the
app cants fo the .docto st ng noted that the NGPC shou d not accept the new GAC
(Gove nmenta Adv so y Comm ttee) adv ce on .docto because the te m docto s not used
e xus ve y n connect on w th med ca se v ces and to e-catego ze the st ng as e at ng to a
With respect to the Category 2 Safeguards, some applicants used ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to ensure that any Public Interest Comments on changes based on safeguards for applications content on sets a e b and ng app oved as a Change Request. Add tion, some applicants cated the support for the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice to the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) adv Ce p otect ons fo nte -gove nmenta o gan zat on ac onyms, p otect on of Red C oss/Red C escent names, and spec a aunch p og ams fo geog aph c and commun ty TLDs.

As pa of ts de be at ons, the NGPC ev ewed the fo ow ng mate a s and documents:

- **GAC (Government Advisory Committee) Be j ng Commun qué:**
  [https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Communique_Durban_20130718.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1375787122000&api=v2](https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Communique_Durban_20130718.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1375787122000&api=v2) [PDF, 238 KB]

- **GAC (Government Advisory Committee) Du ban Commun qué:**
  [https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Communique_Durban_20130717.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1374215119858&api=v2](https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Communique_Durban_20130717.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1374215119858&api=v2) [PDF, 103 KB]

- **GAC (Government Advisory Committee) Buenos A es Commun qué:**
  [https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aires_GAC_Communique_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905332&api=v2](https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aires_GAC_Communique_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905332&api=v2) [PDF, 97 KB]

- **Letter f om . D yden to S. C ocke dated 11 Sepembe 2013 e:.v n and .w ne:**

- **App cant esponses to GAC (Government Advisory Committee) adv ce:**
In adopting these response to emanating terms of Beijing and Dubai GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice, and the new Buenos Aires advice, the NGPC considered the applicant comments submitted, the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice, the comments from the Communiqués, and the procedures established in the AGB and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws. The adoption of the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice as provided in the attached scorecard assisted with assessing the GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice in a manner that permits the greatest number of new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applications to continue to move forward as soon as possible.

The absence of unforeseen impacts associated with the adoption of this solution, but significant impacts of the possible outcomes discussed will be further analysed if adopted. Approval of the solution will not impact security, stability or security issues affecting the DNS (Domain Name System).

As part of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s organisational administrative function, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) posted the Buenos Aires GAC (Government Advisory Committee) advice and officially notified applicants of the advice on 11 December 2013. The Dubai Communiqué and the Beijing Communiqué were posted on 18 April 2013 and 1 August 2013, respectively. In each case, this triggered the 21-day applicant response period pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook Module 3.1.

b. Discussion of Report on String Confusion Expert Determinations

Whereas, on 10 October 2013 the Board Governance Committee (BGC) requested staff to draft a report for the NGPC on String Confusion Objectons setting out options for dealing with the situation raised in this Request, namely the different outcomes of the String Confusion Objecton Dispute Resolution process in cases involving Amazon’s Application – for String and TLD’s Application – for String.
Whe eas, the NGPC s cons de ng potent a paths fo wa d to add ess the pe ce ved ncons stent Expe t Dete m nat ons f om the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am St ng Confus on Object ons p ocess, nc ud ng mp ement ng a ev ew mech an sm. The ev ew w e be m ted to the St ng Confus on Object on Expe t Dete m nat ons fo .CAR,.CARS and .CAM/.COM.

Whe eas, the p oposed ev ew mech an sm, f mp emented, wou d const tute a change to the cu ent St ng Confus on Object on p ocess n the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) App cant Gu debook.

Whe eas, the NGPC s unde tak ng th s act on pu suant to the autho ty g anted to t by the Boa d on 10 Ap 2012, to exe c se the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) Boa d s autho ty fo any and a ssues that may a se e at ng to the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am.

Reso ved (2014.02.05.NG02), the NGPC d ects the P es dent and CEO, o h s des gnee, to pub sh fo pub c comment the p oposed ev ew mech an sm fo add ess ng pe ce ved ncons stent Expe t Dete m nat ons f om the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am St ng Confus on Object ons p ocess.

Rationale for Resolution 2014.02.05.NG02

The NGPC s act on today, add ess ng how to dea w th pe ce ved ncons stent Expe t Dete m nat ons f om the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am St ng Confus on Object ons p ocess, s pa t of the NGPC s o e to p ov de gene a ove s ght of the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am. One co e of that wo k s eso v ng a ssues e at ng to the app ova of app cat ons and the de egat on of gTLDs pu suant to the New gTLD (gene c Top Leve Doma n) P og am fo the cu ent ound of the P og am. (See NGPC Cha te , Sect on II.D).

The act on be ng app oved today s to f st d ect the ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) P es dent and CEO, o h s des gnee, to n t ate a pub c comment pe od on the f amewo k p nc pes of a potent a ev ew mech an sm to add ess the pe ce ved ncons stent St ng Confus on Object on Expe t Dete m nat ons.

The effect of th s p oposa , and the a ssue that s ke y to be befo e the NGPC afte the c ose of the pub c comments, s to cons de mp ement ng a new ev ew mech an sm n the St ng
Confusion on Object on cases where object ons are sed by the same objecto aga nst dffe ent app cat ons fo the same st ng, whe e the outcomes of the St ng Confusion on Object ons dffe. If the p oposa s eventua y adopted afte pub c comment and fu the cons de at on by the NGPC, ICANN (Inte net Co po at on fo Ass gned Names and Numbe s) wou d wo k w th the Inte nat ona Cent e fo D spute Reso ut on (ICDR) to m pemt the new ev ew mechan sm out ned n the p oposa.

The e a e no fo eseen f sca mpacts assoc ated w th the adopt on of th s eso ut on, wh ch wou d n t ate the open ng of pub c comments, but the f sca mpacts of the p oposed new ev ew mechan sm w be fu the ana yzed f adopted. App ova of the eso ut on w not m pact secu ty, stab ty o es ency ssues e at ng to the DNS (Doma n Name System). The post ng of the p oposa fo pub c comment s an O gan zat ona Adm nst at ve Act on not equ ng pub c comment, howeve fo ow on cons de at on of the p oposa equ es pub c comment.

c. **Staff Update on Reassignment of Registry Agreements**
   Item not cons de ed.

d. **Staff Update on Name Collision Framework**
   Item not cons de ed.

Pub shed on 7 Feb ua y 2014
## GAC Advice (Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires): Actions and Updates

5 February 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAC Register #</th>
<th>GAC Advice</th>
<th>Action/Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Items of GAC Advice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. WINE and VIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-09-09-wine and vin; 2013-11-20-wine-vin (Buenos Aires Communiqué §3)</td>
<td><strong>Follow-up from Durban:</strong> The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has finalized its consideration of the strings .wine and .vin and further advises that the applications should proceed through the normal evaluation process. <strong>Buenos Aires:</strong> The Board may wish to seek a clear understanding of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating the two strings. GAC members may wish to write to the Board to further elaborate their views.”</td>
<td>On 28 September 2013, the NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from GAC members as to the nature of the differences in views expressed in the advice while the NGPC analyzed. In Buenos Aires, ICANN facilitated a dialogue between the applicant for .VIN and the affected non-governmental parties. In response to the GAC’s suggestion in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has commissioned an analysis of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in the context of the GAC advice in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .WINE and .VIN. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. GUANGZHOU and SHENZHEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-20-guangzhou; 2013-11-20-shenzhen (Buenos Aires Communiqué §2.a.i.1.a &amp; b)</td>
<td><strong>The GAC advises the Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached:</strong> .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-22691) and .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-82863)</td>
<td><strong>1A</strong> The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 6 December 2013 that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will inform the GAC of this new information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SPA</td>
<td>2013-11-20-spa (Buenos Aires Communiqué §2.a.i.1.c)</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: .spa (application numbers: 1-1619-92115, 1-1309-81322, 1-1110-73648) [Note: Application numbers updated from original text of advice.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. YUN</td>
<td>2013-04-11-gTLDStrings; 2013-07-18-gTLDStrings (Buenos Aires Communiqué §2.b)</td>
<td>The GAC notes that the application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524) has been withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AMAZON</td>
<td>2013-07-18 – Obj-Amazon (Durban Communiqué §1.1.a.i.1; Buenos Aires Communiqué §2.d)</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following application: .amazon (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IGO PROTECTION S</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC, together with IGOs, remains committed to continuing the dialogue with NGPC on finalizing the modalities for permanent protection of IGO acronyms at the second level, by putting in place a mechanism which would: (1) provide for a permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant and the relevant IGO as to possible conflict if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of that IGO; (2) allow the IGO a timely opportunity to effectively prevent potential misuse and confusion; (3) allow for a final and binding determination by an independent third party in order to resolve any disagreement between an IGO and a potential registrant; and (4) be at no cost or of a nominal cost only to the IGO. The GAC looks forward to receiving the alternative NGPC proposal adequately addressing this advice. Initial protections for IGO acronyms should remain in place until the dialogue between the NGPC, the IGOs and the GAC ensuring the implementation of this protection is completed.</td>
<td>On 2 October 2013, the NGPC proposal in response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué regarding protections for IGO acronyms was submitted to the GAC for its consideration. The NGPC is developing ways to implement the GAC advice, including whether there are mechanisms, other than the Trademark Clearinghouse, that can be used to implement the advice. The NGPC will prepare an alternative proposal for consideration by the GAC. The NGPC adopted a resolution at its 9 January 2014 meeting to extend the initial protections for IGO acronyms while the GAC and NGPC continue to work through outstanding implementation issues. To note: During the Buenos Aires meeting, the GNSO unanimously approved the recommendations in the Final Report of the IGO/INGO Protection PDP Working Group. The Final Report recommended reserving IGO names but not their acronyms. It did allow for the inclusion of acronyms in the TMCH in future rounds if they were included in the TMCH during the current round. It also requested an issue report on possible revisions to the UDRP and URS policies that would allow IGOs to take advantage of these processes. Subject to receiving direction from the Board, the NGPC will: (1) consider the policy recommendations from the GNSO as the NGPC continues to actively develop an approach to respond to the GAC advice on protections for IGOs, and (2) develop a comprehensive proposal to address the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations for consideration by the Board at a subsequent meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IOC/RCRC PROTECTION</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out for the protection of acronyms of IGOs be used to also protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).</td>
<td>Refer to the update above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RCRC NAMES</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that it is giving further consideration to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words “Red Cross”, “Red Crescent” and related designations at the top and second levels with specific regard to national Red Cross and Red Crescent entities; and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. CAT 1 SAFEGUARDS | **Beijing Communiqué:** Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. (Refer to the GAC Register of Advice for the full text of each Category 1 Safeguard.)  
**Buenos Aires Communiqué:** The GAC advises the ICANN Board to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors, therefore ascribing these domains exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. The GAC notes the strong implications for consumer protection and consumer trust, and the need for proper medical ethical standards, demanded by the medical field online to be fully respected. | 1A | The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as [Annex 2](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-05feb14-en.pdf) to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework.  
With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domains in the .doctor TLD are ascribed exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAC Register #</th>
<th>GAC Advice</th>
<th>Action/Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. CAT 2 SAFEGUARDS – EXCLUSIVE ACCESS 2013-04-11-Safeguards – Categories -2; 2013-11-20-Cat1-Cat2 (Beijing Communiqué Annex I, Category 2, Item 2; Buenos Aires Communiqué §1.e)</td>
<td><strong>Beijing:</strong> For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access: .antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts,.クラウド [cloud], .ストア [store], .セール [sale], .ファッション [fashion], .家電 [consumer electronics], .腕時計 [watches], .書籍 [book], .珠宝 [jewelry], .通販 [online shopping], .食品 [food] <strong>Buenos Aires:</strong> The GAC welcomes the Board’s communication with applicants with regard to open and closed gTLDs, but seeks written clarification of how strings are identified as being generic.</td>
<td>ICANN contacted the 186 applicants for strings identified in the GAC’s Category 2 safeguard advice. The applicants were asked to respond by a specified date indicating whether the applied-for TLD will be operated as an exclusive access registry. An overwhelming majority of the applicants (174) indicated that the TLD would not be operated as an exclusive access registry. The NGPC adopted a resolution directing staff to move forward with the contracting process for applicants for strings identified in the Category 2 Safeguards that were prepared to enter into the Registry Agreement as approved, since moving forward with these applicants was consistent with the GAC’s advice. Twelve applicants responded that the TLD would be operated as an exclusive access registry. These 12 applicants have applied for the following strings: .BROKER, .CRUISE, .DATA, .DVR, .GROCERY, .MOBILE, .PHONE, .STORE, .THEATER, .THEATRE and .TIRES. Staff requested the applicants to provide an explanation of how the proposed exclusive registry access serves a public interest goal. The responses have been received. ICANN staff will forward the responses to the NGPC and the GAC so that the responses can be considered prior to the Singapore meeting. The NGPC accepts the advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué. As requested in in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has provided a written clarification to the GAC of how strings are identified as being generic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CAT 2 SAFEGUARDS – RESTRICTED ACCESS</td>
<td><strong>Beijing Communiqué:</strong> As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1 above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be appropriate for the types of risks associated with the TLD. The registry operator should administer access in these kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage. <strong>Buenos Aires Communiqué:</strong> The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted Access' registries, particularly with regard to the need to avoid undue preference and/or undue disadvantage. The GAC requests a briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepted the GAC’s Beijing advice regarding Category 2 (Restricted Access). To implement the advice, the NGPC revised Specification 11 – Public Interest Commitments in the New gTLD Registry Agreement. The PIC Spec requires that “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.” The NGPC accepts the advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué. As requested, the NGPC has provided a written clarification to the GAC on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. HALAL AND ISLAM</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board that with regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook, the GAC recognizes that religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed. GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair’s correspondence in similar terms.</td>
<td>The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting. Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the applications. On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE. In a 4 November 2013 letter from the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) to the GAC Chair, the OIC requested that its letter be considered an “official opposition of the Member States of the OIC towards probable authorization by the GAC allowing the use of [...] .ISLAM and .HALAL by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.” In a 11 November 2013 letter to the GAC Chair, the NGPC indicated that before it takes action on the strings, it will wait for any additional GAC input during the Buenos Aires meeting or resulting GAC Communiqué. The Buenos Aires Communiqué took note of the letters sent by the OIC, but did not offer any additional advice to the Board. The OIC also adopted a resolution in December 2013 communicating its official objection to the use of the applied-for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs. The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community. The NGPC has sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Register #</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>Action/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. [PROTECTIONS FOR CHILDREN]</td>
<td>The GAC considers that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC acknowledges the GAC’s view. ICANN will contact all new gTLD registry operators to make them aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. [AUCTIONS]</td>
<td>The GAC requests a briefing on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will provide a briefing to the GAC regarding the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. [SPECIAL LAUNCH PROGRAM]</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch program for special cases as a matter of urgency.</td>
<td>1A The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to provide clarity to the community on the proposed launch program for special cases. <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/launch-application-guidelines-19dec13-en.pdf">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/launch-application-guidelines-19dec13-en.pdf</a> Additionally, the NGPC has provided a briefing to the GAC on this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject: Objection against .islam and .halal

Dear Chairman of ICANN Board,

Dear ICC Panel on .islam and .halal objections,

This has reference to new gTLD applications .islam (1-2130-23450) and .halal (1-2131-60793) and to the community-based objections filed by the government of United Arab Emirates against those two applications.

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) is an inter-governmental organization established in 1981. It is a political and economic union of the Arab states bordering the Arabian Gulf, namely Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates.

The GCC would like to express our concern to the new gTLDs applications (.islam and .halal) that have been applied by Asia Green IT System (AGIT). We believe that gTLD applications related to religions must be fully supported and governed by the concerned community. Unfortunately this is
not the case with these two applications as the applicant did not consult the community, nor it received the support of the community.

Being an IGO that represents the interests of six Islamic countries, we would like to share the concerns raised by UAE government in its early warning. We believe that the application put forward by AGIT is not in the interest of the Islamic community due to the sensitivities inherited in them. We believe that this TLD should be managed and operated by the community itself through a neutral body that truly represents the Islamic community such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Therefore we would like to support to the objection that was put forward by the government of United Arab Emirates and request ICANN not to approve these applications.

Best Regards,

Abdullah J. Al-Shibli
Asst. Sec. Gen. for Economic Affairs
Date: 04 September, 2013

To: Ms. Cherine Chalaby, Chairman of the New gTLD Program Committee,
   ICANN New gTLD Program Committee
   ICANN Board Members,

Subject: Position of Lebanon Regarding New gTLD Applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL

Dear Ms. Chalaby,

Dear New gTLD Program Committee Members,

Dear ICANN Board Members,

Reference is made to inform you the Lebanese position regarding new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL as follows:

We strongly believe that, in general, the ICANN should stay away from making decisions related to religious domain names based on other than purely technical criteria, principals, requirements, and inputs.

Having stated our overarching position, Lebanon believes that TLDs like .ISLAM and .HALAL like many other new TLDs sought using the new gTLD program, will benefit the general public and will help the Muslim community in getting better presentation, and it will also help the community integrate and engage better on the Internet.

We also understand and point out that TLDs of this nature will also bring with it few additional management challenges that we believe that the ICANN board and committees must take into account as part of the evaluation of these two TLDs and of other similar TLDs.

We must reiterate our strong belief that the evaluation process must be a purely technical conducted through a technical committee based on purely technical criteria. However, in case inputs other than technical inputs must be taking into account, we also strongly believe that, the management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral non-governmental...
multi-stakeholder group representing, at least, the larger Muslim community, and representing its different sections and segments including Governments, NGOs and IGOs, Private Sector, Academia, as well as other stakeholders of the internet for the Muslim community.

It is extremely important to guarantee a growth-oriented developmental management process of these, and of other similar, very sensitive TLDs, where the management is conducted in a non-governmental, non-political multi-stake-holder manner. It is also important to avoid any dominance or major influence by any specific organization, country or group of countries, governments, governmental organizations in an effort to help conduct a proper and healthy multi-stakeholder management with the objective of making sure that the internet (and the society as a whole) follows a more inclusive, democratic, peace-seeking, transparent approach, consistent with the purposes of the ICANN and the larger Internet community.

This approach could help engage the entire Larger Muslim Community in a nondiscriminatory process that could benefit from its very objectives to fully consider the matter and take into account the highest level of non-alignment, impartiality, neutrality, inclusiveness, transparency and democratic process.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Imad Y. Hoballah
Lebanon’s Representative to the ICANN-GAC
Chairman and CEO, TRA, Lebanon
Dear Mr. Crocker,

I would like to refer to my letter to Ms. Heather Dryden the Chair of GAC dated 4 November 2013 (copy attached) and her reply dated 29 November 2013 regarding the new gTLD applications for .halal and .islam. I wish to seize this opportunity to thank the GAC Chair and you personally for paying due consideration to our concerns, as well as for the understanding of ICANN for OIC position on new gTLD applications for .halal and .islam.

I have the honor to inform you that the Foreign Ministers of the 57 Muslim Member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, which is the sole official representative of the Muslim world has approved and adopted the OIC position as indicated in my aforementioned letter. I would like here to stress that the resolution was unanimously adopted after extensive consultations between Member States on the issue. The official delegates of the Muslim World have considered the fact that new gTLDs with Islamic identity are of such sensitive nature as they concern the entire Muslim nation and subsequently has decided to file an official objection to ICANN for the use of gTLDs .islam and .halal, and preserve the right of member states in this regard.

The resolution also urged OIC Member States to ICANN to support United Arab Emirates’ position and the measures it took to block the sale of the two domains .islam and .halal or any other domains which concern the entire Islamic Ummah.

In light of the above, you may agree that the adopted resolution clearly nullifies the observation of the GAC members about the lack of community involvement and support to the OIC request. You would also kindly appreciate that the OIC resolution on the issue underlines the need for constructive engagement between the ICANN and OIC as well as between ICANN and OIC Member States.

In this context, I would like to reiterate and affirm the official opposition of the OIC Member States towards any probable authorization by the GAC allowing use of these new gTLDs .islam and .halal by any entity not reflecting the collective voice of the Muslim People.

While appreciating the response by the GAC Chair, I would also like to underline that we all strive towards achieving our ultimate goal of ensuring betterment for our people, and when an issue as sensitive as the one under discussion is being considered, there always should be a scope to reintroduce even after apparent conclusion of deliberations.

I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. Please accept, Mr. Chair, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu

Mr. Stephen D. Crocker
Chair, ICANN Board of Directors

CC: Mr. Fadi Chehade, the President & CEO of ICANN
CC: Mr. Cherine Chalaby Chairman and other members of the new gTLD Program Committee
CC: Mrs. Heather Dryden, Chair of Governmental Advisory Committee
Mr. Cherine Chalaby
Chairman of New gTLD Program Committee
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
Cherine.Chalaby@icann.org

Our Ref. : B-14/QH /SJ/KS.02.04/12/2013
Subject : Indonesia’s Position regarding New gTLD Applications for .islam and .halal

Dear Sir,

With reference to recommendations arising from Islamic states regarding the management and implementation of new gTLD applications for .islam, and .halal by a private company/institution, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MCIT) on behalf of the government of Indonesia would like to convey its official views on the aforementioned matter, as follows:

1. Indonesia highly appreciates and supports ICANN’s policies regarding new gTLD programs which we believe that it will bring about positive impacts for the global development of domain names, particularly its potential in escalating competition and innovation in the business sphere. However, it is inevitable to view that all newly proposed gTLDs will not receive approval from multi-stakeholders, specifically those that concern a certain religion. Thus, Indonesia is of the view that ICANN should be impartial, inclusive, neutral, and has multi stakeholder approach.

2. Besides, Indonesia is a multi-cultural, multi-racial, and multi-religious country, with its population predominantly Muslim (of the Islamic faith). Based on this fact, we indeed realize that domain name issues concerning a certain religion may be of sensitive nature and potentially provoke future conflicts.

3. Taking into consideration the aforementioned grounds, Indonesia’s position on the new gTLD application of .islam are as follows:
   a. Any domain name that uses a name of a particular religion may be the root cause of potential sensitive friction and future conflicts.
   b. The entity/person who proposed new gTLD application does not represent the larger global muslim community.
   c. Within Islam, there exists several different schools of thoughts that may have entirely different opinions and arguments which may cause conflicts.
   d. Indonesia opposes any domain name that uses a name of any particular religion; and strongly objects the proposal of the domain name of .islam.

4. Indonesia's position on the new gTLD application of .halal:
   a. In principle, Indonesia approves the proposal and use of domain name .halal, provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.
b. Entities that register for the domain name .halal should be obliged to submit a halal certification for proof of halal products and/or services from a local government authority of the originating country.

c. Ideally, the domain name .halal should be managed by an entity which resides in a country that represents the majority of Muslim community.

Thank you for your kind attention, and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Basuki Yusuf Iskandar
Secretary General
Ministry of Communication and Information Technology
Republic of Indonesia

CC:
H.E. Minister of Communication and Information Technology, Republic of Indonesia;
Director General of ICT Applications.
Annex 14
Reconsideration Request

1. Requester Information
Name: Asia Green IT System Ltd.
Address: Contact Information Redacted
Email: Contact Information Redacted

(Note: ICANN will post the Requester’s name on the Reconsideration Request page at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm. Requestors address, email and phone number will be removed from the posting.)

2. Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):
   \textbf{X} Board action/inaction
   \textbf{X} Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.
   Applicant seeks reconsideration of the following NGPC decisions in its Feb. 5\textsuperscript{th} Resolution: 1) to refuse to initiate contracting with Applicant to operate the .Islam and .Halal gTLD applications; 2) to provide effective veto power over just these two applications, to just two countries’ governments and two IGOs.

   Applicant also seeks reconsideration of the following Staff decisions in implementing the NGPC Resolution, embodied in Dr. Crocker’s letter to Applicant dated Feb. 7\textsuperscript{th}: 1) to fail to provide clear definition of the purported “conflicts” mentioned in Dr. Crocker’s letter, and clear criteria for Applicant to “resolve” those
purported conflicts; and 2) to fail to explain how any such conflicts, if any, have not already been resolved by (i) Applicant’s PICs and proposed governance model, (ii) the relevant Independent Objector determination, (iii) the relevant Expert determinations in the Community Objections, (iv) the manifest lack of GAC Advice against the applications, and/or (v) Applicant’s compliance with all other rules and procedures set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

4. **Date of action/inaction:**
   
   February 7, 2014. Date of letter from Dr. Crocker to Applicant.

5. **On what date did you become aware of the action or that action would not be taken?**
   
   February 11, 2014. Date the aforementioned letter was emailed to Applicant.

6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:**
   
   Applicant has invested more than USD 750,000 in its applications to operate these gTLD strings that are not prohibited, and thus allowed, by ICANN’s own policy as documented within the Applicant Guidebook. Applicant, a Turkish corporation owned and operated by devout Muslims, intends to bring these TLDs to all of the various Muslim communities around the world, for all Muslim communities’ mutual benefit. Applicant reasonably estimates a multi-million dollar business opportunity from operating these gTLDs.

   Applicant has paid application fees to ICANN, and COI fees as required by ICANN. At significant expense, Applicant has passed ICANN’s Initial Evaluation as to both strings, without any issues for Extended Evaluation.
At further significant expense, Applicant subsequently has responded to ICANN's Independent Objector's inquiry, which was made in light of GAC Early Warnings from the governments of the UAE and India. The IO issued two final rulings, refusing to file either a Limited Public Interest Objection or a Community Objection against Applicant with respect to .Islam:

For all these reasons, the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “.Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community. ...

The IO considers that guarantees presented by the applicant properly address his initial concerns. Therefore and for all these reasons, the IO is finally of the opinion that an objection on community ground is not warranted.

On June 4, 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution as a consequence to the communique received from the GAC at the conclusion of the GAC’s secretive and closed Beijing meetings. The NGPC responded to this communique by producing a Scorecard, and committing to further dialogue with the GAC. This Scorecard further referenced the Community Objection filed by the UAE government with ICC.

---

3 The GAC only noted in the Beijing Communique that “some GAC members” believed the applications “lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.” [https://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf)
against .ISLAM and .HALAL, and said that “these applications cannot move to the contracting phase until the objections are resolved.”

At significant expense, Applicant then successfully overcame those Community Objections filed against both applications by the Telecom Regulatory Authority of the UAE government. In those cases, in October 2013, the ICC expert found there was no substantial opposition to these applications and that, "The Objector has certainly not provided any evidence that the Respondent is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the Muslim community." Consequently, the expert found in both cases that there would be no material detriment to any community of Muslims.

Then in November 2013, Dr. Crocker forwarded a letter from the Organization of Islamic States to the GAC Chair, which requested the GAC to “kindly consider this letter as an official opposition of the Member States of the OIC ... [to] use of these [TLDs] by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.” GAC further discussed these applications and that letter during the Buenos Aires meetings, and decided not to issue any formal advice against the applications. Instead, the GAC stated that “it concluded its discussion on these strings” six

---


months earlier in Beijing. The GAC Chair clarified in her letter\(^8\) to Dr. Crocker that “no further GAC input on this matter can be expected.” Thus, at most, “some GAC members” objected nearly a year ago, without any specific rationale provided by GAC or ICANN to Applicant. But the GAC has not recommended and will not recommend that the applications be rejected.

Thus, Applicant has withstood every potential challenge to these applications set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, at great expense of both time and money. And still, the NGPC has now unilaterally decided that there is one more hurdle, unique only to Applicant and these two applications. Dr. Crocker stated in his Feb. 7 letter, directly contrary to the ICC expert’s determination made after full legal briefing and evidence from the government of the UAE and the Applicant, that “a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings.” And so these two applications are sent to a unique, ICANN-imposed purgatory, with no inkling whatsoever as to how they ultimately will be evaluated by ICANN. This causes clear harm to Applicant, and to the entire Muslim world.

7. **Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.**

Internet users who seek to use domain names within the .Islam and .Halal TLDs are harmed by their continued unavailability, particularly when soon .Catholic and other ‘religious’ strings will be operational. The GNSO constituencies, Working Group members, and public commenters, who considered religious strings in the many Policy Development and implementation processes leading to adoption of the

Applicant Guidebook, will be harmed by the NGPC and Staff refusals to adhere to the consensus recommendations set forth therein. ICANN itself will suffer further degradation in community interest in PDP participation, if the consensus recommendations are ignored by NGPC. And ICANN itself will suffer further degradation in the perception of people in the Muslim world, who will not understand why ICANN has singled out these applications for disparate, discriminatory treatment.9

8. **Detail of Board and Staff Action**

I. **The NGPC Resolution did not consider material information provided since May 23, 2013.**

The NGPC Resolution dated Feb. 5, 2014, imposing open-ended delay upon these applications, with no criteria whatsoever to end such delay, cites only one document from Applicant as a source upon which the NGPC relied. That document, the Applicant’s response to the GAC’s Beijing communique, was dated May 23, 2013.

Given all of the other matters discussed both in the Resolution and in the many various applicants’ responses to the GAC’s Beijing communique, it is highly doubtful that any NGPC member actually even read the Applicant’s response before coming to its omnibus Resolution this month. Moreover, much has happened in the 8 ½ months in between, of which the NGPC apparently has not been made aware.10

---

9 Applicant notes that ICANN has approved the .kosher gTLD application, to be operated by a private entity with a multi-stakeholder governance model no more inclusive than the model proposed by Applicant for .halal and .Islam. How will ICANN explain this to Muslim people who live halal lifestyle?

10 Applicant incorporates by reference its voluminous archive of letters of support from prominent Muslim organizations and individuals. *See infra,* § 12, with
Dr. Crocker’s letter dated Feb. 7, 2014, conveying the Staff’s interpretation of this Resolution to Applicant, mentions just four governmental letters which purportedly comprise the “substantial body of opposition” to the applications. Yet this purported opposition – supposedly from the Cooperation Council for Arab States of the Gulf (“CCASG”), Lebanon, OIC and Indonesia – thoroughly has been addressed by the Applicant, and generally has been deemed insubstantial by both the Independent Objector and the ICC expert arbitrator. It is also effectively insubstantial per the terms of the Applicant Guidebook, since no GAC Advice has been or will be rendered against the application. Regardless, much of the crux of what is said in these letters is supportive of Applicant and its promised governance model.

a. **CCASG/UAE Objections have been denied by ICC Expert.**

A prominent CCASG and OIC member state, the UAE (represented by a highly prominent legal firm in the Middle East), filed a formal Community Objection with ICC and soundly was defeated. Not only was the purported community opposition deemed insubstantial, but also the expert found no likelihood of material detriment to any purported Muslim community. The Objections failed on both bases, and so the Objector proved only two of the four required elements.

ICANN has no right to second-guess this expert finding, which was based upon the procedures set forth in ICANN’s contract with Applicant (referencing the Summary at Exhibit A. Many of these letters have been provided since last May 23, particularly in context of the Community Objection proceeding in which the Expert allowed additional submissions per the request of the Objector.
Applicant Guidebook), and which was fully briefed by lawyers retained by one of the wealthiest per capita nations in the world. The CCASG arguments were unconvincing to the honorable ICC expert, as they previously had been found unavailing by ICANN’s own Independent Objector.

The Applicant Guidebook specifically indicates that the ICANN Board should consider the advice of experts in making determinations about new gTLD applications which raise sensitive government issues. Guidebook §3.1 re GAC Advice specifically provides: “The ICANN 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.” And of course, the Guidebook contains specific lengthy provisions about the Independent Objector and the Community Objection procedures. Here, not only has the GAC not advised ICANN to reject the application, but two of ICANN’s appointed experts have advised ICANN not to reject the applications. What reasonable basis exists for this determination? It seems clear that the NGPC did not consider this material information in coming to its latest Resolution as to these applications.

b. **Applicant proposes a model complying with these governments’ only stated criteria.**

As specifically found by ICANN’s own Independent Objector, Applicant indeed has proposed a multi-stakeholder governance model as suggested by the government of Lebanon (“neutral, non-governmental multistakeholder group”) and by the OIC (“entity representing the collective voice of the Muslim people”).
Applicant has even committed to contractual PICs in this regard. The NGPC has not acknowledged this proposed governance model or the PICs in its Resolution, and so presumably did not consider them.11

Instead, NGPC assumes there is “conflict” between Applicant’s proposed governance model, and the concerns expressed in the four cited letters. But neither the Resolution nor Dr. Crocker’s letter make any effort whatsoever to explain any such purported conflict, nor how such conflict was not fully resolved by the Applicant’s governance model, the Independent Objector, the Community Objection expert, and/or the lack of any GAC Advice against the applications. This notion of conflict is belied by the critical text of both the Lebanese and OIC “opposition” quoted above. Applicant has documented via PIC and otherwise its commitment to a multi-stakeholder, inclusive operational model representing the collective voice of the Muslim world. These are the criteria set forth by Lebanon and the OIC in their letters of purported opposition.

c. **ICANN violates established policy by failing to provide objective evaluation criteria, and by giving late veto to a few government actors.**

ICANN gives Applicant no guidance whatsoever as to how it can pass this hurdle and resolve such unexplained and illusory “conflict”, thus overcoming the special veto that ICANN appears to have given to these two governments and two IGOs. ICANN must reconsider this ill-advised decision to place just these two

---

11 Dr. Crocker did reference the governance model in his letter, and thus at least ICANN has received it, even if it was not considered by NGPC.
applications into an interminable limbo, with no guidance whatsoever as to how they ultimately will be evaluated by ICANN and/or these out-of-bound ‘objectors’.

This new policy is directly contradictory to the policy set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, and thus can only be based upon insufficient and/or inaccurate material information. In effect, ICANN is currently ignoring two experts’ well-considered opinions that Applicant’s governance model is sufficient to overcome governmental objections. And ICANN is currently ignoring the fact of no GAC Advice against the applications, indicating insufficient governmental objections per ICANN’s consensus policy as adopted in the Applicant Guidebook.

Not one Advisory Committee, Supporting Organization, Stakeholder Group, Constituency, Working Group, Review Panel, Implementation Team, Independent Expert or any other ICANN creation is or ever has been opposed to these applications. Only a “few governments”, at various times, have opposed the applications -- with the latest OIC letter coming far too late to be given weight against these applications.

Yet ICANN’s Board, eighteen months after the application window closed and the Guidebook was finalized, now appears to give veto power over just these 2 applications to 2 countries and 2 IGOs -- without any clear means for ICANN and/or Applicant to override such vetoes. There is no precedent for such a decision. It is a foolish decision if ICANN hopes to remain independent of governmental interference in its operations. Thus it can only be based upon insufficient and/or inaccurate information, and must be reconsidered.
And ICANN’s Staff, via Dr. Crocker’s letter, has not provided any criteria by which Applicant will be evaluated in this next step of the application process, and effectively has given a veto to two select governments and two select IGOs, over just these two applications. This is directly contrary to ICANN’s stated Principle “A” underlying the New gTLD Program:12

New generic top-level domains (gTLDs) must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.

Further, it is directly contrary to Recommendation 1, 9 and 12:13

(1) The evaluation and selection procedure for new gTLD registries should respect the principles of fairness, transparency and non-discrimination.

All applicants for a new gTLD registry should therefore be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria, fully available to the applicants prior to the initiation of the process. Normally, therefore, no subsequent additional selection criteria should be used in the selection process.

(9) There must be a clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria.

(12) Dispute resolution and challenge processes must be established prior to the start of the process.

It is also directly contrary to ICANN’s Principle “G”:14

The string evaluation process must not infringe the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law.

13 Id.
14 Id.
This freedom of expression principle was cited by both the Independent Objector and the Community Objection expert, in deciding that Applicant’s applications were important for the Muslim world’s freedom of expression rights, and that this outweighed potential governmental concerns over control of these TLDs.

These Principles and Recommendations were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council in late 2007, and almost unanimously by the ICANN Board in early 2008. The Applicant Guidebook represents the implementation of these Principles and Recommendations. Yet the NGPC and Staff have now gone completely outside the bounds of these bedrock principles underlying the New gTLD Program, and outside the bounds of all of the various processes set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, pertaining inter alia to the Independent Objector, Community Objection, and GAC Advice. Instead they apparently have allowed a last-minute veto to a few governmental actors, with no input from any ICANN stakeholder group, for no discernible purpose whatsoever, and with no discernible means for the applications to be further evaluated.

d. **Halal should proceed, regardless of concerns about .Islam.**

The NGPC and Staff appear to have ignored important details relating to the difference between the two applications at issue here. Thus they have based the decision to lump the two applications together on insufficient and/or inaccurate information.

First, Indonesia only objected to .Islam, and specifically endorsed Applicant’s operation of .Halal. “In principle, Indonesia approves the proposal and use of
domain name .halal, provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.”15 Similarly, the Independent Objector did not even inquire about .halal as potentially problematic, focusing only on .islam.

Moreover, Applicant has provided a specific letter of support from the OIC’s affiliated HalalWorld Institute.16 This is the single largest halal certification organization in the world, with specific backing from the OIC. Indeed it is an Institute within the OIC’s Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). It is OIC’s own unified Halal Standard project operator; its developed Halal Food Standards were approved by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) in 2010, and now its scope of activities was expanded into new sectors like “Halal science,” “Halal regulations,” and “Halal code of conduct”.17 The ICRIC has also provided three specific letters of support to Applicant.

In addition, ICANN cannot discriminate between the .halal and .kosher applications. From a government “sensitivity” perspective, they must be deemed equal, as essentially the words mean the same thing -- halal referring to Muslim lifestyle and kosher referring to Jew lifestyle.18 Apparently the NGPC did not realize in its Resolution, and Staff in its implementation, that the .kosher application has been approved by ICANN and is nearing delegation. As certainly ICANN cannot explain to the Muslim communities how and why .kosher can be operated by a

16 http://www.halalworld.org/about/2?lang=en#.UwemefldXjV
17 Id.
private entity with an inclusive governance structure, yet .halal cannot. At minimum, ICANN immediately should release the .halal application from the discriminatory purgatory created by the NGPC Resolution.

9. **What are you asking ICANN to do now?**

Approve both applications for contracting, immediately. Or at least approve .halal for contracting, immediately.

If both applications are not immediately approved for contracting, then: 1) provide clear definition of the purported “conflicts” mentioned in Dr. Crocker’s letter, and provide clear criteria for Applicant to “resolve” those purported conflicts; and 2) explain how such conflicts have not already been resolved by (i) Applicant’s PICs and proposed governance model, (ii) the Independent Objector determination, (iii) the Expert determinations in the Community Objections, (iv) the manifest lack of GAC Advice against the applications, and/or (v) Applicant’s compliance with every other rule and procedure set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

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.**

Please see Applicant’s response to items 6 through 9, *supra*.

11. **Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities?** (Check one)

___ Yes

**X** No

12. **Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?**

Applicant refers to its archive of support letters, contained at this Dropbox
This archive is far too voluminous to attach to email. A summary of this archive is attached as Exhibit A.

By: Mike Rodenbaugh  
RODENBAUGH LAW  
Attorneys for Applicant  

February 26, 2014
The Requester Asia Green IT System Ltd. seeks reconsideration of the NGPC’s\(^1\) February 2014 resolution deferring the contracting process for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings until certain noted conflicts have been resolved. The Requester also seeks reconsideration of an alleged staff action implementing the NGPC’s resolution; namely, the 7 February 2014 letter from Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board, to Requester.

**I. Brief Summary.**

The Requester applied for .ISLAM and .HALAL. The applications were the subject of two GAC\(^2\) Early Warning notices, an evaluation by the Independent Objector, an objection filed with the ICC,\(^3\) three issuances of related GAC Advice, and significant objections from a number of other entities and governments. Ultimately, the NGPC resolved to take no further action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL applications until and unless the Requester resolves the conflicts between its applications and the objections raised by the organizations and governments identified by the NGPC. The Requester claims that the NGPC failed to consider material information in taking its action and also claims that ICANN staff violated an established policy or procedure by failing to inform the Requester how it should resolve the noted conflicts.

With respect to these claims, there is no indication that the NGPC failed to consider material information in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. Rather, the record

---

1. New gTLD Program Committee.
2. Governmental Advisory Committee.
3. International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.
demonstrates that the NGPC was well aware of the information Requester claims was material to
the 5 February 2014 Resolution. In addition, the Requester has not identified an ICANN staff
action that violated an established ICANN policy or procedure. Instead, the action challenged by
the Requester was that of the Board, not staff, and, in any event, the Requester has failed to
identify any ICANN policy or procedure violated by that action. Given this, the BGC
recommends that Request 14-7 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Relevant Background Facts.

The Requester Asia Green IT System Ltd. (“Requester”) applied for .ISLAM
and .HALAL (“Requester’s Applications”).

On 20 November 2012, the Requester’s Applications received GAC Early Warning
notices from two GAC members: (i) the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”)
(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-AE-23450.pdf;
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-AE-60793.pdf); and (ii) India
(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-IN-23459.pdf;
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-IN-60793.pdf).4 Both
members expressed serious concerns regarding the Requester’s Applications, including a
perceived lack of community involvement in, and support for, the Requester’s Applications.

In December 2012, the Independent Objector (“IO”)5 issued a preliminary assessment on

---

4 Concurrent with the public comment period, the GAC may issue GAC Early Warning notices
concerning particular applications. The notices provide the applicant with an indication that the
application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more governments. (Applicant
Guidebook (“Guidebook”), Section 1.1.2.4.)

5 The Independent Objector, Professor Alain Pellet, was appointed by ICANN to serve for the duration of
the New gTLD Program and lodge objections to highly objectionable gTLD applications on limited
public interest and community grounds. (Guidebook, Section 3.2.5.)
the Requester’s application for .ISLAM, noting that the application received numerous public comments expressing opposition to a private entity, namely the Requester, having control over a gTLD that relates to religion (“IO’s Assessment on .ISLAM”). (http://www.independent-objector-newgtlds.org/home/the-independent-objector-s-comments-on-controversial-applications/islam-general-comment.) The Requester submitted responses to the IO’s initial concerns, and the IO ultimately concluded that neither an objection on public interest grounds nor community grounds to the application for .ISLAM string was warranted. (See IO’s Assessment on .ISLAM.)

On 13 March 2013, the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE filed community objections with the ICC to the Requester’s Applications (“Community Objections”).

On 11 April 2013, the GAC issued its Beijing Communiqué, which included advice to ICANN regarding the Requester’s Applications, among others. Specifically, the GAC advised the Board that, pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), some GAC members:

[H]ave noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.8


---

6 UAE’s Community Objections asserted that there is “substantial opposition to [each] gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.” (Guidebook, Section 3.2.1; New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”), Art. 2(e).)

7 The New gTLD Program includes a procedure pursuant to which the GAC may provide Advice to ICANN concerning a specific application for a new gTLD. The procedures are set out in Module 3 of the Guidebook. (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/objection-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf).

8 GAC Advice regarding a new gTLD application may include advice: “[T]hat there are concerns about a particular application[]. The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns.” (Guidebook, Section 3.1.)
On 18 April 2013, ICANN published the GAC Advice thereby notifying the Requester and triggering the 21-day applicant response period.9 Requester submitted to the Board timely responses to the GAC Advice, which included, among other things, a summary of the support received for the Requester’s Applications and a draft of the proposed governance model for the .ISLAM string (“Requester’s Responses to GAC Advice”).


The NGPC accepts [the GAC] advice…. Pursuant to Section 3.1ii of the [Guidebook], the NGPC stands ready to enter into dialogue with the GAC on this matter. We look forward to liaising with the GAC as to how such dialogue should be conducted.

(NGPC Scorecard, Pg. 3.) The NGPC Scorecard further noted the Community Objections filed against the Requester’s Applications and indicated that “these applications cannot move to the

9 Where GAC Advice is received by the Board concerning an application, ICANN is required to: “[P]ublish 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.” (Guidebook, Section 3.1.)
contracting phase until the objections are resolved.” (Id.)

On 18 July 2013, pursuant to Section 3.1.II of the Guidebook, members of the NGPC entered into a dialogue with the governments concerned about the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings to understand the scope of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Advice in the Beijing Communiqué.

On 25 July 2013, the Ministry of Communications for the State of Kuwait sent a letter to ICANN expressing its support for UAE’s Community Objections and identifying concerns that the Requester did not receive the support of the community, the Requester’s Applications are not in the best interest of the Islamic community, and the strings “should be managed and operated by the community itself through a neutral body that truly represents the Islamic community such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/al-qattan-to-icann-icc-25jul13-en.pdf)

On 4 September 2013, in a letter to the NGPC Chairman, the Republic of Lebanon expressed general support for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings, but stated that it strongly believes “the management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral non-governmental multi-stakeholder group representing, at least, the larger Muslim community.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/hoballah-to-chalaby-et-al-04sep13-en.pdf)

On 24 October 2013, the expert panel (“Panel”) appointed by the ICC to consider UAE’s Community Objections rendered two separate Expert Determinations (“Determinations”) in favor of the Requester. Based on the submissions and evidence provided by the parties, the

Panel determined that UAE failed to demonstrate substantial opposition from the community to the Requester’s Applications or that the Applications created a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the relevant community. (ISLAM Determination, ¶ 157; HALAL Determination, ¶ 164.) The Panel dismissed the Community Objections and deemed the Requester the prevailing party. (ISLAM Determination, ¶ 158; HALAL Determination, ¶ 165.)

On 4 November 2013, the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”) submitted a letter to the GAC Chair, stating that, as the “second largest intergovernmental organization with 57 Member States spread across four continents” and the “sole official representative of 1.6 million Muslims,” the Member States of the OIC officially opposed the use of the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings “by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people” (“4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair.”) (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-11nov13-en.pdf.)

On 11 November 2013, having received a copy of the OIC’s 4 November 2013 letter, the ICANN Board Chairman sent a letter to the GAC Chair, noting that the NGPC has not taken any final action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL applications while they were subject to formal objections. The letter further stated that since the objection proceedings have concluded, the NGPC will wait for any additional GAC input regarding the strings and stands ready to discuss the applications if additional dialog would be helpful. (Cover Letter to 4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair.)

On 21 November 2013, the GAC issued its Buenos Aires Communiqué, which stated the following with respect to the Requester’s Applications:

GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided
advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair’s correspondence in similar terms.

(Buenos Aires Communiqué, Pg. 4, available at https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aires_GAC_Communique_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905332&api=v2.)

On 29 November 2013, the GAC Chair responded to the ICANN Board Chairman’s 11 November 2013 correspondence, confirming that the GAC has concluded its discussion on the Requester’s Applications and stating that “no further GAC input on this matter can be expected.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/dryden-to-crocker-29nov13-en.pdf.)


On 19 December 2013, the Secretary General of the OIC sent a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman, stating that the Foreign Ministers of the 57 Muslim Member States of the OIC have unanimously approved and adopted a resolution officially objecting to the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings and indicating that the resolution “underlines the need for constructive engagement between the ICANN and OIC as well as between ICANN and OIC Member States.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/ihsanoglu-to-crocker-19dec13-en.pdf.)

On 24 December 2013, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology on behalf of the government of Indonesia sent a letter to the NGPC Chairman, stating that Indonesia “strongly objects” to the .ISLAM string and, in principle, “approves” the .HALAL string...
“provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.”

On 30 December 2013, the Requester submitted a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman challenging the nature and extent of the OIC’s opposition to the Requester’s Applications, reiterating its proposed policies and procedures for governance of .ISLAM and .HALAL, and requesting to proceed to the contracting phase.


The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community.

(Action and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) In addition, the NGPC directed the transmission of a letter from the NGPC, via the Chairman of the Board, to the Requester (“7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester”). (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf.) The 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester acknowledges the Requester’s stated commitment to a multi-stakeholder governance model, but states:

Despite these commitments, a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings .HALAL and .ISLAM….
There seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in your letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.

(7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester, at Pg. 2.)

On 26 February 2014, the Requester filed Request 14-7.

B. Requester’s Claims.

The Requester claims that the NGPC failed to consider material information when it approved the 5 February 2014 Resolution. Specifically, the Requester contends that the NGPC ignored, or was not otherwise made aware of, material information including:

1. The ICC’s Determinations dismissing the Community Objections;
2. The Requester’s proposed multi-stakeholder governance model; and
3. The differences between the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications.

(Request, Section 8, Pgs. 6-9, 12-14.)

In addition, the Requester claims that the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violates the policies set forth in the Guidebook and underlying the gTLD program because it fails to provide the Requester with guidance on how to resolve the conflicts identified in the letter. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 1; Section 8, Pgs. 9-12.)

C. Relief Requested.

The Requester asks that its Applications be immediately approved for contracting, or alternatively, at least the application for .HALAL be immediately approved for contracting.

(Request, Section 9, Pg. 14.)
If the Requester’s Applications are not immediately approved for contracting, the Requester asks that ICANN explain why the purported “conflicts” referenced in the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester have not been resolved, and “provide clear criteria for the [the Requester] to ‘resolve’ those purported conflicts.” (Request, Section 9, Pg. 14.)

III. Issues.

In view of the claims set forth in Request 14-7, the issue for reconsideration appears to be whether the NGPC failed to consider material information in approving the 5 February 2014 Resolution, which deferred the contracting process for the Requester’s Application until the identified conflicts have been resolved. Specifically, the issue is whether the NGPC ignored, or was not otherwise made aware of, the information identified in Section II.B, above. An additional issue for reconsideration is whether the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violated ICANN policies because it failed to provide clear criteria for the Requester to resolve conflicts with the objecting entities and countries.

IV. The Relevant Standards for Evaluating Reconsideration Requests.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with the criteria specified in Article IV, Section 2.2 of the Bylaws.11 (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.) Requester is purportedly challenging a Board action or inaction and a staff action.

---

11 Article IV, Section 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.
Dismissal of a request for reconsideration is appropriate if the BGC\textsuperscript{12} recommends, and in this case the NGPC agrees, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the criteria set forth in the Bylaws for challenges of a Board action or inaction as well as a staff action. (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.9.)

V. Analysis and Rationale.

A. The Requester Has Not Demonstrated That The NGPC Failed To Consider Material Information When It Approved The 5 February 2014 Resolution.

A challenge of a Board action or inaction must be based upon the Board acting or failing to act without consideration of material information or as a result of the Board’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.\textsuperscript{13} (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.2.) A proper request for reconsideration claiming that the Board acted without consideration of material information must:

(1) identify the information that the Board had available to it but did not consider; and

(2) identify that the information would be material to that decision. (\textit{Id.}) If the Board did not have the information, the Requester must explain why it did not provide that information to the Board in advance of the decision that is being challenged.

Based upon the Request, the Requester has not sufficiently stated a request for reconsideration of the 5 February 2014 Resolution. The Requester has identified some information that the NGPC had available to it and purportedly should have considered before approving the 5 February 2014 Resolution. But the Requester has failed to demonstrate that the NGPC did not consider this information or that the information was material and would have changed the NGPC’s decision to defer the contracting process for the Requester’s Applications

\textsuperscript{12} Board Governance Committee.

\textsuperscript{13} The Requester is not claiming that the 5 February 2013 Resolution was the result of the NGPC’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.
until certain conflicts have been resolved, as set forth below.

1. The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider the Determinations dismissing the Community Objections, or that the Determinations were material to the NGPC’s Resolution.

The Requester contends that ICANN “has no right to second-guess” the ICC’s dismissal of the Community Objections. (Request, Section 8.I.a., Pg. 7.) The Requester, relying on Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, further claims that the Guidebook specifically indicates that the ICANN Board “should consider the advice of experts in making determinations about new gTLD applications which raise sensitive government issues.” (Id. at Pg. 8.) The Requester concludes that because the ICC, an appointed expert, has not advised ICANN to reject the Requester’s Applications, it “seems clear that the NGPC did not consider this material information” in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Id.) But the Requester’s conclusions are not supported.

There is no evidence that the NGPC did not consider the ICC’s Determinations on the Community Objections in adopting the challenged Resolution. To the contrary, in the NGPC’s Actions and Updates Scorecard that was adopted by the NGPC as part of its 5 February 2014 Resolution, the NGPC specifically referenced the ICC’s Determination on the Community Objections:

On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE.

(Actions and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) Moreover, in communications with the GAC, ICANN noted that it did not take any final action on the Requester’s Applications while the applications were subject to formal objections, but that the “objection proceedings have concluded.” (Cover Letter to 4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair.)
The Requester has also failed to demonstrate that the ICC’s Determinations were material to the NGPC’s Resolution or otherwise identify how the Determinations would have changed the actions taken by the NGPC. With respect to the Requester’s Applications, the ICC only evaluated UAE’s Community Objections, and the fact that the Panel determined that UAE failed to demonstrate substantial opposition from the community to the Requester’s Applications does not change the fact that the NGPC was made aware of opposition by many other entities and governments, such as the OIC, after the ICC rendered its Determination. In other words, the ICC’s Determination would not affect the conflict identified by the NGPC between the Requester’s commitment to a multi-stakeholder model and the concerns raised by other entities/governments outside the ICC’s proceedings. The NGPC is not second-guessing the ICC’s determination, as argued by the Requester, but is instead addressing a separate and distinct issue of concern.

2. The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider the Requester’s proposed multi-stakeholder governance model, or that the model was material to the NGPC’s Resolution.

The Requester asserts that the NGPC failed to consider the Requester’s proposed “multi-stakeholder governance model” in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Request, Section 8, Pg. 8-9.) But this assertion is also unsupported, for a couple of reasons.

First, the Requester’s purported multi-stakeholder governance model was a subject of the Beijing Communiqué, the Requester’s response to the Beijing Communiqué and the ICC’s Determinations. The NGPC’s 5 February 2014 Resolution makes clear that the NGPC considered the Beijing Communiqué, the NGPC Briefing Material summarized the Requester’s response to the Beijing Communiqué, and, as set forth above, the NGPC was well aware of the ICC’s Determinations. Thus, there is no support for the claim that the NGPC did not consider
the Requester’s purported multi-stakeholder governance model in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. Second, as the Requester concedes (Request, Section 8, Pg. 9, FN 11.), the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester identifies (and applauds) a 4 December 2013 letter and a 30 December 2013 letter from the Requester to ICANN relating to its proposed multi-stakeholder governance model. And finally, the Requester does not identify any other materials relating to the Requester’s proposed governance model that should have, or could have, been considered by the NGPC before reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution.

In addition, the Requester makes no effort to demonstrate that the Requester’s proposed governance model was material to the NGPC’s resolution or otherwise identify how the proposed model would have changed the action taken by the NGPC. Rather, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester shows that the NGPC was concerned with conflicts between the Requester’s purported model and the claims made about that model in the letters urging ICANN not to proceed with .ISLAM and .HALAL.

3. **The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider differences between the .ISLAM and the .HALAL Applications, or that such differences were material to the NGPC’s Resolution.**

The Requestor claims that there are differences between the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications and that the NGPC failed to consider these differences in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Request, Section 8, Pg. 12-13.) The Requester’s only support for this claim is a letter from Indonesia objecting to .ISLAM, but “endors[ing]” .HALAL, and a letter from the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”) expressing support for .HALAL. (Id.) But the record indicates that the NGPC reviewed both of these letters before taking its action. The 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester specifically identifies the letter from
Indonesia and that Indonesia was objecting to .ISLAM only and the NGPC Briefing Material specifically identifies the ICRIC’s letter of support for .HALAL.

In addition, the Requester has not explained how consideration of these two letters is material to the NGPC’s Resolution or otherwise identify how the letters would have changed the action taken by the NGPC. There were significant concerns expressed to ICANN with respect to both applications. Moreover, every submission made by the Requester treated both Applications the same.

B. The Requester Has Not Demonstrated That The ICANN Staff Took An Action Inconsistent With An Established ICANN Policy Or Process.

The Requester’s final ground for seeking reconsideration appears to be a claim that the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violates the policies set forth in the Guidebook and underlying the New gTLD Program because it fails to provide the Requester with guidance on how it should resolve the conflicts associated with the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications. (See Request, Section 3, Pg. 1; Section 8, Pgs. 9-12.) This is not a proper basis for seeking reconsideration.

To challenge a staff action, the Requester would need to demonstrate that it was adversely affected by a staff action that violated an established ICANN policy or process. (Bylaws, Art. IV., Section 2.2.) Here, however, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was not a staff action, it was a Board (or NGPC) action. The letter was sent to the Requester under the signature of the Chair of the ICANN Board, Stephen D. Crocker. More importantly, the NGPC, delegated with all legal and decision making authority of the Board relating to the New gTLD Program, (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-10apr12-en.htm), directed transmission of the letter to explain its reasoning for the 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Actions
and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) As such, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester is a Board (or NGPC) action and cannot be challenged as a staff action.

Even if this were to be considered a staff action, which it is not, there is no established ICANN policy or procedure that requires the ICANN Board or the NGPC to provide gTLD applicants with individualized explanations or direction on what the applicants should do next. To the contrary, and as set forth in the Guidebook, after receiving GAC Advice, the NGPC is required to publish the advice, notify all relevant applicants, give the applicants an opportunity to respond to the GAC Advice, take action on, or respond to, the GAC Advice and then publicly post its decision along with a rationale for that decision. (See Guidebook, Section 3.1.)

This is precisely what the NGPC did with respect to the Requester’s Applications. Based on the GAC Advice, and subsequent concerns raised by a number of entities and governments, the NGPC decided that it will take no further action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications until and unless the noted conflicts have been resolved, one way or another, as the NGPC explained in the Actions and Updates Scorecard and the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester. Nothing more is required of the NGPC at this time.

VI. Decision.

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore recommends that the Request be denied without further consideration. There is no indication that the NGPC failed to consider material information in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. In addition, the Requester has not identified an ICANN staff action that violated an established ICANN policy or procedure.
Annex 15
August 10, 2015

Mr. John Jeffrey
General Counsel, ICANN
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

Dear John,

I write with respect to the longstanding "Cooperative Engagement Process" regarding Asia Green IT Systems' new gTLD applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM, initiated by AGIT on Feb. 21, 2014. This letter replaces our August 4 letter in its entirety. We request this letter be posted promptly to ICANN's correspondence page.

We believe that the recent IRP decision in the .AFRICA matter, and the Board's general acceptance of that decision in its July 16 resolution, require that 1) the Board also return the subject applications to processing by the Global Domains Division, and 2) that the GDD issue contracts immediately to AGIT to operate these two gTLDs.

The IRP panel's binding decision held that the Board violated ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws by blindly accepting unsubstantiated GAC Advice (indeed, "consensus" advice) to reject DCA's application. The IRP panel held that, at minimum, the Board should have made an appropriate inquiry and investigation into the rejection, and should have provided substantial reasoning for any rejection, given the substantial investment DCA made in the application, and given ICANN's purported requirement that applicants waive all rights to redress in court.

In this matter, the Board thus far has blindly accepted unsubstantiated advice not of the consensus GAC, but of just a few members of the GAC, and has placed the subject applications into undefined, interminable purgatory. The Board's unprecedented, extremely troubling letter dated February 7, 2014, essentially granted veto power over these applications to those few GAC members, without any reasoning whatsoever. That followed AGIT's successful opposition to the UAE government's Community Objection to these applications, by the neutral expert panel created by ICANN to resolve such objections. It also followed the Board-appointed Independent Objector's thorough investigation and refusal to object to these applications. The Board effectively overruled those decisions without any reasoning whatsoever, other than reference to these few objecting GAC members.

The action taken by the Board's February 5, 2014 resolution and February 7, 2014 letter, to place these applications into undefined limbo until such time as unspecified "conflicts" between AGIT and the few referenced objectors are resolved, is clearly a violation of
ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. That decision ignored both the Independent Objector's reasoned determination, and the ICDR's reasoned determination - each community consensus procedures approved by the Board and set forth in the Applicant Guidebook. That Board decision was completely non-transparent, as absolutely no reasoning is given by the Board, other than reference to vague concerns of these few objecting governments. There was no reasoning given for ignoring the IO and/or ICDR decisions, or for granting these few governments such unprecedented and troubling veto power over these applications. Logically, as the Board is not able to accept unsubstantiated, consensus GAC Advice to reject one application for .AFRICA, it is not able to accept unsubstantiated, non-consensus advice of just a few GAC members to reject two applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM.

To be sure, AGIT has been more than patient with respect to these applications and this "Cooperative Engagement Process". AGIT has passed all of ICANN's numerous evaluations set forth in the AGB and otherwise as to all eight of its applications. These two applications in particular withstood the scrutiny of ICANN's appointed expert "Independent Objector", who decided not to object. AGIT has overcome the Community Objection raised by the UAE government, on precisely the same, extremely vague and unsubstantiated grounds as raised by the referenced government objectors. Also, ICANN and AGIT have received OFAC approval from the US Government for ICANN to contract with AGIT. Thus ICANN's application evaluators, two independent experts commissioned by ICANN, and the U.S. government, have all approved issuance of these contracts. ICANN has no legitimate reason to continue withholding these two contracts from AGIT, based solely on the unsupported, indeed several times expertly refuted, whim of just a few IGO GAC members.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the ICANN Board, in its next meeting, reconsider its February 5, 2014 resolution and its unprecedented February 7, 2014 letter in light of the IRP panel decision and July 16, 2015 resolution of the ICANN Board with respect to the .AFRICA application.

Alternatively, in the context of the ongoing CEP and pursuant to ICANN's Bylaws, in order to narrow the issues for any IRP that AGIT may file against ICANN, and in order to comply with ICANN's transparency obligations as set forth in its Articles and Bylaws, AGIT makes the following further requests of ICANN:

1. Explain in detail the Board's reasoning for accepting the authority of the OIC to veto the subject applications.
2. Explain in detail the Board's reasoning for ignoring and/or rejecting the advice of the Independent Objector and the ICDR panelist in the Community Objection proceeding.

3. Explain in detail the purported "conflicts" referenced vaguely in the February 7, 2014 letter as requiring undefined "resolution" before the contracts can issue.

4. Explain in detail the procedure by which ICANN will facilitate the resolution of such conflicts.

5. Explain in detail the desired form and substance of the resolution that ICANN purportedly requires.

6. Preserve and promptly provide to AGIT, in unredacted form, all documents in ICANN's possession, custody or control which are related to these applications, including without limitation:
   a. All correspondence between any representative of ICANN on the one hand, and on the other hand any purported representative of the OIC, GCC, Lebanon, Indonesia or any other objector to the subject applications.
   b. All records of the NGPC meeting with GAC members in Durban relating to these applications, referenced in the February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT.
   c. All documents considered by the Board in coming to its February 5, 2014 resolution and February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT.
   d. All documents considered by the BGC and NGPC in rejecting AGIT's Request for Reconsideration of that resolution.
   e. All documents regarding any effort by ICANN to facilitate resolution of the purported "conflicts" referenced in the February 7 letter.

7. Provide an entirely unredacted version of both the AFRICA IRP decision and all documents submitted to and/or considered by the IRP panel in reaching that decision.

We hope the Board will choose to reconsider this matter, and thus avoid further, repetitive and costly litigation via the IRP process or otherwise. Please let us have your substantive reply no later than August 20, 2015.

Sincerely,

Mike Rodenbaugh
Rodenbaugh LAW
10 September 2015

VIA E-MAIL Contact Information Redacted

Mike Rodenbaugh
RODENBAUGH LAW
548 Market Street
San Francisco, CA  94104

Re: .Halal and .Islam

Dear Mr. Rodenbaugh,

This will respond to your letter of 10 August 2015 to John Jeffrey regarding Asia Green IT Systems’ (AGIT) applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM (10 August 2015 Letter).

In your 10 August 2015 Letter, you suggest that the DotConnectTrust Africa IRP (DCA IRP) decision and the Board’s related resolution “require 1) that the Board also return [AGIT’s] applications [for .HALAL and .ISLAM] to processing by the Global Domains Division, and 2) that the GDD issue contracts immediately to AGIT to operate these two gTLDs.”

The DCA IRP matter, however, is not analogous to the matters surrounding AGIT’s applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM. The DCA IRP matter, as noted in your letter, related in part to ICANN’s acceptance of consensus advice from the GAC, issued in accordance with Module 3.1, part I of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB), to not proceed with DotConnectAfrica Trust’s application for the .AFRICA gTLD. (See AGB, § 3.1, part I.) In contrast, the GAC Advice relating to .HALAL and .ISLAM in its Beijing Communiqué was advice issued in accordance with Module 3.1, part II of the AGB. (See AGB, § 3.1, part II: Beijing Communiqué, § IV.1.a.i.ii.1, https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf.)

Module 3.1 of the AGB states that GAC Advice may take several forms. Part II of the Module 3.1 states:

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.
On 5 February 2014, the NGPC approved the actions/updates relating to the remaining items of the GAC Advice (Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires) (see https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf). In accordance with Module 3.1, part II, the NGPC provided a detailed explanation for its decision in both its rationale to its 5 February 2014 resolution (see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.rationale and in Annex 1 attached to the resolution (see https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf).

In his letter of 7 February 2014 to Mr. Abbasnia, ICANN’s Board Chairman, Dr. Steve Crocker, discussed in detail the apparent conflict between the commitments made by AGIT and the concerns raised in the letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate .HALAL and .ISLAM (7 February 2014 letter). (Letter from S. Crocker to M. Abbasnia, dated 7 February 2014, pp. 1-2, available at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf.) The 7 February 2014 letter did not “essentially grant[] veto power over [AGIT’s] applications to those few GAC members, without any reasoning whatsoever” as suggested in your letter. Rather, as set forth in his 7 February 2014 letter, Dr. Crocker explained that due to aforementioned conflict “the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.” (Id.)

Your letter also suggests that the Board overruled the advice of the Independent Objector and ICDR panelist in the Community Objection proceeding. That is not the case. The Independent Objector’s decision to file or not file an objection against an application was never intended to, and did not, constitute advice to the Board. Further, the Board did not ignore the ICDR panelist’s determination in the Community Objection proceeding. The determination is advice that ICANN accepted in accordance with the AGB, however, it does not override any other data that the Board may take into consideration including, but not limited to, the GAC
Mike Rodenbaugh  
10 September 2015  
Page 3 of 3

advice in the Beijing and Buenos Aires Communiqués, the GAC Early Warnings issued by the Governments of UAE and India, the letters from various governments and organizations expressing opposition to and support for AGIT’s applications, and the conflict between the commitments made in AGIT’s letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings.

Finally, with respect to the issues raised in your letter in the context of the ongoing CEP, pursuant to the Bylaws, those matters must remain confidential. (See Bylaws, Art. IV, § 3.17.) Accordingly, the appropriate forum to address those issues will be in the course of a CEP conference and we look forward to discussing those with you.

Very truly yours,

Amy Statthos  
Deputy General Counsel
Annex 16
.ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs

Endorsement Letters

January 2014
Who supports .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs?

.ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs, applied for through Asia Green IT System have received several endorsement letters from different Islamic organizations and famous people around the world, and from different branches of Islam (Shia and Sunni as the main branches).

AGIT as the Muslim company applying for .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs, has an ongoing task to promote .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs to the Muslim community to receive new supporting letters.

As a strategic approach, AGIT has tried to make International Islamic organizations be involved in the governance of .ISLAM and major Halal certification bodies to be involved in .HALAL policy making.

AGIT has been succeeded in receiving supporting letter for .ISLAM and .HALAL from the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). We have also been succeeded in involving HALALWORLD, the only HALAL certification body which is accepted by all Islamic countries. There are many Halal certification bodies around the world but all of them are supported by one or few countries. HALALWORLD is OIC (Organization of Islamic Cooperation)’s Halal certification standard project which is accepted by all Islamic countries.

In particular these international organizations could act as a potential sponsoring organization. AGIT is currently working out the formalities of such relationship.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) in association with the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was established in 2003. ICRIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Malaysia, Jordan, Egypt,… plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

AGIT has also recently started to open the opportunity to Muslim people to express their interest in .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs through online social media like Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/DotIslam and https://www.facebook.com/DotHalal) with thousands of fans.
List of .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLD supporters¹:
(updated on January 15, 2014)

1. Prominent Organizations and Leaders representing the Muslim community

1.1. Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ICRIC is a subsidiary of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)², the 2nd largest international organization after UN with 57 Islamic member countries. ICRIC is responsible for research and information activities of ICCI and operates some of OIC and ICCI’s projects. OIC has created ICCI in line with the goal of development for all Islamic communities, and its continuous consideration on the promotion of commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve the goal of sustainable and comprehensive development. ICRIC acts as the research and development wing of ICCI in terms of new ideas and technologies, and is known as the most relevant subsidiary of OIC and ICCI to these subjects.


1.2. Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad³ (.ISLAM)

The former president of Malaysia and the man who moved Malaysia to an advanced country. He is with no doubt the most popular figure in Malaysia and many other countries. Dr. Mahathir was one of the first who supported us and his support has brought a great credit for AGIT, because everybody knows that he will not support a non-eligible entity to hold the sensitive TLD of .ISLAM.

Malaysia has a 17 million Muslim population⁴ and we believe Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad is the best representative of this community.


1.3. The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought (\textit{.ISLAM and .HALAL})

The management center for \textit{Twelver} or \textit{Imami Shia} Schools of thought (Hawza’s) in Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India, Bahrain, Syria, Lebanon etc… operate under this center’s supervision.\footnote{5}

Shia’s population is around 200 Million\footnote{6}. 85% of them (170 Million) are \textit{Twelver} or \textit{Imami Shia’s}. All Imami Shi’a’s follow the thoughts of religious leaders which are trained in schools of thoughts in different countries under the supervision of this center. This center is the main training management system of Shia schools in terms of religious content and can be counted as the representative of \textit{170 million Twelver or Imami Shia’s} around the world.


1.4. The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought (\textit{.ISLAM and .HALAL})

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is a multi-cultural organization that several hundreds of Islamic leaders (both Shia and Sunni) cooperate with, in its consideration about creation of peace and proximity between different Islamic sects.

The forum holds the “Islamic Unity Conference” each year with participants from around the world, including mostly religious leaders of different Sects of Islam. The followers of these leaders are Muslims from all sects of Islam all around the world.

\textbf{Link to download the letter:} \url{http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS-ISLAM_SHIA_HALAL-World_Forum_for_Proximity_of_Islamic_Thoughts.pdf}

1.5. HALAL WORLD Center (\textit{.HALAL})

Halal Research & Development Center (HALAL WORLD) is \textit{the only unified Halal standard and certification project} of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). ICRIC operates under Islamic Chamber of Commerce and affiliated with OIC.

\textbf{Official website:} \url{http://www.halalworld.org/home?lang=en}

\textbf{Link to download the letter:} \url{http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-halal/LOS-HALAL-HalalWorld.pdf}

\footnotetext{5}{References: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hawza} and \url{http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_shi-religion-islam-shia}}

\footnotetext{6}{Wikipedia: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shia_Islam#Demographics}}
1.6. **Supreme Islamic Shia Council, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

One of the highest level Islamic centers in Lebanon.

Mr. Mohamad Rizk Chief, Info Center, [www.Shiitecouncil.com](http://www.Shiitecouncil.com) or .org or .net or .gov.lb, Contact Information Redacted


1.7. **The ECO cultural institute (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

ECO Cultural Institute is one of the specialized agencies under the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO), an intergovernmental organization consisting of Islamic State of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan Republic, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan. Among ECO member states, 9 out of 10 are members of OIC. ECO Cultural Institute has supported .ISLAM as a subsidiary of the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO) which is most likely related to governmental attitudes of its member states.


1.8. **Muslim Religious Community, Belarus (.ISLAM)**

The main organization of Muslims in Belarus (total Muslim population: 51,000)

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Belarus_Muslim_Religious_Community.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS-ISLAM_Belarus_Muslim_Religious_Community.jpg)

2. **Islamic Religious Institutes / Associations / Organizations**

2.1. **Islamic United Council, Pakistan (.ISLAM)**

One of the main Islamic Societies in Pakistan.


2.2. **Islamic Center Hamburg, Germany (.ISLAM)**

Germany has the largest Muslim population in Western Europe after France. Approximately 3 to 3.5 million Muslims live in Germany, and 80% of them do not have German citizenship; 608,000 are German citizens. 70% of the Muslim population is of Turkish origin. ([http://www.euro-islam.info/country-profiles/germany/](http://www.euro-islam.info/country-profiles/germany/))
The Islamic Centre Hamburg (German: Islamisches Zentrum Hamburg) is one of the oldest Shia mosques in Germany and Europe.

Established in Hamburg, in northern Germany, in the late 1950s by a group of Hamburg-based emigrants and business people it rapidly developed into one of the leading Shia centers in the Western world.

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg)

2.3. Association AlGhadir Islamique, France (.ISLAM)

A Shia Islamic training institute in France (with 350,000 Shia’s out of 5 million Muslims)

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_AlGhadir_Islamique.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_AlGhadir_Islamique.jpg)

2.4. Centro Islamico No Brasil (.ISLAM)

The main Islamic organizations in Brazil (Muslim population of around 900,000) ([http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_num_of_mus-religion-islam-number-of-muslim](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_num_of_mus-religion-islam-number-of-muslim))

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg)

2.5. Islamic Institution Arresalla, Brazil (.ISLAM)

An Islamic institute offering cultural, religious services to a large group of Muslim community in Brazil.

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg)

2.6. Association Culturelle Musulmane de Roissy en Brie, France (.ISLAM)


2.7. Aras Justice, Freedom and Solidarity Association, Turkey (.HALAL)

Established in 2012 in Istanbul, As a Non-government and non-profit organization, Aras’s mission is to support victims and protect their rights and help them to solve
their problems. And creating public awareness in order to uphold political freedom and prevent inhumane conduct.

For this reason, Aras organizes panels, Symposiums and conferences in Turkey and Azerbaijan. Aras is kept public informed through the release of periodicals, press releases. Aras makes use of the internet, as well as radio and TV broadcasts preparing, organizing contests, demonstrations, dinners and evening performances.

Apart from these, Aras finances scholarships for poor student and opens the student dormitory.


### 2.8. El-IRSCHAD Berlin a.v. Germany (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

Islamic religious center in Berlin

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_El-Irschad.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_El-Irschad.jpg)

### 2.9. Beyan Cultural Center, Turkey (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

Beyan started its activities in 2012 in Istanbul. The main object of the Beyan Cultural Center is to provide better understanding of Islam for Muslims and non-Muslims in Turkey. Therefore, they organize such activities as conference, symposium, and meetings.


### 2.10. Harekat-el-Omma Association, Lebanon (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

Lebanese Islamic Association.

Mr. Issam Ghandour, Secretary General, [www.alomma-lb.org](http://www.alomma-lb.org), Contact Information Redacted

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AlOmma.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AlOmma.jpg)

### 2.11. Kudus-Der, Turkey (*ISLAM*)

Founded in 2012, the association's headquarters in Istanbul. The association was founded to help the Palestinian people.

Kudüs Der assistance not only humanitarian aid but also inform Turkish public about Palestinian issue by organizing media conferences, meetings in Turkey.
2.12. Halal Supreme Council, Iran (.HALAL)


2.13. Fatih Akincilari Social and Cultural Association, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Akincilar social solidarity and cultural association was founded in the 1970s in Istanbul district Fatih.

Akıncilar aims to meet the needs of those who are suffering poverty or hunger.

Social Aid: food aid and organizations during the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner, Qurban programs.

Educational Aid: delivering school bags, educational sets, and supplementary materials to needy students.

Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkey_Akincilar_Social_Solidarity_and_Cultural_Association.pdf](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkey_Akincilar_Social_Solidarity_and_Cultural_Association.pdf)


2.15. Diplomatic Correspondents Association, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

The association of Diplomatic Journalists of Pakistan, with thousands of members, all active in the media in Pakistan


2.16. Peoples Youth Organization, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

A famous civil socia Islamic organization, very active in Islamic cultural activities in Pakistan.

2.17. **Brasil Halal Foods, Brazil (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

The main institute in Brazil working as a certification body for Halal foods (Foods certifying Islamic criteria on religious approved foods and drinks) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal))

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg)

2.18. **Baheth Center for Palestinian Studies, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

An Islamic Educational institute for Palestinian Strategic Studies. Mr. Walid Mohamad Amro, President, [www.bahethcenter.net](http://www.bahethcenter.net), Contact Information Redacted

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Baheth-Center-for-Palestine-Studies.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Baheth-Center-for-Palestine-Studies.jpg)

2.19. **Ehlibeýt Alimleri Derneği / Ehla Der, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

Ehlibeýt Alimleri Derneği (Association of Ahlulbayt Scholars) was founded in May 31, 2011 in Istanbul.

The short name is Ehla-Der and the Head Office is in Yenibosna - Istanbul. Currently, 18 people work in Headquarters Building. There are 190 Ahlulbayt Scholar members of the association who work in different cities in Turkey.

The purpose of Ehla-Der is contributed to the spread of social unity and brotherhood in the country. And provide correct information about Ahlulbayt.

Ehla-Der organizes cultural and social activities throughout Turkey.


2.20. **Dar El Feta El Jafari, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

An Islamic Shia religious educational center in Lebanon.

Mr. Ali Charaf, Chief Info Center, [www.iftaajafari.com](http://www.iftaajafari.com), Contact Information Redacted


2.21. **Halal Export Consortium, Iran (.HALAL)**


2.22. **Rawdat Religious Guidance, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**
2.23. Religious Guidance Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Diab Al Mihdawi, President, Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.24. Association Assembly of Religious Scholars, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Hassane Abdullah, President, www.tajamo.net , Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.25. Mosque and Center of Holly Koran, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)


Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.26. Research Services Group, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Mr. Faysal Al Ashmar, Editor in Chief, www.rsgleb.org , Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Research-Services-Group.jpg

2.27. Islamic Unity House for Media And Documentation, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)


3. Islamic Media / Newspapers / Publications

3.1. Medya 14 Radio TV, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayınıncılık A.Ş is the owner of On4 TV; On4 TV is a nation-wide television channel in Turkey. The channel was established by the Turkish businessmen in 2012.

On4 TV delivers the latest breaking news and information on the latest top stories, weather, business, entertainment, politics, and more.

Headquarters is located in Istanbul and more than 100 journalists, reporters etc. work in it.


Link to download the letter (No.2): http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOSIslam-Halal_IRTVU_ON4.jpg

3.2. KUDUS TV, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

One of the leading Islamic TV channels in Turkey: http://www.kudustv.com/

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_KudusTV.jpg

3.3. Kevser Basin Yayınıncılık, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Kevser Basın Yayıncılık (Kevser Press Publishing) has about 200 branches and distribution networks throughout Turkey and 10 distribution networks abroad. Headquarters is located in Istanbul Asaray and one of the leading Press publishing companies in Turkey.


3.4. Aden Live TV, Yemen (ISLAM and HALAL)

Yemen’s Islamic TV Channel.

Mr. Abdel Nasser Al Jaari, General Manager, www.adenlivetv.net , Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AdenLive.jpg

3.5. Al Ahed News, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

Lebanese Islamic News Agency: http://alahednews.com.lb , Contact Information Redacted
3.6. Athabat Satellite TV, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Daily newspaper / Media in Lebanon.

Mr. Khalil Haidar, Executive Director

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AthabatSatTV.jpg

3.7. Al-Sahat Satellite TV, Yemen (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Islamic Satellite Radio and TV channel in Yemen: http://www.al-sahat.tv/

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_Sahat.jpg

3.8. Daily Nijat, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


3.9. Al Bilad Magazine, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Islamic Cultural monthly magazine in Lebanon, Mr. Mostafa Khazem, Editor in Chief, www.albilad.com.lb, +96170801354

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Bilad-magazine.jpg

3.10. Al Intiqad Center, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

www.alintiqad.com, Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Intiqad-Weekly.jpg

3.11. Daily Spokesman, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-Pakistan_Daily_Spokesman.jpg

3.12. Arenas Space Channel, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Mr. Raydan Al Mokaddem, General Manager,

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf
3.13. Daily Wisdom, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


Islamic Satellite Radio and TV channel in Lebanon.

Mr. Nafeth Abo Hasanah, Executive Director, [www.paltoday.ps](http://www.paltoday.ps), Contact Information Redacted


3.15. Ath-Thabat Daily, Lebanon (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Lebanon

Mr. Abdullah Jabri Editor in Chief, [www.athabat.net](http://www.athabat.net), Contact Information Redacted


3.16. Inbaa News, Lebanon (*ISLAM and Halal*)

News agency in Lebanon, Mr. Mahmoud Raya, Editor in Chief, [www.inbaa.com](http://www.inbaa.com), Contact Information Redacted


3.17. Islamic Unity Magazine (Wahda Islamiya), Lebanon (*ISLAM and .HALAL*)

The Lebanese Islamic organization’s magazine on the unity of Islam Branches.

Cheikh Mohamad Amro, General Manager, [www.wahdaislamyia.org](http://www.wahdaislamyia.org), Contact Information Redacted


3.18. Mr. Malik Abdul Qayum Khan, Pakistan (*ISLAM*)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

3.19. Al Doha Company for Press and Media, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Mr. Ghaleb Rashed Sirhan, Editor in Chief, www.alintiqad.com,

3.20. Haqooq Ul Awam, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Haqooq_Ul_Awam.jpg

3.21. Shown Book Association (Koran), Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Maher Abdullah, President, www.lkdg.org/node/5512

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

3.22. Page International, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Page_International.jpg

4. Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic figures

4.1. Daawa Islamic University, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)


4.2. Islamic Academy, Germany (.ISLAM)

One of the oldest and most well-known Islamic educational centers in Germany with over 50 years of activity. Many Islam fans are trained in this center.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Academy_Germany.jpg

4.3. Cheikh Ahmad Al Zein, Ex Sharee'ah Judge of Saida, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Judge Sharee'ah, Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf
4.4. Mr. Nureddin Sirin, Turkey (.ISLAM)

Well-known journalist by Islamic circles in Turkey. He was born in Trabzon and knows English, Arabic and Persian.

He has worked as a journalist with different News Papers and Magazines till 1997. In 1997 military memorandum he was arrested and sentenced to a prison term of 17.5 years, in the prison Type-F of Kandira. He released in 2004. During that time his name has become a symbol for victims.

He currently works for Kudüs TV.


4.5. Dr. Pere Michel Lelong, France (.ISLAM)

Famous Islamologist in France with lots of researches and publishing.


4.6. Brotherhood Association for development and Education, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Ali Mohamad Khodr, President, www.lkdg.org/node/869 ,

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

4.7. Islamic Da'wa Institute for Islamic Studies, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)


4.8. Call Center for Koran Teaching, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Maher Abdulrazaq, President, Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

4.9. Dr. Majid Tafreshi, UK (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

University Professor and history Researcher, and the manager of a cultural publishing institute.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS-ISLAM-Dr.Tafreshi.pdf
4.10. Group of Turkish Religious Leader, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

4.10.1. Yasar Kara
4.10.2. Onur Adiguzel
4.10.3. Necati Talap
4.10.4. Muhammed Yasin Sakalli
4.10.5. Kemal Kicik
4.10.6. Kadir Kaya
4.10.7. Ismail Sen
4.10.8. Isa Erkan
4.10.9. Hoseyn Memis
4.10.10. Enes Haz
4.10.11. Ali Ekber Talan
4.10.12. Nicat Cebrailoglu
4.10.13. Kazim Celikbilek
4.10.14. Hayreye Eksi
4.10.15. Fohri Kaya
4.10.16. Ekrem Eksi
4.10.17. Cenksuha Tatlises
4.10.18. Burkan Bozkurt
4.10.19. Ali Osman Celikbeilk
4.10.20. Ali Kocalar

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkish-Religious.pdf

5. Cultural Organizations and Institutes in Islamic Countries

5.1. International Council Association for Arabic Language, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Global institution dealing with cultural scientific interest in Arabic to preserves its integrity, seeking to promote classical Arabic, promoting its beauty and ability to absorb modern scientific terminology, to raise and defend it in the face of contemporary challenges, and the conspiracies being hatched against it. It is licensed under the Lebanese law based on the approval of the Council of Ministers on 12/30/2005 under No. 370, and includes a selection of the world's scientists.

Mr. Hussein Atwi, Director Public Relations, www.cil-a.org,
5.2. The Danish-Palestinian Friendship Association, Denmark (.ISLAM)
An NGO active in Humanity helps to Palestinians


5.3. Ilaf Association for Cultural and Social work, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Ghazi Hneineh, President,

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.4. Hope and Charity Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Zuhair Al Jaceed, President, www.amalataa.org ,

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.5. Brotherhood Association for Culture and Charity, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Maher Chafiq Mezher, President, www.lkdg.org/node/203 ,

Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.6. Al Bayan Social Association for Culture and Charity, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Yussef Hussein Sbeity, President, Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.7. Say and Work Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Ahmad Al Kattan, President, www.lkdg.org/node/1197 ,

Contact Information Redacted

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.8. Arabic Sports Club, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Zuhair Al Jaceed, President,
5.9. Cooperative Association for the Manufacture of Agriculture and Livestock Production, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Maher Abdullah, President
Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.10. Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association, Iran-Tajikistan (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
A multinational NGO working on cultural activities to tighten the relationships of Farsi-Speaking Muslims in Iran and Tajikistan.

5.11. Kindness Charity Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Mohamad Al Homsi, President, www.markazalihsan.org
Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

In the name of God

Dear Sirs

This letter is to confirm that Islamic Chamber Research & Information Center (ICRIC) fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the President, I confirm that I have the authority of the ICRIC to be writing to you on this matter.

The gTLDs will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Mohammad Nahavandian

President

www.icric.org  
info@icric.org  
www.HalalWorld.org

Halal World Offices: Turkey, Iran, New Zealand, Malaysia, Australia, Fiji, Canada, North America, France, Switzerland, Denmark, Germany, Thailand, Pakistan
ISLAMIC CHAMBER RESEARCH & INFORMATION CENTER (ICRIC) INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND
The Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), in line with strengthening cultural, economic and political convergence, and through inspiration from the idea of “unity of the Muslim Ummah”, and inaugurates its activity in 1962. From the very beginning, the organization has continuously taken into consideration the promotion of the commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve sustainable and comprehensive development. Therefore, the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) has been established in 1997 as an economic contribution section for the OIC.

From the beginning of its establishment, the Islamic Chamber has made effort to strengthen the cooperation among OIC member countries in the fields of trade, insurance, shipping, banking and promotion of joint ventures.

Establishment of ICRC
Considering the importance of promotion intra-organizational and regional cooperation among Member States of Islamic Chamber and along with decisions made in the 8th Assembly of OIC member Countries held in 1997 in Tehran, and following the Doha deliberation 37/9-E (15) issued in Qatar on establishment of an Islamic Common Market according to the agreement between Ali Naghi Sayed Khamoushi, former President of the Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines and Aqeel A. Al-Jassem, Secretary General of the Islamic Chamber, arrangements were made to establish "The Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center" and later the related agreement was signed between the two parties on 8th October, 2003.

The mentioned center has been established to tackle one of the existing problems in Islamic communities which slow down the development of joint cooperation in economic, commercial and industrial fields; this is caused by lack of information regarding trade opportunities, trade regulations, and potential partners and investment opportunities.

ICRIC STRUCTURE
ICRIC Board of Director includes the following 9:

Chairman: Head of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines
Vice Chairman: Secretary General of ICCI
Vice Chairman: Director General of ICRIC

Members: Three representatives from Islamic Republic of Iran and three from Chambers of Commerce in OIC Member States which were appointed by the General Assembly of the Islamic Chamber.

In the 21st Assembly of Islamic Chamber which was held 18-20 December, 2004 in Abu Dhabi-Dubai, the representatives from Malaysia, Egypt, Jordan, have been appointed for a four-year term as members of ICRIC Board of Directors.

ICRIC OBJECTIVES

The center undertakes studies and researches in the following areas:

1- Identifying and analyzing challenges and opportunities in the domain of trade and investment, information technology (IT) and e-commerce;
2- Assisting small and medium enterprises in the Islamic countries;
3- Organizing seminars, workshops and training programs regarding changes related to new trends in the global Trade System;
4- Designing training programs for Islamic Chamber in different sectors based on the actual needs and requirements of Member States;
5- Collecting, compile, analyze and disseminate trade information among Islamic Countries and also establishment of an economic data bank in all fields related to economies;
6- Developing and strengthening the relationship with training institutions, consultancy centers, universities and other relevant institutions in Member Countries;
7- Publishing and disseminate reports, booklets and books;
8- Studying and analyze Rules of Membership in WTO and active participation in relevant discussions in order to take a unified strategy among Islamic Countries and other developing countries in this case;
9- Performing responsibilities given by ICCI;
10- Undertaking studies, and researches for supporting and entrepreneurs in Islamic Countries for implementation of their joint venture projects by inter-alia, preparing the necessary documents and feasibility studies in conformity with guidelines of IDB;
11- Undertaking studies and research projects on the strategies for establishment of the Islamic Common Market;
12- Contributing the researches in the appropriate for development of cooperation in tourism in the Islamic Countries;
13- Conducting research on proposals in order to apply modern research methods to tackle economic problems in Islamic Countries and providing necessary Islamic solutions;
14- Helping entrepreneurs through Islamic Chamber, to gain technical skills and knowledge on marketing in different fields of industry;
15- Conducting researches to determine potential areas of competitive advantage in different sectors in Islamic countries for strengthening socio-economic growth areas regarding in the Islamic Countries;
16- Publishing and disseminate the information of member Countries. The Center shall establish close link with economic organs in the Organizations Islamic Countries in order to implement its objectives.

ICRIC Achievements and Projects

1. Launching and up-to-dating ICRIC website (http://www.icric.org) in order to implement ICRIC’s objectives;
2. IVTD Project: preparing the Islamic World Trade Directory for economic, commercial, industrial and service information in Muslim World;
3. MECAWARD Project: Muslim Excellence and Competitiveness Corporations Award is to play the role of incentive motor in excellence business in Islamic Countries;
4. IC-CRS Project: The Credit Delivery System is to Design Models by a multi-fold classification based on Standard Credit assessment and to introduce Excellence agencies promote the level of them through consultancy;
5. Halal Project: Designing and operating the Halal World Brand to make unity among national Halal brands of countries.
6. Islamic Tourism Chain Countries (ICTC) Project: Information on Islamic Countries Tourism and making effort to create tourism facilitation chain to implement tourism in Islamic Countries proportionate to Islamic culture.
7. ONSA Project: Information on related negotiations for small & medium-sized enterprises in Islamic world, news coverage also coverage to essays, and different seminars related to the subject.
8. Holding the short-term educational courses.

More information in all above areas is available on ICRIC website.
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1. Background
The Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), in line with the goal of development for all Islamic communities, and through inspiration from the idea of “unity of the Muslim Ummah”, aiming at the promotion of cultural, economic and political convergences has launched its activity since 1969. From the very beginning, the organization has continuously taken into consideration the promotion of commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve the goal of sustainable and comprehensive development. Therefore, the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) has been established as an economic wing for the OIC since 1977.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) was established in 2005 hosted by the Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines. ICRIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Islamic Republic of Iran., Malaysia, Jordan, and Egypt plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

2. Structure
The Board of Directors of the Center is composed of the following 9 representatives:
Chairman: President of Iran chamber
Vice Chairman: Secretary General of the Islamic Chamber (ICCI)
Vice Chairman: Director General of the Center
Members: Three representatives from Iran Chamber and three from National Chambers of OIC Member States appointed by the General Assembly of the Islamic Chamber.
The representatives from Malaysia, Egypt, Jordan, have been appointed for a four-year term as members of Board of Directors in the Meeting of ICCI General Assembly in Abu Dhabi, Dec. 2004.
3. Objectives
The Center shall undertake studies and researches in the areas such as: To identify and analyze challenges and opportunities in the domain of trade and investment, information technology and E-commerce; To assist small and medium size enterprises in Islamic countries; To organize seminars, workshops and training programs on changes related to new trends in the World Trade System; To design training programs for ICCI in different sectors based on the actual needs and requirements of Member States; To collect, compile, analyze and disseminate trade data among Islamic Countries in order to set up an economic data bank in all fields related to economies; To develop and consolidate the relationship between the Center and training institutions, consultancy centers, universities and other relevant institutions in Member Countries; To publish and disseminate reports, booklets and books; To study and analyze Rules of Membership in WTO and active participation in relevant discussions in order to take a unified strategy among OIC and other developing countries; To perform assignments suggested by Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry; To undertake studies, projects and researches for project sponsors and entrepreneurs in OIC Countries for implementation of their joint venture projects by inter-alia, preparing the necessary documents and feasibility studies in conformity with guidelines of IDB; To undertake studies and research projects on the strategies for establishment of the Islamic Common Market; To contribute to the potential areas for development of cooperation in the area of tourism in Islamic Countries; To prepare studies on proposals in order to apply modern research methods to tackle economic problems in OIC Countries and provide solutions thereto; To help entrepreneurs through ICCI, to be equipped with technical skills and knowledge on marketing in different fields of industry; To conduct surveys to determine potential areas of competitive advantage in different sectors in OIC countries for contributing to socioeconomic growth of Islamic Countries; To publish and disseminate the outcomes of the Center research in OIC Countries. The Center shall establish close linkages with economic organs of Islamic Countries to further its objectives. To research, develop and collect information about the Halal issues in Muslim and Non-Muslim countries and supporting and cooperating with the Halal centers in the world.

4. Activities
As mentioned earlier based on the approval of the Board of Director, the center is involved in 6 major innovative projects which are being introduced briefly as follows due to requirements of Islamic Countries:

Creation of the Islamic World Trade Directory (IWTD)
Everyone knows that access to proper information is a key to commercial and economic success. Then the lack of databases on economic cooperation’s of Islamic Countries is a major bleak point for these countries. Understanding such a need, the center has deemed the necessity of creation of a Trade Directory and has established the mega internet system of IWTD to introduce the economic operators of the Islamic world on line. This system now includes informations from 161225 economic corporations from around 51 Islamic Countries and is known to be the largest trade directory of the Islamic World. The web address: “www.iwtd.icric.org” is free to public access.

World Halal Certificate
Around 2 billion of the Muslim populations who live in the world whether concentrated or dispersed have created economic exigencies including "trading Halal products and services "whose global annual volume is estimated around US $ 200 billion. The vast market of food stuff has required the producers to stamp their products with Halal Certificate in order to distinguish their goods among other products in the market. Furthermore some centers have been developed in a self initiated basis in order to issue Halal certificates for these producers. Scores of Halal approving centers have been established around the globe to confirm the Halal criteria on products by thousands of food producers. Preparing Halal magazine and implementation of research and holding Halal forums are other
measures taken by ICRIC. As an affiliate of ICCI in an effort to unify Halal Brands and prepare the OIC Halal Food Standard. Based on the fact that no National Halal Certification center was available in Iran, the world Halal Certification Center of ICRIC has also audited certain Iranian producers of foodstuff and has issued some 300 certificates to Iranian firms. Holding International Halal Fair & Forum annually is also planned and the first one was held in Tehran, 2009.

The bilingual website "www.halalworld.org" and Halal Magazine both initiated by ICRIC inform the Islamic world on Halal developments.

4.3 Muslim Excellence Competitiveness Award (MECCAward)
As EFQM award in Europe could be a motivation engine of trade and services industries, presence of an Excellence Award in Muslim Countries can follow this objective. Lack of an Excellence award in the Islamic World, has brought the ICRIC to the conclusion to design and create an award based on the Europe Excellence Award to create competitiveness among major companies of Islamic countries and name it "MECCAward" as a tribute to sanctity of the Holy City of Mecca among the Muslims.

The 1st MECCAward Forum was discerned in Tehran to certain firms from Islamic countries under a predesigned procedure and the next round of the award will be held in 2011 in Turkey in order to witness a higher level of competitiveness among major firms from Islamic Countries in an international process.

The website for the MECCAward is: www.MECCAWARD.com which provides information on various aspects of the award.

4.4 Islamic Countries Tourism Chain (ICTC)
Today the tourism is a tremendously thriving industry by whose means countries aim to enjoy its economic advantages and make cultural achievements. With their tremendous number and special culture as well as a precious historical, religious and artistic background deserve to have a greater share in the global tourism industry. Nevertheless since the Muslim tourism is under the influence of certain cultural aspects such as Halal food in hotels and restaurants as well as airlines and other places, design of chain of hotels, services and communications under the title: "Islamic Countries Tourism Chain" is needed whose realization has been entrusted to ICRIC by the Islamic Chamber as research in this area has started and certain implementations have been conducted in this respect where the information for the project is available.
At: www.ictc.icric.org

4.5 Islamic Countries Credit Rating System (IC-CRS)
The Islamic Countries Credit Rating System has been deemed as a necessity in economic transactions. In order to sign a deal with a corporation, one needs to get to consider the credentials of the institution on a scientific basis by credit rating institutions in order to have an assured contract. In this respect as there were no credit rating companies available in Islamic countries, ICRIC started to design and create "Islamic Countries Credit Rating System (IC-CRS)" in order to use the existing credit rating knowledge in the Islamic world's available rating companies in lieu of similar rating institutions in non Islamic regions so that they can easily emerge in global arenas and assure their economic counterparts. Exact supervision on companies in accordance with 100 criteria which exist in EFQM system in Europe and adding quality criteria which are set in all countries, prepares this system for credit rating of companies from those with100 to corporates with 1000 employees.

Information regarding the IC-CRS can be accessed through www.ic-crs.com

4.6 The OIC Network of Small and Medium Enterprises Information System (ONSA)
With respect to the importance of Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) in contemporary
economy and special attention that they receive from global institutions and their governments, the Islamic Development Bank on the part of the OIC and in collaboration with the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) have held and organized several training courses on SME’s and ultimately ICRIC was requested to create The OIC Network of Small and Medium Enterprises Information System (ONSA)

Hence the center embarked on a plan to establish a website: www.smes.icric.org where the affairs of the SME’s and their developments can be followed to bear concrete results.

Recent Activities

Beside these researches on above mentioned fields, ICRIC has other economic plans are appropriate to the necessities of each member in Chambers of Commerce of Islamic Countries. These researches are as follows:

a. Study in the field of rating on commercial cards
b. Health tourism issues in Islamic countries. Specifying exploitation of economic enterprises whose result would be disseminated shortly.

5. Major performances of the recent last 2 years of 2006-2010

Following up the projects of the center in the framework of the bi-annual plans. Updating multiple websites relevant to ICRIC including: the main Halal website, MECCAward, (IC-CRS Islamic Countries Credit Rating System), Islamic Countries Tourism Chain (ICTC), The OIC Network of Small and Medium Enterprises Information System (ONSA) and the Islamic World Trade Directory (IWTD) website.

Preparation of the grounds for establishment of Halal Certificate representative offices in Thailand, China, Austria, Switzerland, Turkey, Malaysia, Indonesia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and France.

Auditing and Visiting about 300 Halal producing companies and awarding Halal Certificates to these companies.

Publishing 6 issues of Halal Magazine in Persian and English.

Collaboration in compiling the I. R. of Iran National Halal Standard.

Compilation of Halal Food standards on common areas of jurisprudence of various Islamic faiths.

3 years of cooperation and discussion of adoption the Halal OIC Standard.

Participation at International Halal conferences in Turkey, Malaysia, Indonesia, China, Thailand and Pakistan.

Participation at various annual international Halal products exhibitions in Malaysia, Indonesia, China and Turkey.

Attraction of collaboration of the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) for holding the “First international Conference on Halal Food” on Feb 2010 in I. R. of Iran and preparations for the Second one on Feb 2011.

Preparing the grounds for holding the Second Muslim Excellence Competitiveness Award (MECAward) in Turkey.

Research and verification of plans relevant to the ICRIC’s projects and their presentation in websites and conferences.

Holding scientific meetings with experts for consultations regarding the center’s projects.

Holding several informative exhibitions in collaboration with Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM) and assumption of responsibilities for holding the “First Halal Food Exhibition” in Feb 2010 in Tehran.

Endorsement of an MOU for cooperation with I. R. of Iran’s Ministry of Health and Medical Education on Global Halal Certificate.

Translation of a book on “Halal Food Production” from English for development of texts available in research area regarding “Halal” in Iran. Utilization of the potentials of provincial chambers of commerce in Iran to establish Halal commissions within Iran Chamber of Commerce Industries and Mines. Conducting research for compiling the Commercial Cards Grading System Establishment of an ICRIC Representative Office in Thailand in collaboration with the Thai Islamic Trade and Investment Association (TITIA) and endorsement of an MOU in this regard. Endorsement of an MOU with the Thai Assumption University for collaboration in development of tourism in Islamic Countries.

Endorsement of an MOU with the administration of Yen Chuan province in China on Halal certification, tourism and development of
trade ties Designing the Economic Corporation Rating System in collaboration with Iran Chamber of Commerce Industries and Mines (ICCIM). Establishment of a research group on "Halal Pharmaceutical Standard" and "Common Areas of Religions on Food". Cooperation with the Agricultural Jihad Office of Fars Province for holding a Seminar on Clean and Halal Food for which around 70 scientific papers were presented to the seminar secretariat.

Carrying out research and preparing the grounds for registration of “world Halal Brand” in Europe via registration in Switzerland and Austria.

Participation at General Assembly and Board of Directors Meetings of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) for informing the participants on ICRIC’s performance.

Collaboration with Commercial and Economic Co-operations Committee of OIC (COMCEC) and I. R. of Iran Standard and Industrial Research Authority for editing the "Halal Food Standard Texts" prepared by the Turkish Standard Authority (TSE).

Holding the First International Halal Fair and Forum in I. R. of Iran with attendance of representatives of economic activists from around the world and experts and researchers from over 20 countries where the last achievements of Halal research projects were disclosed Establishment of ICRC representative office in Austria and holding the 1st Halal Brand Awarding ceremony to 2 Austrian companies Initiation of research on SME’s development and current situation in OIC countries with participation of lecturers and scholars Continuation of inputing the information regarding the economic institutions of Islamic countries where information for 45 firms have been already uploaded Translation and publishing of Halal Book Publishing the issues no 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Halal Magazine (special Issues for International Halal Exhibition and Conference)


Title: Updating the Centers’ websites
The Pivotal issues of the plan
1. Revision and Updating as well as maintenance of various websites of the Center in Technical terms
2. Updating the main ICRIC English website: www.icric.org
5. Updating the English website of the Islamic World Trade Directory: www.iwtd.icric.org
6. Updating the Persian website of the Islamic World Trade Directory: WWW.iwtd.icric.ir
7. Updating the English website of the Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award (MECAward): www.MECAward.com
8. Updating the English website of the Islamic Countries Tourism Chain: www.ictc.icric.org
9. Updating the Islamic Credit Rating System (IC-CRS) website: www.ic-crs.com
10. Updating the website for the information System of OIC Small and Medium Enterprises (ONSA): www.onsa.icric.org

Title: Promotion of ICRIC Representative Offices in overseas
Pivotal issues of the Plan
1. Official inauguration of ICRIC Representative office in Thailand at Assumption University
2. Establishment of ICRIC Representative office in Turkey
3. Establishment of ICRIC Representative office in China
4. Establishment of ICRIC Representative office in Pakistan
5. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Austria
6. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Norway
7. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Canada
8. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Germany
9. Establishment of Halal Representative office in New Zealand
10. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Australia Establishment of Halal Representative office in Fiji 10
11. Establishment of Halal Representative office in Two US States (Selection Completed)
12. Establishment of Halal Representative
Title: Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award (MECCAward)

Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Explanatory meetings with ICRIC Operative in Turkey for holding the 2nd Round of MECCAward in the Country in Tehran)
2. Preparation of the exact operation Plan and the Check list for the 2nd Round of MECCAward in 2011 in Turkey
3. Auditing the factories and institution demanding MECCAward Process by foreign auditors
4. Regulation of financial relations between the Iranian and foreign Contractors and ICRIC
5. Planning and carrying our Promotional activities for attraction of Sponsors from Turkish Industries to take part in the 2nd MECCAward Ceremony in 2011
6. Holding the Ceremony for the MECCAward with attendance of ICCI member chambers delegates in Tehran
7. Attracting the Participation of Turkish officials at the MECCAward Ceremony in Support for the Award
8. Training Planning for auditors from Turkey in order to Audit the companies with respect to their recognition and excellence
9. Attraction of members to "Excellence Club" from active Centers of Islamic Countries
10. Planning for holding the 3rd round of the MECCAward in Turkey as well by Creation of a MECCAward office there

Title: World Halal Brand

Pivotal issues of the Plan
1. Cooperation closely with Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) with the collaboration of International Halal Alliance (IHI)
2. Continues auditing of Halal Brand demanding Companies and issuing Halal Certification
3. Dissemination of Halal related news all around the world and among Islamic Countries in various methods
4. Compilation and preparation of Halal Magazine issues 2,3,4,5,6 and 7 (Two English issues)
5. Participation at major Halal International Exhibitions (Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, China, Abu Dhabi and Turkey)
6. Establishment of the International Halal Exhibition in Iran simultaneously with the 2nd Forum of Tourism and the 3rd International and Investment Conference in Islamic Countries in Tehran
7. Establishment of Halal representative offices overseas
8. Collaboration with Iranian Standard and Industrial Research Institute (ISIRI) for Compilation and deliberation of the 'Halal Food Standards" in International events (COMCEC, Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry etc)
9. Holding the 2nd and 3rd round of "Halal Auditors Training Course"
11. Establishment of Supreme Halal Council of I. R. of Iran
12. Planning for the establishment of the International Center of Halal Studies
13. Establishment the International Union of Halal Certificating Holders
14. Participating in HDC Seminar in Malaysia

Title: Islamic Countries Credit Rating System (IC-CRS)

Pivotal issues of the Plan
1. Publishing the latest update on Credit Rating on the relevant website
2. Hiring the executive Staff for the rating Project amongst the elite candidates
3. Implementation of the 1st Phase of rating of Commercial Cards for 300 Cases and Planning for the 2nd Phase of Commercial Cards rating (1000 Cards) and its deliberation by the ICCIM Board
4. Following up the Credit Rating Project for Islamic Countries and dissemination of due information to executive operatives of the said Projects
5. Registration of Islamic Credit Rating Company for implementation of Credit rating on Iranian economic corporations
6. Research on global rating institutes and dissemination of due information on the
website
7. Negotiations with 5 foreign Chambers (Turkey, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, Cyprus and Malaysia) for promotion of their Credit Rating activities
8. Holding Conferences and Seminars for explaining the importance of Credit rating and its new methods (at least 2 Cases)
9. Design and updating of Digital Registration System for companies willing to be rated at "Commercial Cards Rating System"

Title: Islamic World Trade Directory (IWTD)
- Continuous uploading of the Companies active in OIC Countries onto the website of the IWTD
- Continuous uploading of the information regarding trade and productive companies from Directories of Islamic Countries and their Chambers of Commerce onto the website
- Uploading the information regarding the import/export Statistics of the recent years in OIC Countries onto the website
- Planning for activation of Purchase and Sale Section at the website
- Dissemination of information regarding the trade fairs in different Countries either general or specific
- Encouragement and collaboration with institutions involved in Publishing the Trade Directories and Yellow Pages of Islamic Countries for updating these books and production of specific production of Yellow Pages
- Holding 2 Sessions with Participation of industrialists and traders involved in certain areas
- Attending the certain international trade fairs for exchange of experiences and dissemination of information regarding the IWTD Project 9. Attraction of advertisements to the first page and other pages of the website from relevant Companies

Title: Islamic Countries Tourism Chain (ICTC)
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Continuous uploading of information regarding the touristic characteristics of Islamic Countries in ICRIC’s website
2. Selection of Papers involving the SME’S and publishing these papers and relevant news onto the center's website
3. Attending the meetings of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry related to SME’s and uploading relevant news and articles onto the center's website
4. Correspondence with the Islamic Chamber to receive the news regarding the SME’s activities in the member countries and uploading them onto the center's website
5. Conclusion of an MOU for collaboration with identical institutions acting in the area of SME’s in Iran and overseas to elevate the knowledge in this respect
6. Communicating the proposals made during the Scientific Symposiums regarding the SMES to OIC Member countries for improvement of the status of SME’s thereto.
7. Communication with Intl. Institutions such as UNDP and utilization of scientific articles published by these institutions for development of SME’s
8. Communication with UNDP regarding the SPX Project (Chain of Contracts) and utilizing the information gained for development of the SME’s
9. Collaboration with identical SME’s institutions in order to hold scientific conferences regarding the SME’s in Iran
10. Initiation of research projects with participation of lecturers and scholars on the ways and the means of SME’s development in OIC countries

7. Intended Plans for 2011

Office Affairs
1. Renewal of contracts with the staffs of the center and selection of new expert staff members
2. Provision of the new administrative Construction of Various Units of the Center
3. Organizing Internal and Foreign Correspondences
4. Promotion of relations with other OIC member chambers
5. Making arrangements for the presence of the Director of ICRIC in relevant Convention Centers
6. Delivery of report on the trips made by ICRIC’s Board on the ICRIC’s website
7. Communication of the Center’s News to the Public Relations Department of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry
8. Making arrangements for press conferences on Fulfilled Projects and Meetings
9. Arrangement of accounting financial books for the operation of the center and preparation of the balance sheets
10. Following up the financial affairs of the Center
11. Following up the Insurance and Social Security Affairs of the Staff members
12. Employment of new expert Staff for the new Projects
13. Conclusion of Contract with Contractors and follow up and Supervision of their implementation
14. Following up the Publishing of Halal Magazines (No 8 & 9)
15. Publication of brochures, catalogues and booklets required for ICRIC Projects
16. Following up the affairs regarding the Promotion Plans
17. Invitation and reception of domestic and foreign delegations interested in collaboration and negotiation with ICRIC
18. Provision of gifts for guests of the Center and foreign delegates
19. Arrangement and hosting of ICRIC’s Iranian Board Meetings once a month
20. Arrangement of ICRIC’s Board Meetings twice a year
21. Employing 2 foreign personnel at ICRIC head-quarter
22. Provision of necessary office accessories of the Center
23. Making correspondence of the Center in MS- office Software
24. Provision of the Special Office Automation System through 17 departments of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM)
25. Following up the Memorandums of Understanding Signed earlier
26. Following up the contract regarding the internet access of the main building of the headquarter and building no.2
27. Following up the attendance of ICRIC in its Pavilion at the relevant exhibitions

Updating the ICRIC Websites
1. Restoration, maintenance, technical support and development of various center websites
2. Updating the main ICRIC website in English: www.icric.org
3. Updating the English Halal website: www.halalworld.org
4. Updating the English website of the Islamic World Trade Directory: www.iwtd.org
5. Updating the Halal Exhibition website: www.ihaf.ir

Promotion of ICRIC Representative Offices overseas
1. Inauguration of ICRIC office in Turkey through rent or purchase of the property
2. Creation of ICRIC Representative Office in Austria (preparations have been accomplished)
3. Creation of ICRIC Representative Office in Canada (preparations have been
accomplished)
4. Following up the affairs of ICRIC representative office in Thailand (Assumption University)
5. Inauguration of ICRIC office in France, New Zealand and Australia
6. Inauguration of 2 new ICRIC offices overseas

**Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award (MECCAward)**
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Holding the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Round of MECCAward in Turkey
2. Preparation of the exact operation Plan and the Check list for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Round of MECCAward
3. Auditing the factories and institutions demanding MECCAward Process by auditors
4. Promotional activates for attraction of Sponsors from Turkish Industries to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} MECCAward Ceremony
5. Correspondence with Turkish officials and Islamic Chambers to attend the MECCAward Ceremony in Support for the Award
6. Organizing the Training programs for auditors from Turkey in order to audit the companies with respect to their recognition and excellence
7. Planning for the attraction of members to "Excellence Club" from active Centers of Islamic Countries
8. Beginning for the preparation of planning for holding the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Round of the MECCAward in Turkey

**World Halal Brand**
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Continuous auditing of Halal Brand demanding Companies and issuing Halal Certification
2. Organization and dissemination of Halal related news all around the world for the Islamic Countries in various methods
3. Publication the new Halal Magazines (no 7 & 8)
4. Participation at major Halal International Exhibitions (France, Abu Dhabi, Malaysia, Brunei and Pakistan)
5. Holding the third International Halal Fair and Forum in Iran
6. Establishment of Halal representative offices overseas (3 offices)
7. Propagation and development of unit OIC Halal Food Standard among the Islamic countries especially the Islamic Chambers
8. Holding the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} round of "Halal Auditors Training Course"
9. Conclusion of MOU with Certain institutions and Centers for fortification of Halal Executive aspects
10. Studying the establishment of Supreme Halal Council in some Islamic countries
11. Auditing foreign companies in consultation with Halal Representative Offices
12. Following up the Halal Research contracts with the universities and research centers (4 Research)
13. Dissemination of Information on progress regarding World Halal Brand through advertisements and propagations in Mass Media

**Islamic Countries Credit Rating System (IC-CRS)**
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Uploading the latest update on Credit Rating on the relevant website
2. Following up the Credit Rating Project for Islamic Countries and dissemination of due information to executive operatives of the said Project
3. Research on global rating institutes and dissemination of due information on the website
4. Negotiations with 4 Chambers for Promotion of their Credit Rating activities (Egypt, Pakistan, Malaysia and Oman)
5. Holding Conferences and Seminars for explaining the importance of Credit rating and its new methods (at least 2 Cases)

**Title: Islamic World Trade Directory (IWTD)**
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Continuous uploading of information on active companies in OIC countries onto the website of the IWTD
2. Continuous uploading of the information regarding trade and manufacturing companies from ICCI member Chambers onto the website
3. Planning for activation of sale and buy section at the website
4.Informing the trade fairs in different countries
5.Encouragement and collaboration with institutions involved in publishing the Trade Directories and Yellow Pages of Islamic countries for updating these books and production of specific product Yellow Pages
6.Attending the certain international trade fairs to gain experience and dissemination of information regarding the IWTD Project
7.Attraction of advertisements to the first page and other pages of the website from relevant companies
8.Publishing the bulletins including information on specific IWTD website information for associations and unions
9.Endorsement of a contract with the assigned company for advertisements on IWTD website

Title: Islamic Countries Tourism Chain (ICTC)
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Continuous uploading of information regarding the touristic characteristics of Islamic Countries onto the ICRIC website
2. Dissemination of information regarding the Program of the 3rd forum of Tourism in Islamic Countries in I.R Iran
3. Contracting with the researchers regarding the methods for creation of various Parts of the Islamic Countries Tourism Chain (Hotels, Restaurants, Halal food, Trade Services, Tour leaders, Attraction etc)
4. Dissemination of the latest information regarding investment in Tourism Section of Islamic Countries
5. Introduction of economic Tourism Projects in Islamic Countries for Companies and entities willing to be involved in the Project
6. Planning for establishment of a satellite TV network (ITC-TV)
7. Planning for establishment of the Tourism News Agency of Islamic Countries (ICTC News)
8. Planning and conducting due arrangement for holding the 3rd forum of Tourism in Islamic Countries in Egypt

Title: OIC Networking of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises and Incubators (ONSA)
Pivotal issues of the Plan:
1. Continuous uploading of information regarding Small and Medium Enterprises of OIC member Countries onto the center’s website
2. Attending the meetings of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry related to SME’s and uploading of relevant news and articles onto the Centers website
3. Correspondence with the Islamic Chamber in order to receive the news regarding the SME’s activities in member Countries and their uploading onto the Centers website
4. Execution of an MoU for Collaboration with identical institutions acting in the SME’s areas
5. Communicating the Proposals made during the Scientific Symposia regarding the SME’s to OIC Members countries for improvement of the Status of SME’s thereto.
6. Communication with International organization such as UNDP and utilization of scientific articles published by these institutions for development of SME’s
7. Collaboration with identical institutions in order to hold Scientific Conferences regarding the SME’s
8. Initiation of research projects with participation of lecturers and scholars on ways and means of SME’s development in OIC countries
9. Management of Incubators Centers of the Islamic countries and establishing a central research office

Address:
Central Office: 254, Taleghani Avenue, Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM), 6th floor, Tehran, Iran
Tel: +98-21-88810527
Fax: +98-21-88308332

Executive and Projects Office: No 8, Afshar Alley, Mofatteh Ave., Tehran, I R. of Iran
Tel: +98-21-88381320-23
Fax: +98-21-88381324
Website: www.icric.org
E-mail: info@icric.org
HALAL WORLD
Research, Development Monitoring & Support

Islamic Chamber Research & Information Center (ICRIC)
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM new gTLD

This letter is to confirm that the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) fully supports the application for .ISLAM submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the Director General of the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC), I confirm that I have the authority of this center to be writing to you on this matter.

Therefore, the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) has been established as an economic wing for the OIC since 1977.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was established in 2003. ICRIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Malaysia, Jordan, Iran and Egypt; plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

As a subsidiary of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI), I declare that we believe that ISLAM gTLD will be used to Principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement among Muslim community on the general principles.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Mehdi Fakheri

Director General

www.icric.org  info@icric.org  www.HalalWorld.org
HALAL WORLD

Research, Development
Monitoring & Support

Islamic Chamber Research
& Information Center (ICRIC)
DR. MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD

16th April 2012

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad fully support the application for .ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles. This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and non – radical followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad

Contact Information Redacted
Tun Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad

QUICK FACTS
NAME: Datuk Seri Mahathir bin Mohamad
OCCUPATION: Prime Minister
BIRTH DATE: December 20, 1925 (Age: 86)
EDUCATION: Sultan Abdul Hamid College, University of Malaya
PLACE OF BIRTH: Alor Setar, Malaysia

BEST KNOWN FOR
Mahathir bin Mohamad served as prime minister of Malaysia from 1981 to 2003, overseeing his country's transition to an industrialized nation.

Profile
Mahathir bin Mohamad was reelected to the Supreme Council of the United Malays National Organization (UMNO) in 1972 and to parliament in 1974. Later in 1974 he was appointed minister of education. In 1976 he became deputy prime minister and in 1981 was elected president of UMNO. He became prime minister in July of that year, the first commoner to hold that office, holding it for the next 22 years.

Tun Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad (born 10 July 1925) is a Malaysian politician who was the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia. He held the post for 22 years from 1981 to 2003, making him Malaysia's longest serving Prime Minister. His political career spanned almost 40 years.

Born and raised in Alor Setar, Kedah, Mahathir excelled at school and became a medical doctor. He became active in the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO), Malaysia's largest political party, before entering parliament in 1964. He served one term before losing his seat, before falling out with the then Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman and being expelled from UMNO. When Abdul Rahman resigned, Mahathir re-entered UMNO and parliament, and was promoted to the Cabinet. By 1976, he had risen to Deputy Prime Minister, and in 1981 was sworn in as Prime Minister after the resignation of his predecessor, Hussein Onn.

During Mahathir's tenure as Prime Minister, Malaysia experienced rapid modernization and economic growth, and his government initiated a series of bold infrastructure projects. He was a dominant political figure, winning five consecutive general elections and seeing off all of his rivals for the leadership of UMNO. However, his accumulation of power came at the expense of the independence of the judiciary and the traditional powers and privileges of Malaysia's royalty. He also deployed the controversial Internal Security Act to detain activists, non-mainstream religious figures, and political opponents including his sacked deputy, Anwar Ibrahim. Mahathir's record of curbing civil liberties and his antagonism to western diplomatic interests and economic policy made his relationships with the likes of the US, Britain and Australia difficult. As Prime Minister, he was an advocate of third-world development and a prominent international activist for causes such as the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and the interests of Bosnians in the 1990s Balkans conflict.

He remains an active political figure in his retirement, having become a strident critic of his handpicked successor, Abdullah Badawi, and actively supporting Abdullah's replacement by Najib Razak.
In the name of God

To:
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that The Management Center of Islamic Schools of Thoughts fully supports the applications for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the Manager of the center, I confirm that I have the authority of The Management Center of Islamic Schools of Thoughts to be writing to you on this matter.

This center is responsible in managing collaboration, communication and harmony between Islamic Schools of Thoughts, and has relation to all of these schools in Shia sect.

The gTLDs will be used to Principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on the general principles. Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be a satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Morteza Moghtadaei
Manager

[Stamp]
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .Islam, .Shia, .Halal gTLDs

This letter is to confirm that World Assembly for Proximity of Islamic Sects fully supports the application for .ISLAM and .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the new gTLD Program.

As the Secretary General of World Assembly for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought I confirm that I have the authority of the Islamic communities to be writing to you on this matter. By bringing the perspective of the World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought means: Convergence between the followers of Islamic schools in order to know some of them over others by achieving harmony and religious brotherhood on the basis of Islamic principles common fixed and firm. Islamic unity is: Cooperation between the followers of Islamic schools on the basis of Islamic principles common fixed and firm and take a unified stand in order to achieve the goals and interests of the Muslim and its enemies to the common position with respect for the obligations of every Muslim to his doctrine of faith and deed.

The gTLD will be used to Principles of rapprochement i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on the general principles. Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be a satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.
Yours sincerely

Thanks and best regards
Secretary General The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought
Mohammad – Ali Taskhiry

P.O. Box 15875 - 6995, Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran - Fax:(+9821)8321414 Tel:(+9821)8321412 E-mail: taghrib@taghrib.org
Forum for proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is the only and most welcomed Forum among Muslim Community in both Shia’a and Sunni’s.

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought was established in response to the thoughts of Islamic Unity, a revolution which is not only related to all Muslims but also all the oppressed masses of the world.

The Members of the Supreme Council comprise of eminent thinkers of different Islamic Schools of Thought from various Islamic countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, America, Pakistan, Oman and Iran.

The Forum’s activities are aimed toward bringing Proximity and Unity among Muslims, whatever group they belong to. That had made the Forum popular among Muslim leaders all around the world.

FORUM’S ACTIVITIES

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought’s activities is mostly directed to education, clarification and explanation of the Proximity Thoughts to Muslims.

Such activities consist of:

1. The annual International Islamic Unity Conference:
   
   The 25th International Islamic Unity Conference was recently held. Muslim world scholars from 57 countries of the world attended this annual conference held by the World Forum for Proximity of Proximity of the Islamic Countries headed by Secretary General Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Taskhiri.

2. Publications: The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought publishes books, journals and internet content in different languages for all Muslims in the world.

   The Forum’s website “www.taqrib.info” is published in 16 different languages the majority of Muslims speak.

   More than 250 books and journals are published by the Forum till today.

DEFINITION OF PROXIMITY AND MUSLIM UNITY

From the viewpoint of The World Forum of the Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought, proximity of Islamic schools of thought entails closeness of the followers of Islamic sects with the aim of getting acquainted with one another in order to attain
religious brotherhood according to the principles and common goals of religion. Muslim Unity entails co-operation among the followers of schools of thought while adopting joint approaches to reach the desired goals for the interests of the Muslim Ummah and confronting enemies of Islam.

**BASICS OF PROXIMITY**

The movement of proximity of Islamic schools of thought is based on firm general principles, the most important one being:

1) The Holy Qur’an and Prophetic traditions, which are the basic sources of Islamic Law. All Islamic schools of thought share commonalities in these two elements and rely on them as their main and reliable reference points.

2) Belief in the principles and pillars being the criterion of a Muslim
   
   a) Belief: Oneness of God the Almighty.
   
   b) Belief in the Prophethood and the Holy Prophet (SAW) as the seal of Prophets including belief in the traditions of the Messenger as one of the mains sources of religion.
   
   c) Belief in the Holy Qur’an and its concepts.
   
   d) Belief in the Day of Judgment.
   
   e) Not denying the necessaries of religion and submitting to the pillars of Islam such as prayers, Zakat, Fasting, Hajj, Jihad...

3) Legitimacy of Jihad and freedom of debate and officially acknowledging differences of opinion within the framework of basic Islamic sources.

4) To be bound to Islamic unity according to the mentioned definition.

5) The principle of brotherhood and Islamic morals in relations among Muslims.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE FORUM**

1. Assistance towards reviving and spreading Islamic culture and teachings and defending the sanctity of the Qur’an and traditions of the Holy Prophet (SAW).

2. Making efforts towards creating acquaintance and more understanding among scholars, thinkers and religious leaders of the Islamic world in the fields of beliefs, Fiqh including on social and political fronts.

3. Spreading proximity ideas and thoughts among scholars of the Islamic world and transferring that to Muslim masses while informing them of plots aimed at creating divisions by enemies of Islam.

4. Solving pessimism and arguments among followers of Islamic schools.

5. Making efforts to strengthen and propagate the principle of Ijtihad and deduction in religion.
6. Endeavor to co-ordinate and establish a joint front to confront the propaganda plots and cultural onslaught of enemies of Islam.

PRINCIPLES AND VALUES OF THE FORUM

1. The necessity of co-operations in all spheres to enable Muslims obtain consensus and agree among themselves.

2. The need for joint concerted efforts and co-operation in confronting enemies of Islam.

3. Abstaining from libeling one another as infidel and innovator.

4. Dealing respectfully on points of difference.

5. Freedom to select school of thought

6. Being bound by the culture of healthy dialogue and observing its rules and manners.

7. Endeavor to encourage Muslims to implement proximity in all its dimensions and ensure crystallization of its values in all aspects of life.

IMPORTAN ORGANS OF THE FORUM

1) Supreme Council.

The Members of this council comprise of eminent thinkers of different Islamic Schools of Thought from various Islamic countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, America, Pakistan, Oman and Iran. They are mandated with setting the path and activities of the forum and oversee it.

2) General Assembly.

More than 100 thinkers and Ulamaa from different Islamic schools of thought are members of this assembly and are charged with the important duty of studying the general issues and problems of the Islamic world and presenting solutions and programs of actions to the forum including management of such programs.

3) Secretary General.

The secretary general is the highest-ranking executive position of the forum and its holder is responsible for following up and implementing decisions and decrees of the Supreme Council, General Assembly and the management of all departments of the forum.

4) Departments.

5) The University of Islamic Schools of Thought.

This university, which is a fruitful outcome of action taken by this forum, was established in the year 1995 in Tehran. Students from different Islamic countries in this university are engaged in studying Islamic Sciences in the field such as,
Jurisprudence of Islamic Schools of thought, Qur’an and Hadith Sciences, Islamic History, philosophy and Islamic speech. While practically learning the culture of proximity and peaceful co-existence in Islamic communities coupled with Islamic brotherhood, they will be the cream of experts in Islamic seminaries and suitable propagators of the culture proximity in Islamic communities.

Its scientific board members are professors, scholars and thinkers coming from various Islamic Schools of thought. Meanwhile the University of Islamic Schools of thought has up to now conducted four courses and will soon have complete study programs. The graduates of this University have excelled scientifically and have obtained high marks in various scientific Olympiads.
Biography of Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Taskhiri

Mohammad Ali Taskhiri, Ayatollah is a well-known and highly respected intellectual figure among Muslims, both Shia’s and Sunni’s.

He was born in 1944 in the holy city of Najaf, Iraq. He acquired his primary and middle-level education from Najaf while for the acquisition of highest educational level of the Islamic Seminary (Hawzah) i.e. "Dars-e-Kharej" which contains advanced religious courses. He gained extensively from the renowned Ulama of Najaf Ashraf.

Taskhiri attained the university-level education on Arabic literature, Islamic law & Jurisprudence from the Fiqh College of Najaf Ashraf. Along with the acquisition of education, during his stay in the Islamic Seminary of Najaf Ashraf, he was also engaged in the teaching of the Islamic subjects. As regards the Arabic poetry and literature, he benefited from the distinguished mentors like Ayatollah Sheikh Muhammad Reza Muzzafar, Sheikh Abol Mehdi Matar and Sheikh Muhammad Amin Zain-ud-Din. Being fond of the Arabic poetry and literature at a tender age, he versified many Arabic odes and on diverse occasions delivered literary lectures at different forums of poetry and literature.

In the political arena, he played a dynamic role against the Bathist party of Iraq and for the same reason he was jailed and also given death sentence. But with the grace of Almighty Allah he was released later.

In 1971 he proceeded to the Qom Islamic Seminary in Iran and for ten years attended the lectures delivered by the leading Ulama like Ayatollah Golpayengani, Ayatollah Wahid Khurasani, and Ayatollah Mirza Hashem Amuli.

In the aftermath of the victory of the glorious Islamic Revolution in Iran, he fully got engaged in the cultural activities and the preaching of Islam, in Iran and elsewhere in the world. During this period, Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Taskhiri held different cultural, propagation and administrative positions and undertook various responsibilities.

Some of his responsibilities in political arena include: Representative Gilan province in the Assembly of Experts, Supreme leader’s advisor in Islamic World’s cultural affairs, Head of the Islamic Culture and Relations Organization from its establishment until 2001, International affairs director at the Islamic Ideology
Propagation Organization, Member of Islamic Ideology Propagation Organization’s Board of Trustees, Culture and Islamic Guidance Minister’s advisor on international affairs, Secretary General of the Ahl-ul-Bayt (AS) World Assembly. Following appointment by the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution he is now serving as the secretary general of the World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought.

Ayatollah Taskhiri has authored over 50 books on various Islamic topics including Islamic ideology, Fiqh (jurisprudence), Islamic economy and Islamic history. He has also penned some 350 articles on Islamic issues including unity. Many of his works have been translated into English, Urdu and other world languages.
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the HalalWorld Center fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the General Secretary of the HalalWorld Center, I confirm that I have the authority of this center to be writing to you on this matter.

Islamic Chamber research & Information Center (ICRIC), affiliated to Islamic Chamber of Commerce & Industry (ICCI) and a member of the family of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) has embarked to study and research on the subject to meet the need in Muslim World, and as a result embarked to adopt a monitoring system in "Halal Product" including "Halal Food" and proceeded to research, development, information and support in this ground, under the supervision of the HalalWorld Center.

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Abd-ul-Hussain Fakhari  
General Secretary

www.halalworld.org info@halalworld.org NO.254, Taleqani Ave, Tehran, Iran  
Tel:(+9821)88346537-8 Tel/Fax:(+9821)88308332,88810527
Simultaneously with holding the Second International Halal Fair and Forum in Tehran, the meeting of the Halalworld's representatives in different countries was held.

In this meeting Dr. Fakhriz, Executive Manager of ICRIC, described the successful ratification process of the Unit Halal Food Standard of OIC in COMCEC 2010 in Turkey for the audience and then explained the great task of establishing this standard throughout the world by Halalworld's representatives.

Then each of the representatives of the Halalworld expressed their views for better implementation of the standard in different countries and they stressed on the unification of Halal assessment process.

Dr. Mohammad Hossein Shojaei, from Research Center of the Halalworld presented some information about the necessity of research which has already supported the Halal certificates awarding process and as one of the managers of this center he was appointed as the technical reference for the representatives. Also, it was also approved that the representatives meetings will be held at least once a year for the exchange of experiences and discussing the latest Halal events. The necessary coordination will be done by ICRIC.

Faster launching of representatives' websites and their linking in Halalworld's site was another decision made in this meeting.

Brotherhood and spiritual atmosphere which dominated the family of "Halal World" led once again to respect the high position of Abrahamic religion of the prophet Mohammad( A.S).
Halal in Croatia

Prof. Esad Prohic, Phd., The Ambassador of Croatia in I. R. of Iran, visited Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, and discussed about the fields of cooperation between manufacturer companies of Halal products in Croatia and ICRIC. Mr. Davor Lokotar, Project Manager of Podavka, who is the baby food producer and their products are about 300 items expressed his readiness to get Halal certificate from Halalworld the entrance to the vast Halal market.

Halal in Russia

In a meeting with Mr. Zhafar Azizbaev, Executive Director of the Halal Department of Russia Muftis Council, and Ms. Madina Kalimullina, Director of Economic Department of Russia Muftis Council (who were participating in the Second International Halal Fair & Forum) and Dr. Fakhari, the Executive Manager of ICRIC, the necessity of observing the OIC Halal Standard by all Halal certifier centers including the Russia Halal Center was discussed. It was decided that OIC Halal Standard in Islamic world will be considered by the Russia Mufti Council in Russia Halal Standard.

Also, Mr. Zhafar Azizbaev invited Dr. Fakhari to take part in Moscow Halal Exhibition 2011. The invitation was accepted by Dr. Fakhari. Establishing representative office of Halalworld in Russia was another issue which was discussed and it was decided that in Dr Fakhari’s journey to Moscow will be discussed.
Halal Industry in Russia

Zhafar Azizbaev
Director, Division of Standard Halal International Centre for Standardization and Certification of the Centralized Muslim Religious Organization, the Council of Muftis of Russia

The ancestors of contemporary Muslims living in the territory of modern Russia learned about Islam from the missionaries and travelers in the 8th century. Taking Islam and the Muslim way of life, of course they have to eat Halal, and this tradition has spread with the spread of Islam in modern Russia.

By the beginning of 20 centuries Muslims have lived compactly in the traditional Muslim regions of Russia: Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, the northern Caucasus (Dagestan, Chechnya, Ingushetia, Adygea, etc.), the rest of Russia by individual settlements in the Volga region, Urals, Siberia, Orenburg region, in Central City Russia- Moscow, Tver, Tambov, Tula, etc.) and dispersed throughout the territory of Russia.

Halal products produced in rural areas, Muslims and sold among Muslims. Russia was a religious Christian country, and meat from animals allowed Muslim people of the Book, in exceptional cases consumed as "Halal".

The period of militant atheism since 1917 little has changed in the diet of the Muslims and they are still kept in a food laws "Halal".

After the war with the Nazis in 1945, people leave their homes, rebuild the ruined city in Russia has led to mass migration, including the Muslim population in the city.

For feeding the growing urban population created by industrial enterprises for food production, where there are not just laws of Islam, but Christian laws of slaughtering and processing.

Muslims who had relatives in the villages, brought food "Halal" in the city for themselves, their relatives and friends and for sale. In the late 90-ies of the twentieth century is the collapse of the Soviet Union, the accelerated migration from rural to urban areas, reviving traditional religion. Muslims open madrasas, the higher Islamic educational institutions, turns the construction of mosques, prayer rooms are opened, begins an organized trade in meat products "Halal".

Meat products produced uncontrollably on individual small businesses or handicraft at home, begins a massive import of products labeled "Halal".

Muslims were satisfied with the inscription "Halal" in different languages, images, cens and mosques on the food.

The euphoria that arose at the beginning, has been replaced by doubts, after the Muslims were revealed by unscrupulous Russian manufacturers, and imported products were not halal certificates.

The question of the reliability of marking "Halal" on food products, was raised a Muslim head of centralized religious organization, the Council of muftis of Russia's Mufti Sheikh Ravil Gainutdin in late 2002 before the President of Russia, after numerous appeals to the religious organizations of Muslims.

Treatment of Muslims have been linked by the fact that at the grocery market in Russia appeared in many imported products labeled "Halal" (from Brazil, France, Argentina, New Zealand, etc.).

Formation of industry "Halal" in Russia began in 2002 the Federal Law on Technical Regulation of 27.12.2002 No 184-FZ " which gave the right of religious bodies to develop
the normative documentation and the system of voluntary certification, and October 1, 2002 comes into force the International Code food standards.

In 2003, the Central Muslim religious organizations in Russia, "Mufti Council of Russia has developed a standard." Regulations on the organization of production, trade, control over production and trade of products allowed for consumption of Muslims- Halal- PPT-SMR. The standard was developed in accordance with the State system of standardization in Russia and is the "standard organization." Necessary in the public and our standard is not standard enough to start work in the creation of industry "Halal". This document is united in himself and technological features, the organization of certification and turnover products. According to the results of mining at the forefront of modern enterprises standard was corrected November 29, 2004. This standard takes into account the requirements of Codex Alimentsations standards and the standard "Halal" Malaysia.

Also Federal Law No.184 gave the right to our religious organizations to create a system of voluntary certification of "Halal". Certification shall be a body recognized by independent parties, and above all from the manufacturer, retailer, consumer. This ensures the objectivity of the results.

Certification rules are certification schemes as a set of evidence to make an informed conclusion about the object under the requirements of "Halal".

The proof is obtained by carrying out certain operations, confirming compliance with the requirements of the object.

With regard to certification "Halal" are the following generalized types of operations: test: assessment of production; supervisory control.

Each of these types of operations is detailed in view of the risk of inaccurate assessments and impact on its overall conclusion on the conformity of production requirements.

The implementation of the certification scheme is part of the entire certification process, which in general form can be represented as the following steps: Filing of an application to the certification body; application review and acceptance of her decision; audits in accordance with the certification scheme; review audit results and decision making; issuance of certificate of conformity; inspection control of certified facilities (if provided by the certification scheme).

Voluntary certification is an initiative of the applicants, a way of regulating the market, allowing the manufacturer to obtain certain competitive advantages, and the consumer to make informed choices. This applies, above all, food "Halal", intended for people who believe.

The main objectives of the system are to provide assurance that:
- Meat products produced from meat of animals slaughtered is produced by the Islamic tradition;
- Goods produced by domestic and foreign manufacturers, does not contain the canonically forbidden for Muslims items.

Products that comply with the requirements of the religiously permissible products marked with conformity. This symbol is intended to provide information to consumers about what products they marked is "Halal".

In accordance with Federal law "On technical regulation" system of voluntary certification of "Halal" was registered by the Federal Agency for Technical Regulation and Metrology (State Standard), Russia, and entered into a single register of voluntary certification. This is a very important step that gives the state the legitimacy of the system.

PIF "Halal" includes two papers: "The rules of the system" and "The application of a registered mark of conformity."

Certification consists of two stages
1. Sertifikatsiya company, is the analysis of the company, certification of production facilities, equipment, tools, management, use of raw materials, ingredients, etc. This deals with the certification authority annually.

2. Sertifikatsiya batches of products manufactured by a specially accredited experts in the enterprise standard "Halal" by the representatives of the Muslim religious organization. Certificates accompany shipment of goods to counter consumers.

This allows consumers who prefer Halal products to make the right choice, increases confidence in the products, manufacturers and sellers, producers and enterprises to enable expansion of sales markets.

The modern poultry industry and ptitseperabotki does, roughly speaking, most of the principles of "Halal", namely:
- Power requirements of poultry;
- And hygiene requirements (for facilities, equipment, tools, clothing, and staff);
- Requirements for the health of poultry;
- Requirements of poultry before slaughter;
- Sparing requirements with respect to the bird;
- Requirements for the maximum expiration of blood from the body of a bird;
- Requirements for the legality of financial resources used in the production of poultry meat;
- Safety requirements;
- Requirements for the utility.

Remaining two positions for industry without the Muslims can not do:
- Prayer- to kill living creatures for food "Bismillaah";

The certification of the Muslim observance of all requirements.

Thus, the Mufti Council of Russia in accordance with applicable federal law shall exercise all possible steps to protect the interests of Muslims in the area of nutrition food "Halal". Currently in Russia, more than 150 enterprises are certified "Halal"

Systematically we stand with the explanation of the provisions of our standard in academic institutions meat industry at a workshop for production managers and technicians in Russia and CIS countries, the courses enhance industry workers, to students of specialized high schools.

Currently, sales of products "Halal" is in stores at mosques, specialty shops such as "supermarket" with a 100% range of "Halal" shops and trading halls, major federal and regional chain stores, markets, etc. In our estimation it is more 1,500 stores in Russia.

In the large chain stores sold mostly packed in thermo products, which eliminates the contact product "Halal" with "nehayalal."

Is exported products, Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian enterprises: milk powder, infant formula, casings for sausages, pastries, complex food additives, fast food, cosmetics, etc.

Halal market more than 23 million Muslims, citizens of Russia and more than 5 million migrant Muslims - is very attractive. The level of quality of Russian products is very high. This applies particularly to industries that have moved all their products are 100% "Halal".
Halal Research & Development Center

Dr. Hedayat Hosseini
Associate Professor of Food Science & Technology Department
Shahid Beheshti Medical Sciences University
Advisor of I.R of Iran’s Halal Supreme Council (IRI-HSC)

According to our religious dietary rules all foodstuffs are permitted except for those that have been explicitly or unambiguously forbidden. Muslims are not permitted to eat:
• Alcohol
• Blood

Food of animal origin, pigs and other animals that are Haram. It is only permitted to eat food of animal origin that originates from permitted animals that were slaughtered in accordance with Islamic law and did not die a natural death.

In the present century, due to development of food industries many more food raw materials and processed food have been introduced to the food market, of both natural and artificial origin which needs more scientific consideration from point of Halal aspects. Doubtfully food additives are the most important part of this subject.

Additionally, Halal is not just end-product certification but involves approval of all ingredients and all food processing at every stage of the production from farm to plate concept.
• Slaughtering process
• Sanitary washing procedure
• Fermentation

It is very challenging and increasingly difficult for Muslims to ensure the Halal status of food in the market. This trend has raised concerns among Muslim consumers regarding new processed food.

Meanwhile adulteration is an issue of major concern in the Halal food trade and industry globally. For example in some countries, food manufacturers choose to blend vegetable fats with lard to reduce production cost.

For example in the U.K., Food Standards Agency conducted test for adulteration and authenticity of chicken using molecular biology techniques - samples with Halal label revealed that they were adulterated with pig DNA.

In Indonesia, the episodes on ‘Pig Fat’ (1998) and MSG adulterated with enzyme derived from pig (2001), In Thailand, ‘Muslim Frozen Food Sausage Scandal’ 1997, lard in palm oil, 1998, undeclared gelatin 2001 etc.

Food additives are substances added to food for different technological proposes such as preserve food and shelf life extension, enhancement of flavor and taste, improvement of stability and appearance. E-Numbers represent specific food additives, used by the food industry in the manufacture of various food products. These E-Numbers have been formulated by the European Economic Community (EEC) and are universally adopted by the food industry worldwide.
• 100-199/ food colors
• 200-299/ preservatives
• 300-399/ antioxidants, phosphates, and complexing agents
• 400-499/ emulsifiers, gelling agents, phosphates, humectants
• 500-599/ salts and related compounds
• 600-699/ flavor enhancers
700-899/ not used for food additives (used for feed additives)
900-999/ surface coating agents, gases, sweeteners
1000-1399/ miscellaneous additive
1400-1499/ starch derivatives
Main subjects of Halal doubt concerns are: Gelatin, Glycerin, Emulsifiers, Enzymes, Natural Extracts, Colors and Flavor enhancers.

1- Common sources of gelatin are pig skin, cattle hides, cattle bones, poultry skin and fish skins. Used in many food products such as:
- Jellies
- Ice cream
- Confectionary
- Cookies & Cakes

2- Emulsifiers and Stabilizers salts or Esters of Fatty Acids as below:
- E470- Sodium, Potassium and Calcium Salts of Fatty Acids
- E471- Mono-and Diglycerides of Fatty Acids
- E472- Various Esters of Mono-and Diglycerides of Fatty Acids
- E473- Sucrose Esters of Fatty Acids
- E474- Sucroglycerides
- E475- Polyglycerol Esters of Fatty Acids
- E477- Propane-1,2-Diol Esters of Fatty Acids
- E481- Sodium Stearoyl-2-Lactylate
- E482- Calcium Stearoyl-2-Lactylate
- E483- Stearyl Tartrate

Are Halal if it is from plant fat, Haram if it is from pigs and other animals that are Haram fat.

3- Flavour Enhancers such as:
- 620 L-Glutamic Acid
- 621 Monosodium Glutamate (MSG)
- 622 Monopotassium Glutamate
- 623 Calcium Glutamate
- 627 Sodium Guanylate
- 631 Sodium Inosinate
- 635 Sodium5-Ribonucleotide

Are Halal if it is obtained from sardines and Halal fish, but they are Haram if it is made from brewer yeast extract, a by-product of beer making or if it is produced via pig enzyme.

4- Genetically modified organisms (GMO), Fermentation, Biochemical reaction/conversion

For the Muslims who observe the dietary laws of their respective religions, the new technologies open up new opportunities for expanding their food supply, at the same time. These new technologies may create some difficulties for the religious in making Halal determinations of food ingredients.

So we need Halal research center because simultaneously to food industries development we need to update and improve Halal sciences and

1- Determination of Halal for Moslem consumer is very difficult today
2- Halal certification needs precision analytical methods and manufacturing procedure verification
3- Because the huge market of Halal products sometimes Halal logos and certifications are not true and in import and export time we need to check the certificated Halal products. Due to these reasons ICRIC & I.R of Iran’s Halal Supreme Council (IRIHSC) decided to establish Halal research & development center.

The vision of Halal research & development center is Halal Globalization through Research & Scientific Services and objectives of Halal research & development center are:
- Investment the theoretical, laboratory and field Halal research
- Supporting and coordinating national Halal research
- Research for edition and development of Halal standards
- Attempting for Establishment of international Halal research network to connect similar centers
- Design and holding National &International conferences, workshops and training courses for investment Halal sciences
- Education of Halal sciences to experts, auditors, manufacturers
- Provide Halal laboratory services as reference Halal lab and Verification Halal composition
- Development Halal test methods and audit procedures
- Halal sciences development is a Religious, national and international responsibility so all relevant stockholders should support and collaborate in this subject.
- Ministries
- Non Governmental Organizations NGOs
- Universities
- Scientists
- Manufacturers
HALAL WORLD

Research, Development, Monitoring & Support

Islamic Chamber Research & Information Center (ICRIC)
"Iraq and Halalworld"

In the fringe of 26th COCEC Session in Istanbul (Turkey) Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC has an opportunity to talk simultaneously with Vice President and Industry Minister of Iraq about Halalworld issue and opening ICRIC’s representative office in Iraq. Also he presented them the latest Halal Magazines which included the important events in the field of Halalworld. H. E. Tarik Hashemi, Iraq’s Vice President, has welcomed this issue and asked Industry Minister to follow the subject and it was assigned that the setting up for the presence of Halalworld will be prepared. Iraq with a great potential in production of Halal materials can allocate a good portion of global Halal trade to itself.

Congratulation for Achievement of Adopting Halal Standard to the religious leaders

Dr. Nahavandian, President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM), through separate letters congratulated the great achievement of adoption of "Halal Food Standard" in OIC Ministerial Meeting to the religious leaders, the Leader of Islamic Revolution, religious authorities, and the Head of the World Forum for Approximately of the Islamic Schools of Thought.

He announced that this event is the most important feasible event on proximity of the Islamic Schools of Thought and asked them to support this text which is the first authorized juridical text and is in conformity with all common Islamic Madhabs while he demanded that they support ICRIC for its implementation through the world.

Registration of Halal Certification Holders Organization in Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines

Following the registering application of the Founding Board of Halal Certification Holders Organization to the Commission of Organizations of Iran Chamber, the head of this commission invited the founding members board to specify the objectives and plans of the new organization.

Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, and the head of the organizer board of Halal group along with a number of the members of organizer board participated in this commission on October 17, 2010 and they answered the questions of the respected commission’s members. The head of the commission and the respected members have emphasized on the necessity of this organization for development, promotion, production and the trade of Halal products for the export aspect of these products. Finally the commission agreed to register the new organization under the name of "The Society of Development and Promotion of Production and Trade of Halal Products".
Visiting the Deputy Minister of Industry of Malaysia

Dr. Nahavandian, the Head of Iran Chamber, had a meeting with Mr. Mohd. Mahatir, Deputy of Malaysia Ministry of Industry alongside of the program of his journey.

In this meeting Datuk Seri Jamil Bidin, Halal Development Corp (HDC) Chief Executive, presented a report of successful seminar of investment in Iran and Indonesia and said common investment project of two countries is an obvious sample of potential of cooperation.

Then Dr. Nahavandian has expressed that it is necessary for OIC member countries to intra cooperate in this crucial time and asked the Malaysian authorities to apply all available capacities in two countries especially in common economical subjects.

He asked Iran and Malaysia for preparation of “Halal Development Plan” for all countries before next COMCEC Meeting.

Mr. Mahatir while welcoming this suggestion expressed his readiness to travel to Iran for more exact discussions.

The Guests of Pakistan Halal Congress in Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industries

Whereas the office of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) located in Karachi, Pakistan, the guests of the Pakistan Halal Congress visited Mrs. Attiya Nawazish Ali, Assistant Secretary General of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry, on December 3, 2010.

In this meeting the Bosnia's Mufti had a lecture on behalf of the guests. Then Mrs. Attiya Nawazish Ali has presented a report of the ICCI's efforts about its measurements in the field of Halal issue especially in adoption of the OIC.

Halal Food Standard. Also she presented a number of publications related to the Islamic Chamber to the guests. In this meeting besides the guests, the I. R. of Iran's Consulate General in Karachi and a group of merchants and authorities of Karachi Chamber of Commerce were present.

The latest publications of ICRC (Halalworld) also were distributed in the fringe of this meeting.
Halal Brand: Symbol of Islamic Unity

The press conference of the president of Iran Chamber was held with the presence of Medias’ reporters about the achievements of Iranian delegation’s journey to Malaysia and also the economical issues. With the report of Public Relation Office of the Iran Chamber, Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, has emphasized on the development policy of Iran’s presence in the world’s economy and said:

“Iran Chamber has already started some plans for more presence in international economical relations and we should increase our efforts in this field especially after intensification of those tensions due economical embargoes.

With reference to the holding Trade Opportunities and Export of Halal Products Seminar in Malaysia the presidents of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines said:” This seminar was an opportunity for discussing about two main subjects on Halal market in Islamic countries and international arena “.

He added:” Because of Muslim and non-Muslim population of Malaysia and the necessity of the Muslim society to Halal food and Halal pharmaceuticals Malaysia has already started to work in this issue since 10 years ago”.

Dr. Nahavandian has emphasized on Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center’s efforts (ICRIC) and the cooperation of Islamic countries for adopting OIC Halal Food Standard and said: “The Unit Halal Standard was confirmed and accepted by all Islamic Madhabs.

Halal in the ICRIC’s Chairman visits in Turkey

Dr. Nahavandian, the Chairman of ICRIC in his journey to Turkey travelled to Ankara and had a meeting with Mr. Rafaat Hilas Chikly Oughlou, the Head of the Federation of Turkey’ Chambers and Exchanges (TOBB).

He expressed his gratitude of good relations between two countries and emphasized on the expansion of relations with TOBB and the necessity of consultation in issues such as Islamic Chamber, ICRIC, stabilizing Halal Standard and economic development of Asian Countries.

Mr. Oughlou in response expressed his agreement with the issues and announced his desire for the full cooperation with the brother and friendly country of Iran and also his readiness to attend the 127th anniversary of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Mines (ICCM) on the invitation of Dr. Nahavandian.

Meanwhile Dr. Nahavandian had a meeting with the Head of Turkey Standard Institute (TSE) and congratulated the adaption of OIC Halal Food Standard to him and the experts of two countries for this achievement. He demanded for the cooperation of Iran and Turkey for the announcement of this standard to all of the countries and added that this cooperation is necessary for the stabilizing this standard in the world.
Traveling to Turkey a New Window to Develop more Cooperation

Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, and his accompanying delegation opened a new window for more co operations during their 4 days journey to Turkey.

1. Visiting Turkey Chamber of Commerce and its Relevant Organizations

Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, in a meeting with Mr. Rafaat Hisar Chikly Oughlou, the Head of the Federation of Turkey Chambers and Exchanges (TOBB) has emphasized on the necessity of the promotion of the relations with TOBB. They talked friendly about successful relations in recent years and the level of co operations and the necessity of more consultations between two Chambers in the fields of World Chamber, Islamic Chamber, ECO, D8 Chamber and other issues which welcomed by Turkish partner.

In this meeting two responsible of Turkey Chamber of Commerce presented a report of assessment system of the Turkish Chambers there.

Dr. Nahavandian also visited the different parts of the University of Commerce and Industry, a hospital and a big supermarket of Turkey Chamber of Commerce. The related responsible presented a report of their work and answered his questions.

2. Visiting the Scientific Centers, Universities and Techno Park Center affiliated to the Turkey Chamber of Commerce

Visiting techno parks, incubator centers in Namazi University, Atılım University and Bilkent University, Ankara Elahiyat University were in the plans of this journey too. The procedures of supporting these centers and incubator centers by the universities were observed and the responsible of each part presented necessity explanations about those centers there. Also they talked about more cooperation through common projects.

3. Holding the Second and Third Round of Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award (MECCAAward) in Turkey

A cooperative MoU was signed between ICRC, Turkey Chamber of Commerce and TOBB for holding the Second and Third Round of Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award on 2011 and 2012 in Turkey.

In a part of this MoU mentioned:

"The Federation of Turkey Chambers and Exchanges has already declared its complete support for holding this ceremony in Turkey and will try to persuade excellence enterprises for this event and will introduce a representative for judging in this event. ICRC will be committed to implement technical programs, assessments and awarding the prizes".

This MoU was signed by Dr. Nahavandian of ICRC and Mr. Rafaat Hisar Chikly Oughlou of TOBB.

4. Cooperation with Turkey Standard Institute

Dr. Nahavandian, the President of ICCIM visited Mr. Taher Halvaki Gil, the President of TSE and thanked his efforts for hosting SEG workgroup (representatives of 30 countries for adopting Halal standard) and cooperation with ICRC and Iran for implementation of this great duty. He asked for sending the information of this standard to all countries in the world as a great duty and asked ICRC and Turkey for common cooperation in this field. Also a MoU will be prepared for cooperation in the field of ICRC’s utilization of the TSE’s laboratories in the field of Halalworld. It was assigned that in near future this MoU will be signed by the Presidents of ICRC and TSE for implementing the assessment of Halal products in Turkey and Europe.

5. Visiting of Economical Research Centers (SESRIC)

This center which is affiliate to OIC and located in Turkey is responsible for research in the field of economical condition of OIC member countries and has already published different magazines in this issue. In a report presented to Dr. Nahavandian and his accompanying delegation by the Director and the training and research responsible of this center, some of research and training achievements were presented. Dr. Nahavandian emphasized on the common cooperation of SESRIC and ICRC and it was assigned that a MoU between two centers in the fields of MECCAAward, IWTD and the great potential of Halal market will be signed.

6. Interviewing with Beyaz TV

By the invitation of new Turkey TV Network, Dr. Nahavandian took part in a live TV program and answered to the economical questions.
raised by the moderator of the program. In this program some subjects such as the level of economic cooperation of two countries which is planned to the amount of 30 billion US$, benefiting of the advantages of good condition of the relation between two countries in the recent years, cooperation in the field of Halal and ICRC’s projects and the necessity of more correlation and strategic policies of Asian countries were discussed.

7. Visiting the Office of Endowments and Haddith Research Center

Visiting the central office of Endowments of the Turkey Dianat Organization and listening to the complete report of the Center’s Director General was one of the programs in this journey. Director General of this department presented a report included, the establishment of the university, research center, high school and management of about 1000 religious propaganda centers, the procedures of auditing the training of Turkish immigrants in Turkey and helping Muslims in some events like the flood in Pakistan.

Also they visited the Haddith research center and the director of this center presented a report of the great project of gathering thematic Haddithes for social and moral patterns. It was assigned that the common cooperation between two countries in this field will be followed.

8. Visiting Turkey Minister of Industry

With the invitation of Turkey Minister of Industry, Dr. Nahavandian had a meeting with him in his office in the ministry.

Dr. Nahavandian in his long speech requested for creation of Common Industrial Towns in the border lands and the necessity of more cooperation and utilizing of the potential of two countries in the field of science, university and production. He also emphasized the strategic cooperation between the countries such as Iran, Turkey and Malaysia and indicated to his meeting with Mr. Mokhriz Mohait, Deputy of Malaysia Ministry of Industry, Turkey Minister of Industry emphasized on this issue too and reminded to the study processes of creating Industrial Towns will be finished and the executive process will be started soon. He also accepted the invitation to take part in the 130th anniversary of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines in Tehran.

9. Other Plans and Lateral Meetings

Dr. Nahavandian visited the former Turkey Minister of Commerce at his residence and expressed his sympathy for the death of his father and thanked his efforts for creating suitable relation between two countries in his period.

Other plans included visiting the responsible officers of representative office of ICRC, interviewing with External TV Network of Iran and also Iran News Agency (IRNA) about the economical condition of the country and the goals of this journey and meeting with some of interested merchants for investment in Iran.

10. Inauguration of the New Representative Office of ICRC

Dr. Nahavandian inaugurated the new ICRC’s office in Ankara-Turkey and presented some guidelines for future programs of this office for following up the projects such as; MECC Award and Halal.

As mentioned before it is assigned that the Second and the Third Round of Muslims Excellence Competitiveness Corporations Award will be held by the cooperation of Federation of Turkey Chambers and Exchanges (TOBB) in Turkey in 2011 and 2012.

Holding the 11th meeting of ICCI Board of Directors in Alexandria

The 11th meeting of ICCI Board of Directors has held in Hilton Hotel in Alexandria on Dec 15, 2010. In this meeting the directors and the members of the boards of 17 countries were present. At first the report of financial condition of ICCI in 2011 which was set up by financial committee, adopted and then some points were presented by the boards.

H. E. Sheikh Saleh Kamel, President of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce & Industry presented some points about the establishment of a central organization in order to research on Islamic Tourism, Auditing Zakat projects, Islamic Loans and Halal.

Dr. Nahavandian presented a report to the ICCI President and the Board of Directors about the ICRC’s activities and the meeting of the Board of Directors which was held in the same day on the morning. He asked ICCI to prevent consigning the activities of the Chamber to a company which ICCI Board of Directors wouldn’t have any role there.

Also, Dr. Nahavandian enumerated the adoption of OIC Halal Food Standard as a great success which is the realization of a golden goal in the direction of the Proximity of the Islamic Chambers of Thought. At last, the President of ICCI assigned that the hosting of the 2011 meeting will be in Jordan, 2012 in Turkey and 2013 will be held in Iran.
Holding ICRIC’s Board of Directors

Simultaneously with holding the 11th meeting of ICCI Board of Directors, the 8th meeting of ICRIC’s Board of Directors was held in Hilton Hotel in Alexandria with the presence of all members included, Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan and Iran (except Malaysia). Dr. Bassem Awadallah the Secretary General of ICCI was also presented there. In this meeting the Board of Directors elected Dr. Nahavandian as the Chairman and Mrs. Attiya Nawazish Ali as the Secretary. Dr. Karbasi, a member of the Board of Directors presented the report of ICRIC’s activities in the years 2009-2010. The plans of 2011 in different sections presented to the Board of Directors and they were approved. They thanked and appreciated the good financial support of Iran Chamber. It was assigned that ICCI will continue to provide 50% of the expenses and the rest will be provided by the partnership of the other chambers in the centers’ projects. Also it was adopted that with the attention to the absence of Malaysia’s representative in most of the meetings of the Board of Directors, after counseling with this country ICCI will replace another voluntary country to Malaysia.

It was emphasized to follow up the establishment of the new ICRIC’s representative offices in member countries and to specify the liaison for each chamber.

Dr. Nahavandian declared that common efforts of Turkey and ICRIC for adoption of OIC Halal Food Standard is a bright point in ICRIC’s achievements and announced of holding the second and the third round of the MECCaward meeting in Turkey.

It was assigned that Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC and a member of ICRIC’s Board of Directors, will provide periodic seasonal report of ICRIC’s activities for the members of the Board of Directors and secretariat of ICCI and also will inform these information and all news related to the ICRIC’s projects by the ICRIC’s main sites to the 57 member countries and the members of the Board of Directors.

Specifying the time of the next meeting was the last discussion which was assigned that the 9th meeting of the Board of Directors will be held simultaneously with the meeting of ICCI Board of Directors on April 2011 in Jordan.

A New Season in Iran and Egypt’s Economical Relations

Two nations of Iran and Egypt, with population of more than 150 millions have already watched silent years in their different relations with each other with incredibility and regret and to missed thousands of co operations’ opportunities. The lack of relations during these long years has already caused two old nations to be uninformed and they missed economical and cultural relations. Each time that everything was provided for restoring the relations something happened by some black - hearted and prevented establishing a new relation.

The existence of some political problems among governments prevented restoring of economical relations between two nations whereas it could be implemented with the presence of such disputes. Dr. Rashid Mohammad, the educated Minister of Commerce and Industry in a meeting with Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, said: “The establishment of economical relation with Iran is possible despite the presence of political disputes. As the political disagreements among European governments have never prevented them from economical relations. The relation between Iran and Egypt is an old relation and it is possible to restore the economical relations according to the interests and profits of two nations.

With the invitation of the new president of Egyptian Chamber of Commerce and in order to take part in
the 11th meeting of ICCI Board of Directors, Dr. Nahavandian and his accompanying delegation who travelled to Alexandria visited Dr. Mohammad, Minister of Industry and Commerce, and Dr. Ahmad Vakil, the New President of Egypt Chamber of Commerce. He explained that the potentials and demands of two nations can complete each other and asked the fulfillment of the economical relations.

The news sites and also magazines "Al-dastoor" and "Al-mesri Al- yawm" covered this news and with citation of Rashid Mohammad Words has emphasized on the importance of the economical cooperation between Iran and Egypt.

Rashid Mohammad added: "President Hosni Mubarak has already talked about the historic relations between two countries several times ago". Al-mesri al-yaum newspaper selected this sentence from the words of Minister of Commerce and Industry: "Egypt is interested to restore the relations with Iran to the normal condition with the dominance of the economical profits to the political disputes".

The high ranking delegation of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines had the goal of practical implementation and accomplishing of these economical relations in these fields:

To activate the common relation of chambers of Iran and Egypt
Creation of friendship group of two countries
Exchanging trade delegations
Holding trade exhibitions for presenting the potentials of two parties
Establishing a permanent trade center for each country in the other country Implementation of common projects in different section included: machinery, petrochemical, electronic and electric, new technology and energy, establishing common directory of economical enterprises in two countries and updating these information, cooperation in different ICRCs' projects such as, Halalworld, MECCAward and etc.

By a New MOU with the Ministry of Health
More Cooperation

"70,000 food production licenses, 11,000 hygienic and Health production licenses for 12,000 manufacturer and factories were issued. We are ready to cooperate with ICRC in the field of Halal brand for these productions for continuation of the solidarity of this work". Said Dr. Sheibani.

Deputy of Minister of Food and Pharmaceuticals in the Ministry of Health, Treatment and Medical Education who presented in Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM) with the invitation of Dr. Nahavandia, the President of ICCIM.

Dr. Janat, Director General of Food, Dr. Rastegar, Director General of the Food and Pharmaceuticals Control Laboratories and Dr. SafarChi, the Responsible for Cooperation and International Relations were accompanying Dr. Sheibani.

Dr. Nahavandian thanked the cooperation and companionship of the Ministry of Health, Treatment and Medical Education with ICRC that has become applicable with signing previous MOU by the former Deputy of the Ministry of Health and also thanked of good cooperation of the current responsible in following up and strengthening that MOU and increasing the area of cooperation especially in the field of operating of the central food and pharmaceutics research center. He remarked that the achievement of holding International Health Tourism Forum was a great success and added:

"It was a grace of God that we achieved by the efforts of our friends, ICRC, Iran, Turkey and some other countries and also the great achievement of adopting OIC Halal Food Standard is a golden document in the proximity of the Islamic Schools of Thought which should watch over very carefully and to stabilize it in the world".

Dr. Nahavandian emphasized that establishing Halal Research Center is a necessary issue which
has been adopted by Halal Supreme Council and we can promote and accomplish it with the cooperation of Ministry of Health.

In the field of laboratories, all potency of the Ministry should be in service of this international issue and fortunately a MoU was signed with the Turkey Standard Organization (TSE) which according to this MoU all laboratories in Turkey will be in service of this direction.

Dr. Sheibani expressed his happiness of these efforts and expressed his full readiness and his friends in different parts of Ministry of Health among all Food and Pharmaceutics Office and also the laboratories of food and pharmaceutics control. In this meeting a MoU was signed between Dr. Nahavandian from ICRIC and Dr. Sheibani, the Deputy of Food and Pharmaceutics of the Ministry of Health, Treatment and Medical Education.

Necessary Cooperation of the ECO Chambers of Commerce and Industry with ICRIC

During the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee and the Eleventh Meetings of the General Assembly of ECO Chamber of Commerce and Industry which was held on 19th January, 2011 in Tehran, the Presidency of the Secretary General of ECO Chamber that was previously chaired by Turkey was given to Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, and Dr. Korbasi, the member of the Board of Directors of ICRIC for three years.

Also in this meeting, Dr. Fakhr, the Executive Manager of ICRIC, while introducing activities and projects of ICRIC spoke about the necessary of cooperation of ECO chambers with ICRIC’s projects such as Halal, MECC Award, IWTD, Countries Tourism Chain, IC-CRS, SMES and Islamic Countries Incubators and proposed to avoid parallel works by inviting Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) for Eco Summits and all the chambers can benefit of ICRIC’s researches. He suggests signing agreements with this center to make this cooperation official.

It is worth noting that three proposals were approved by the General Assembly of ECO Chambers and these clauses were inserted in the final report and in the statement of the meeting per following.

The 11th Paragraph of the statement:

-- Meeting agreed to utilize ICRICs, proposed researches related to ECO countries, regarding the use and exploitation of these researches.  
-- Meeting agreed to invite ICRIC in all ECO summits to be notified of the latest researches to avoid parallel studies.  
-- Meeting emphasized that all the Chambers sign the cooperation agreements with ICRIC to make their cooperation official.
The Guideline of the Principles of OIC Halal Services

1. The Principles of the "Halal" Standard in Hotels
2. The Principles of Halal Standard in Banks and Financial Organizations
3. The Principles of Halal Standard in Transportation Services
4. The Principles of Halal Standard in IT Services and Media
5. The Principles of "Halal" Standard for Tourism
6. The Principles of Halal Standard in Public Trade and Business
7. The Principles of "Halal Standard in Clothes"
8. The Principles of Halal Standard for Sport and Amusement Services

1. The Principles of the "Halal" Standard in Hotels

Definition: the purpose of the usage of "Halal" in the category of the hotels is regarding the Shariah laws for all services in tourism places like, hotels, motels, hotel apartments, restaurants, auditoriums, entertainments facilities, transportation services, local tours, washing services of the venues, utensils and clothes.
Requirements:
1. To observe related services with water and sanitations
2. To present related services of worshiping
3. To avoid presenting alcoholic beverages in the rooms
4. To regard Halal food standards in restaurants and food services
5. To regard Islamic conducts and behaviours by the stuffs
6. To avoid presenting prohibited services in contradiction with Shariah

Article 1: Water in pipelines (related to pure reservoir) must exist in all mentioned places such as passengers' residences either public or private places like WC, bathrooms or the others services in restaurants, dry cleaners, washing towels and bed sheets and etc.

Article 2: Presenting related services to worship
includes; specifying the direction of Quibbel in all rooms or to allocate a separate place with all necessities for pray.

Article 3: All allocated places to Halal must be free of alcoholic services (whether in the rooms refrigerators or in the bars and restaurants).

Article 4: “Halal Food Standard” is obligatory in all services related to beverages and foods.

Article 5: The stuffs are obliged to regard Islamic rules (shariah) with passengers.

Article 6: To avoid presenting the Shariah prohibited services.
( Such as mixed ceremonies, discos, illegal gender relations, visiting illegal centres in local tours and transportation services)

2- The Principles of Halal Standard in Banks and Financial Organizations

Definition: The purpose of the usage of "Halal" in these kinds of services is observance Shariah laws in requirements and activities of the organizations of financial services included banks, exchange centers, investment and finances, insurance, hiring and etc.

Requirements:  
1- To avoid presenting any kinds of direct or indirect usury (Rabavi) services
2. To regard Shariah laws in the fields of financial transactions
3. To avoid mixing mistaken capitals with pure capitals in dealing with usury centers
4. To compile an accurate supervision system on the authorities in order to prevent financial corruption.

Article 1: All these centers must avoid entering every kinds of deals related with usury. The details of this article will be specified by the comprehensive regulations.

Note 1: The means of "usury" is, claiming the direct augmented (increased) of the main "money" without any Shariah laws financial transactions.

Article 2: About all the past and future transactions in these organizations, the Shariah laws must be regarded. "Halal" contracts are mentioned in the jurisprudence books of the honourable religious leaders and those who issue Fatwa. Then observing “Shariah contracts regulations” is binding.

Article 3: Because some of Halal organizations have exchanges and interactions with their similar organizations which are free from Halal system should besides observing Halal requirements in these kinds of exchanges avoid mixing suspicious goods and properties with pure properties or in case of manipulation they must get permission of authorized authorities who issue Fatwa.

Article 4: Because corruption in financial organizations will be caused degeneracy and detriment of investors and the owners of the stockholders, these organizations should employ righteous stuffs while they should teach them the basis of Shariah doctrine in their specified field they also should set up and implement an accurate control system for the executors.

3 – The Principles of Halal Standard in Transportation Services

Definition: Implementation of "Halal " in transportation services is the observance Shariah laws in all services in the field of transportation of passengers and carrying goods in the internal and international destinations by airlines, trains, roads and ships.

Requirements:
1. To regard related services with water
2. To regard and present related services with worship
3. To regard Halal Food Standard in catering services for passengers and the stuffs
4. To regard Islamic Shariah by the stuffs and the workers
5. To not presenting services opposed with Shariah

First Article: To be e sure about the cleanliness of the tanks before every loading for transportation of bulk goods (tank ships and tankers) and to be careful about non entry or mixing with unclean and Haram goods during transportation.

Second Article: Washing and pure services and all necessary devices such as kiblah indicator and the place for worshipping and services for fasters at all airline journeys should be provided for passengers.

Third Article: To regard OIC Halal Food Standard in catering services is binding at all journeys in presenting food and drinks.

Forth Article: Those staffs who present these kinds of services should pass necessity training of Islamic teachings and are committed to regard and implement them.

Fifth Article: It is necessary to avoid presenting services opposed to Islamic Shariah such as serving alcoholic beverages or other immoral services.

4 –The Principles of Halal Standard in IT Services and Media

Definition: The implementation of "Halal "in IT services and Media is observance Shariah laws at all IT and media services including presentable services in internet, software products, radio, TV, cinema, theatre and art.

Requirements:  
1. To regard permitted advertisement, avoid publishing harmful, seductive and doubtful issues
2. To avoid publishing issues opposed to public moral purity
3. To regard Islamic laws by the staffs
4. To present safeguard services in order to prevent entering viruses and illegal issues in the pro-
5. To compile especial regulations of control system on the presentable services
6. To present especial search system in search engine motors and to categorize them thematically for different audience

Article 1: Because of the sensitivity of this services, the attempt for identifying different kinds of permitted services should implement by senior experts.

Article 2: In all times and steps of productions the control and assessment of the proficient experts to the Islamic Shariah (preproduction) should be implemented corresponding with the type of the artistic and media products.

Article 3: Not presenting the illegal and prohibited pictures and issues in all productions of audio-visual media and internet

Article 4: Because of the abundance of illegal programs and media it is necessary preventing accessing of the inexpert users by the programs and technical apparatus.

Article 5: The regulations related to the protection of the rights of the productions and the owners of the literary works should be observed since their dissatisfaction don’t cause unlawful usage by the consumers.

Article 6: The appropriate trainings for all level of producers and consumers to be set for identifying Halal laws and regulations.

5 –The Principles of "Halal" Standard for Tourism

Definition: The implementation of "Halal " in the field of tourism is observe the Islamic Shariah in all related services with different kinds of tourism included recreational and tourist sight-seeing, especial touring for health, trade and marketing, teaching, scientific and technical, destined for pilgrimage and related services.

Requirements:
1. To present related services with the religious issues of the tourists during the journey
2. To observe Islamic laws by the staffs and the tour guides
3. To avoid presenting services opposed to Shariah
4. To choose venues and centers which are the executor of the Halal Standard (hotels, camps, etc)
5. To choose restaurants where are the executor of the Halal Standard
6. To choose transportation services which are the executor of the Halal Standard

Article 1: In all these services, related standards with those services should be observed.

Article 2: Necessity trainings should be arranged for the executers of the tourism services and the staffs are committed to implement and observe them.

Article 3: Services related to the health tourism (in hospitals, clinical centers, hot waters etc …) should meet the regulations of the center.

Article 4: During all journeys the necessity things included time, place, kiblah indicator for praying and fasting and other necessities should provide.

Article 5: There should prevent of mixing program in the combination relation of men and women

Article 6: There shouldn’t set a program for visiting unlawful and Haram places

6 – The Principles of Halal Standard in Public Trade and Business

Definition: The implementation of "Halal " in public trade and business is, observe the Shariah measurements and its conditions in every kind of business weather the production of different kinds of products or every kinds of buying and selling in the international or internal level according to this Haddith of Imam Ali (A.S.) : “O traders and sellers observe the jurisprudence regulations then entering to the trade arena “

Requirements:
1. To be familiar with the basis of the Halal business and to avoid Haram trading
2. To observe minimum requirements of the business (the principles of the ownership, the correctness of the deals, to set agreement, repayment of the debts …)
3. To avoid every deal based on usury and to compile the basics of Trade without usury
4. To be familiar with general requirements related to the deal with the Followers of the Book ( Ahli Kitab) and unbelievers
5. To be familiar with the principles of the moral business (fairness, extension, compensate…)
6. To design a mechanism for solving the trade disputes and to observe them in the agreements

Article 1: To have certificate of passing training courses of jurisprudence basis of general and especial trade in related Unions, federations and syndicates or to attain of having necessary information

Article 2: To compile specific regulation for Halal deals in that field and training the staffs

Article 3: To compile the regulation for the non entrance mechanisms to the deals with usury and to regard them

Article 4: To observe those requirements on "Haram" which are related to their business

Article 5: To observe the regulation of the methods of deal with the Followers of the Book and unbelievers

Article 6: To be familiar with the moral principle of the business and to try implementing by the directors and responsible

7. The Principles of "Halal Standard in Clothes

Definition: The implementation of "Halal " in the
category of clothes is observance Shariah Laws at all presentable services in the field of clothes (Not including any kind of skin, hair or parts of the Haram animal or those animals that did not slaughtered according to the Islamic Shariah) or those kinds of clothes that their wearing are prohibited or the clothes with especial signs defining an especial group of pigeons and non believers and so on.

Requirements:
1. To observe Islamic laws regarding clothes and kinds of garments for women and men and wearing men’s clothes for women and prohibited clothes for men (like clothes containing gold, pure silk, ornamental products like gold ring, golden watch, golden button and golden glasses etc.)
2. To regard Islamic laws in other clothing like shoes, belt, bag, etc. (on the basis of their raw materials especially leather)
3. To regard non existence of different parts of Haram component of the animals in clothes and textiles
4. To regard washing the clothes with Halal lotions materials or touched with unbelievers and pigeons or containing Najis (Unclean) materials

Article 1: To be familiar with all kinds of Haram meat animals to avoid using their skins, and components in clothes and shoes, etc.
Article 2: To be familiar with unlawful raw materials in producing garments
Article 3: To regard washing for garment which are in contact with unclean materials
Article 4: To be familiar with the resources of the production of clothes of not containing the parts of Halal animals that didn’t slaughtered according to Halal laws
Article 5: To be familiar with the religious regulations of the conditions of using the brands and signs of unbelievers and pagans regarding the prohibition of being similar with them by Muslims

8. The Principles of Halal Standard for Sport and Amusement Services

The implementation of Halal in sport and amusement services is the observance the Islamic Shariah in services such as, specifying kinds of Haram sports (like professional boxing, violent and harsh sports) and Haram amusements (like gambling or combined with other sins), regarding Halal in presentable services to the Muslim athletes in camps, hotels and different kinds of races, energetic tablets and capsules, regarding lawful clothes and garments for men and women athletes in competitions.

Requirements:
1. To be familiar with non entrance to Haram sports like professional boxing and harsh sports that cause bilateral physical and mental harms
2. To be familiar with unlawful kinds of amusements like gambling that causes corruption or sin
3. To regard Halal laws in presentable services to the athletes in camps, hotels, competitions, etc.
4. To regard Halal laws in Hygienic, treatment and teaching services (tablets, capsules, energetic drinks and etc)
5. To regard Halal in the garments of Muslim men and women’s athletes in the competitions

Article 1: The regulation of the lawful and unlawful sports from the view point of the Islamic Shariah and the limitation of each of them should be compiled for men and women Muslim athletes
Article 2: To compile the regulation of the introduction of kinds of gambling according to the especial tools and apparatus or the kinds of agreements
Article 3: To compile Halal standard for presentable services to the athletes residency, worshiping, drinks and etc.
Article 4: To identify and to regard kinds of lawful and unlawful pharmaceutics, edibles and energetic drinks as regard their component materials
Article 5: To regard lawful garments of the men and women athletes’ clothes in different sport competitions
Article 6: To survey sport requirements and to identify kinds of Haram regulations especially national and international requirements and to take measurements for their correction.
Italy Chamber of Commerce and "Halal world"

Cho Dardanlou, the Director of the Union of the Italian Chambers, in Rome. Mr. Dardanlou explained that this Union has 6 million members and among them there are 200,000 exporter companies.

Dr. Nahavandian has described the outlook of Europe Trade and the role of Italy in global economy and said: It is necessity to take Halal World Brand for attending of exporting companies of food materials, pharmaceuticals and machineries related to Halal in Muslim markets. Then he introduced ICRIC and Halal World Brand and then presented him the latest issue of Halal magazine of ICRIC.

Common Cooperation in the field of Halal with Association Italian Alleviatory

In a meeting between Dr. Charles Dadi Wago from Italian Association Alleviatory (which is under Ministry of Agriculture) with Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, he explained that this research center has scientific services activities for all herd breeding institutions, abattoir centers and cattle quality control from farm to supply in the markets. Even this center is implementing control on Islamic slaughtering in abattoirs. After becoming familiar with Halalworld activities, he requested for cooperation in this filed. Hence it was assigned a joint research work will be started immediately in one of the Italian abattoirs. Then this successful cooperation will promote to other cattle production centers after surveying the achievements. Dr. Charlesdi invited Executive Manager of ICRIC to take part in animal husbandry researches and cattle products exhibition that will be held in summer in Rome.

Italian Ambassador and "Halalworld"

In a joint meeting which was held by Chamber of Iran and Italy in Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines, “Alberto Bradnny” Italian Ambassador get familiarity with economical activities of Iranian private sector. In this meeting Executive Manager of ICRIC presented a report of his journey to Italy and its achievements. Dr. Fakhari has discussed with the responsible authorities of Milan Chamber of Commerce about the necessity of the Italian Food materials, Pharmaceuticals and Hygienic Factories to get Halalworld Brand for exporting their products to the Islamic countries. Then he advised the Italian Ambassador about the mechanism of explaining Rome Chamber of Commerce and also Italian Industry Union about the necessity of Halal Brand for their exporting products to Islamic countries and to arrange appropriate programs and conferences. Dr. Fakhari also informed about the presence of some Italian companies in International Halal Fair and Forum in Iran on March 2-5, 2010 and he presented the last issue of English Halal Magazine to him. Italian Ambassador promised to follow up the discussed issues.
World-class Halal events held in Malaysia during the same week this June. This June, Malaysia, the focal point for Halal industry players, stakeholders, and opportunity seekers as it hosted Halal Malaysia Week from 21 to 27 June 2010.

The Halal Malaysia Week was a coalescence of three major events: International Halal Showcase (MIHAS), World Halal Research Summit (WHR), and World Halal Forum 2010 (WHF) and targeted to bring in thousands of delegates and exhibitors from over 50 countries to facilitate trade and drive the global Halal industry and discuss issues, share advancements in Halal research, which is estimated to be worth trillions of dollars. Iran also took part with 20 companies which were organized by Isfahan Exhibition Center. Simultaneously, several trade boards participated in this event for discussing and visiting with joinery sides from Kerman, Ghazvin, and Tehran. This event followed by the 3rd World Halal Research Summit from 23 – 24 June, also held at the KL Convention Centre and was organized by the Halal Industry Development Corporation (HDC). This international conference provided a platform for scientists, researchers, scholars, and academicians to meet, discuss, and exchange ideas on new research findings, emerging technologies, trends, issues, and challenges in the global Halal industry. Apart from delving into the latest issues in Halal research, the conference also provided the participants with the latest updates in the development of strategies, new technologies, emerging trends, product innovation, best practices and more within the Halal industry. IHI also invited ICRC's authorities for scientific presence in this Forum.
IHI and ICRIC Cooperation in the Field of OIC Standard in the COMCEC 2010

Following the idea of the president of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry, H. E. Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdullah Kamel, in a session in Doha, Qatar (three months ago) regarding the expertise coordination of ICRIC and International Halal Integrity (IHI), the managers of these two centers, Dr. Fakhari and Mr. Darhim Hashim, and also Dr. Shojaei the senior advisor of ICRIC had a meeting in Hotel Istana Kuala Lumpur City Center. After discussion about the ways of coming to a common consensus of countries to confirm the prepared standard in COMCEC it was assigned that each center takes the responsibility of explanation of some countries for expediting in approving the Unit Standard. Also this issue will be discussed with Arab Countries by the President of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Both two centers emphasized to deliver the record of their actions to the president of Islamic Chamber and to implement the results after getting the approval. Also it was assigned that the report of the measures will be presented to the next session of the Islamic Chamber on Ramadan for future planning and the next programs.

World Halal Research Summit (WHR)

The three-day event from June 23 to 25, 2010 with the theme: "Inspiring Innovation Through Halal Research" was held at the Kuala Lumpur Convention Centre by Halal Development Corporation (HDC) in Malaysia. The summit consisted of 5 working groups named: Global prospective of Halal innovations, emergence of production of Halal pharmaceuticals products, updated Halal sciences, technology and trade, first and second part and Halal science and shariah. Lecturers presented their papers and researches in those fields. Most of the speakers who were from scientific centers and universities have been presented their articles on those professional modules. This Summit was opened by Dr. Jalaludin Syed Salim, the Chairman of HDC, and closed by The Prime Minister's wife, Datin Paduka Seri Rosmah Mansor. Also Halal Development Corporation with the effort of Matrad and Jakim published a book consisting of the Directory of Halal exporters and Halal services of Malaysia in 270 pages which is including information of about 200 Malaysian exporters.
Halal and United Arab Emirates

A great investor group called "Al-Oujan" which has 110 years history of experience in Halal industry production, requesting for receiving Halalworld Brand. This company by establishing some factories in Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and I. R. of Iran started to export non-alcoholic beverages like, "Ranni" and "Barbican Beer Beverages" to more than 10 countries. One of its great factories is located in Jabal Ali in United Arab Emirates that is producing other kinds of non-alcoholic beverage called "Barbican". This center was audited and assessed by Halalworld authorities. After necessary surveying by the experts, they will decide for issuing Halal certificate for the products of this factory.

One of the outstanding point is that the Al-Oujan Company is one of the international investor group with %100 foreign investors and the capital of 170 Million US $ which has already established 3 fruit juice manufacturing factories in Iran.

Halal in Iran & Thailand Commerce Relation

Dr. Mahdi Fakheri, International Affairs Deputy of Iran Chamber of commerce, in a meeting with Mrs. Atchaka Sitbrank, Secretary General of Thailand Investment Council, declared that Thailand investors have to regard Halal Brand for importing goods to Iran and in this respect, ICRIC has the authority and administrative responsibility of this certificate by Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICRIC). Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, also introduced the activities of the center and declared that because Thailand is an observatory member of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) and is planning to have good coordination with 57 Islamic countries in the fields of economy hence it is necessary to have good cooperation with ICRIC in the field of Halalworld Certification. He added that fortunately the representative office of ICRIC has already inaugurated in Assumption University of Thailand and it is appropriate that according to a signed MOU by Thailand Muslim Merchants Council to join to this cooperation the path is right.

Also, according to a MOU which was signed between Ministry of Health, Treatment and Medical Education and ICRIC hereafter all importers of food materials are obliged to receive Halal certificate.
Halal world in France

The presence of 7 Millions of the Muslim population in France has been caused the largest Muslim Community in Europe. Although this country was the cradle of Laicity because of the bad actions of its church authorities in the past, but tendency towards religion especially towards Islam in this country has its especial feature and nearly every week a newly converted to Islam from France shows their interest to this religion. Preparing Halal food for this big society is an important economical issue that the French government has known the importance of this event especially the economical outlook of "Halal" is beyond of this population and it is consisted of all food industry, cosmetics, hygienic and pharmaceutical products.

The presence of different Halal brands which have been created for the necessity of this issue, has caused ICRIC to regulate Halalworld brand in this country and also to organize the journey of Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, to France for this purpose. The programs of this journey included different visiting with the responsible representatives of those offices, explaining of Halalworld process, the importance of OIC Halal standard and avoiding of multi standards and plurality of Halal, visiting of Islamic Center for Halal (MCI) in Sharter in the suburb of France, discussion for awarding representative to this center for following up the Halalworld in France, interview with the reporter of "Sedaye Ashena" channel and explaining about the importance of Halal market and the different center's activities in different parts of the world and planning for the future meeting with the authorities of French Chamber of Commerce and Ministry of Agriculture and Trade about Halalworld issues. It is a hope that through a country which has the largest Muslim minority we can promote Halalworld to the whole Europe.
Superior Future for Halal in Turkey

Welcoming of Halal World Brand by the producers and exporters of food materials companies in Turkey, changed Ramadan to an active month in regard to Halal issue. Measures taken by Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, during his 3 days visiting in Turkey were as follows: Visiting some of the producing beverages and protein materials, issuing Halal World Certificate to them, carrying on the first Halal training course for the Halal Inspectors in the office of Halal World (Tunersin) in Turkey, discussion with the selected executor for holding imminent International Halal Fair in Turkey (which will be held by ICRIC’s effort), preparing an independent office for ICRIC and Halal project in Ankara, studying on the especial situation of Turkey as an important potential in exporting of Halal products to European Countries and planning for it.

It is worthy to say that the Second Great Forum of Meccaward will be held in 2010 in Turkey in order to witness a higher level of competitiveness among major firms from Islamic Countries in an international process.

SMIIC Report of the 1st General Assembly of the Standards and Metrology

SMIIC is the standardization body of OIC whose status was approved in 1999 and the OIC Standardization Expert Group (SEG) was formed as a temporary solution that has been established in 1985 by COMCEC meanwhile the Turkish Standard Institution (TSE) acts as its secretariat pending on entry into force of SMIIC. By the end of May 2010, Somalia was the 11th country that officially ratified the membership of SMIIC followed by Turkey which started the process earlier but took a long time for ratification.

At present, some 11 OIC Member States (Algeria, Cameroon, Guinea, Jordan, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia and Turkey) have so far both signed and ratified the Statute of SMIIC, enabling it to enter into force. Hence, during the period of 2000-2005 only 3 OIC member states had ratified the SMIIC statute, while since 2005, the other 8 member states have joined.

In the wake of the 1st General Assembly of the Standards and Metrology Institute for the Islamic Countries (SMIIC) held on Aug 2-3, 2010 in Ankara, Turkey, attended by representatives of 11 member countries as well as the a delegation taking part on behalf of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI), comprising of Mr. Mostafa Sobri, Senior Advisor to President of ICCI and Dr. Mohammad Reza Karbasi, Board Member of the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC).

The ICCI delegation was actively involved in discussions and negotiations during the Assembly and conveyed the message of H.E Sheikh Saleh Kamel, President of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) as below:

As deliberated by the OIC Council of Foreign Ministers in Dakar-Senegal, the executive responsibility of Halal in OIC countries has been entrusted to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) as the ICCI has been preparing the necessary back-up for Halal implementation in OIC countries by establishment of various institutions.

Permanent membership of the ICCI in Halal Accreditation Committee was also discussed and approved during the assembly.

No.7 – Special Report 30 Islamic Chamber Research & Information Center
The 1st Indonesia Int’l Halal Business & Food Expo and Global Halal Forum paradigm of international Halal business

This Exhibition was held with the purpose of presenting Indonesia export ability for Halal products on July 23-25, 2010 in Jakarta Convention Center. There were few numbers of foreign companies and most of the visitors were Indonesian and those who were invited for Halal Forum. This event was opened by Deputy of President. ICRIC’s delegation while visiting the exhibition invited booth holders for participating in the I. R. of Iran’s Second International Halal Fair and Forum on February 2011. Simultaneously of holding The 1st Indonesia International Halal Exhibition, 3 other Forums and Teaching Courses were held with the management of Majlis Ulama of Indonesia (MUI) that is responsible for Halal issue in this country.

The main topics of the Forum:

A— Global Halal Forum: Global opportunities and facilities in Halal industry

This Forum which was held by the presence of delegates of World Halal Council was opened by Deputy of President and continued by the words of the president of MUI. In continuation of the Forum 3 issues on "the requirements related to the export and import of Halal products"," a glance to the opportunities and challenges in the global Halal market and " Halal certifier as strategic partner on halal business " were discussed by the participants of this Forum. Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, while was talking with some of participants about Halalworld (one of the ICRIC’s projects) invited them for taking part in the Second International Halal Fair & Forum in Tehran, Iran.

B—International Training on Halal Assurance System

This training has been organized for supervisors and auditors of Halal productions and presented on issues such as, quality and condition of Halal productions, the procedures of labeling and packaging of Halal industrial productions in Indonesia, legal terms of Halal productions, the role of governments and merchants in private sector in the development of Halal small industries and necessary teachings to the participants.

C— International Meeting on Global Halal Standard.
This Session was held by the management of MUI and with the presence of delegates from the issuing organizations of Halal certifications affiliate to the World Halal Council in different countries. All participants presented their viewpoints on global unifying standard and ICRC's delegates also discussed with the delegates of World Halal Council about actions which have been done by Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) and COMCEC Meeting in Turkey about preparing united global standard of Islamic Countries in order to prevent redoing. Also, in the fringe of this exhibition, Dr. Fakhriz, Executive Manager of ICRC, visited Dr. Aisja Girindra, the Manager of Supervision on issuing Halal Certification of MUI.

And also he had a meeting with Dr. Ali Mostafa Jacob, Vice President of Indonesia Ulama (The writer of Halal and Haram in food, drinks, pharmaceutical and cosmetics). He explained about ICRC's global projects and its objectives in the frame of OIC and the actions done for preparing the draft of united standard of Islamic countries. He asked them to justify Majlis Ulama Indonesia for more cooperation for the finalization of global united Halal standard. In a meeting with the Ambassador of I.R. of Iran the ICRC's plans and objectives and the actions in regard to issuing global Halal certification to the Iranian and foreign companies presented to him. Also the efforts by expert committee affiliate to the OIC especially COMCEC Meeting for preparing draft of Global Halal Standard of OIC countries was discussed. In addition the role of cooperation of Indonesia was emphasized in finalization of united standard. He appreciated the actions and promised to discuss with Indonesian authorities about this issue and he promised to activate the Economic Section of the Embassy in this field.

Also, during a meeting with Vice President of Indonesia Chamber of Commerce they emphasized on the importance of the commercial and economical relations between two important countries, Iran and Indonesia, and also suggested to activate joint committee among two countries.

The Report of the International Halal Fair and Forum to the Board of Directors of the Islamic Chamber

The president of the Islamic Chamber of Commerce, and Industries (ICCI), Mr. Abdollah Saleh Kamel, in his opening speech in Annual General Assembly and Board of Directors of ICCI, spoke about different issues such as the importance of Halal issue in the world, ICCIs' activities and also the responsibility which is undertaken by OIC. He asked all chambers members to help and support ICCI in the frame of prepared Halal Standards by OIC to implement great responsibility of preparing executive regulations and Unit Halal Brand in Islamic Countries. In the fringe of holding the meeting of the Annual General Assembly and Board of Directors of ICCI in Doha, Qatar, ICRC's Plan for 2010 and also full report of holding the First International Halal Fair and Forum in Iran presented to the ICCI Board of Directors consisting of Saudi Arabia, Benin, Egypt, Turkey, Jordan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar, Syria, United Arab Emirates and Oman. In a separate meeting between the president of Islamic Chamber with ICRC's delegation, IHI and Dr. Ahmad Mohyedeen, Economic Assistant of Secretary General of Islamic Chamber, in Ho-
tel Carlton in Doha, he asked them to prepare more quickly the schedule of executive mechanisms of supervision on certifications and unite Halal Brand and to present it to the next sessions of COMCEC at the end of this year in Istanbul. ICRIC’s delegate assured that they will put in to practice all their experiences to make this goal practical in Islamic world. Also in a meeting between Dr. Sabah Zangeneh, Counselor of the Head of Iran Chamber in Arabic and Islamic Countries Affairs, and Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, with H.E. Mr. Sheikh Saleh Kamel they emphasized on more effective cooperation’s between ICRIC and ICCI.

### Beginning of "Halal world" in Denmark

Dr. Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, travelled to Denmark with the invitation of Che-Hanson Company which is the largest and the famous producer of natural edible color and applicable starters in dairy industries in the world. This company is one of the applicants of Halal Certificate for its products especially Carmine Color. In that journey, he visited producing lines of Christian Hansen Factories and then listened the explanations of managers of the different parts of the company. The managers of this great factory explained the 150 years of history for producing natural colors and starters and its equipped laboratory for specification of colorful spectrum, that is unique in its kind and also the production process of Carmine Color from RM which is obtained from South American farms (especially in Peru).

Also, preparation for establishing representation of Halalworld was provided in Denmark for answering to the applicants of Halalworld Certification and then the center’s liaison in Copenhagen introduced. Discussion with International Marketing Manager of Denmark Industries House was another plan of his travelling. Executive Manager of ICRIC presented a report of competition among food, pharmaceutics, cosmetics and hygienic industries of different countries for entering to the estimated about 2 billion dollars Halal trade and also he explained about the necessity of familiarizing of Denmark industries owners with the importance of Halal and the entrance procedures to this trade. Dr. Fakhari proposed a conference with cooperation of ICRIC for producers and merchants of Denmark because Denmark is one of the hub exporters of food and pharmaceutical materials and this dialogue can facilitate their trade to the Halal market. This suggestion accepted by Ch. Hansens’ managers and it was agreed totally to be implemented with bilateral cooperation. In this journey, he succeeded to have discussions with religious leader and religious authorities of Islamic organizations. After Dr. Fakhari’s consultation and explanations about the achievements on OIC Halal Food Standard in COMCEC, they emphasized on necessity of unification in confirming the Halal certification of Denmark’s Muslims Foods by a scientific and credible center. It was assigned that Denmark’s Islamic Religious Organizations will cooperate in this field.
Simultaneously with The First International Halal Fair and Forum in Iran, Halal magazine No. 4 (Persian) and magazine No. 5 (English) was published. Trade Chambers of Islamic Countries and also Scientific and Research Centers can receive this magazine from IC-RIC. Here are some topics of the issues in this magazine:

* World Homotonousness on Halal

* A Fulfilled Idea: Holding an International Forum on Halal

* Halal in Trade World and its role in establishing common markets

* Halal Companies with Global Halal Certification

* Memorandum of Understanding on Halal

* The necessity of compiling Halal teaching plans in universities and teaching centers

* The hot food
Halal, The axis Discussion between New Zealand & ICRIC

H.E. Brayan Sanders the Ambassador of New Zealand in I.R. of Iran with Mr. Heath Fisher, the First Secretary of the Embassy, in a meeting with the managers of ICRIC emphasized about the importance of Halal for the government of New Zealand for the right and easy exportation of its meat and protein productions to Islamic Countries without any problem.

They expressed their happiness for finalization of the OIC Halal Food Standard in the 26th COMCEC Session in Turkey and said that the variability of procedures, criterions and activity of different Halal organizations made difficulty for them. They appreciated ICRIC for its role in preparation and cooperation in finalizing unit standard and common standard and said: New Zealand Government is ready to use this standard after being finalized as the main source of Halal control and standard in Ministry of Agriculture.

In this meeting Dr. Abdolhossein Fakhari, Executive Manager of ICRIC, expressed ICRIC’s readiness for presenting consultation to New Zealand and other Oceanic Countries. He announced about the presence of "Oceania Research and Business Development Bureau" which is under ICRIC’s supervision in near future. This issue was welcomed by New Zealand Ambassador.

The other issue of discussion was further inauguration of exporting of New Zealand’s meat to Iran. In this direction Mr. Sanders declared that the hygienic protocol will be signed between two countries in near future. He hoped that after 2 decades of meat export suspension the ground of further export of New Zealand products will be resumed like the first decade of the Islamic Revolution of Iran.

Also he asked to have a meeting with Dr. Nahavandian, the President of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM) soon.

Mr. Hasan Fakheri, the Consultant of President’s Chamber, has promised to follow his request.
## Halal Food Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Halal Food Act</th>
<th>Halal Food Enforcement Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australia</td>
<td>The Export Meat Orders under the Export Control Act 1982</td>
<td>Australia Quarantine Inspection System (AQIS) in cooperation with the Islamic Bodies in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indonesia</td>
<td>Food Law No.7/1996:30,33,34; Food Labelling &amp; Advertisement Regulation (Government Regulation No. 69, 1999) 10, 11; Consumer’s Protection Law: No.8/1999: 8(h) and Decree of Minister of Health: KepMen Kes RI No. 24/Men Kes/ SK/VIII/1996</td>
<td>Majlis Ulama Indonesia (MUI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Malaysia</td>
<td>Trade Description Order (Usage of Expression “Halal”) 1975 – under the provision of Section 10, Trade Description Act 1972 Trade Description Order (Marking of Food) 1975 – under the provision of Section 11, Trade Description Act 1972, Ministry of Domestic Affairs and Consumer Affairs (KPDN)</td>
<td>Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Singapore</td>
<td>Administration of Muslim Law Act (AMLA) 88A</td>
<td>Majlis Ugama Islam Singapura (MUIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thailand</td>
<td>Administration of Organizations of the Islamic ACT (the AOI ACT)</td>
<td>Central Islamic Committee of Thailand (CICOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. United States of America</td>
<td>The Halal Food Act in 6 States: New Jersey, Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, California, Texas</td>
<td>The 6 State Governments and Islamic Bodies in USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Halal Certification Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Halal Food Certification Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australia</td>
<td>Islamic Coordinating Council of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indonesia</td>
<td>The Indonesian Council of Ulama (MUI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Malaysia</td>
<td>Department of Islamic Development Malaysia (JAKIM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Zealand</td>
<td>New Zealand Islamic Meat Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Singapore</td>
<td>Islamic Council of Singapore (MUIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thailand</td>
<td>The Central Islamic Committee of Thailand (CICOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. United States of America</td>
<td>Islamic Food and Nutrition Council of America (IFANCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Establishment of Trade Holdings on Halal Trade

Mr. Abderrazak Louati
Advisor to the CEO for Special Projects
Islamic Corporation for Development of Private Sector (ICD)
IDB Group

First he talked about the organization of IDB and its global vision, that is the development organization created by Islamic countries to assist the development of these countries, ICD has the leading role in Islamic finance industries in the world and here you can make the parallel Halal food industry all the infrastructure of the organization now taking care of the Islamic finance, the guidelines, the procedures, the accounting, the arbiters, the rating, etc. All of these organizations are initiated by IDB. We continue to work on this aspect to on vaghf, etc on sharia boards, how to organize that because now each company has its organization board, should we have an umbrella for all the industrial Islamic finance, etc, IDB has this rule to look at this aspect and to propose solution to the participants industries, we also take care about economic integration and the cross country partnership.

The third point which he mentioned was that IDB is playing a role in all aspects of Islamic countries and establishing the committees working on them, to go over through the difficulties of the food security crisis. Among the organization of IDB, there are mainly 3 affiliates:

1. ITFC was created to help the trade financing.
2. ISEC
   And insurance coverage especially for political risk for investment export.
3. ICD to make its symbol which is the Islamic IFC. We are here to finance all private sector projects, in member countries, the member countries of IDB group or OIC countries, then we can finance a cement plant in Pakistan, or a sugar refinery in Senegal or a bank in Mauritania, any private sector which is sustainable and with profitability. We are here to finance all private sector projects. ICD was created ten years ago, with an authorized capital of 2000 billion of 48 member countries. We financed about 1500 projects during the last 10 years. The vision of ICD is to be a major player in development and promotion of the private sector as the vehicle of economics social growth and prosperity in Islamic countries and the mission is to complement a role laid by IDB through providing Islamic financial services, products, promoting competition in member countries, encouraging cross border investments. In brief, ICD is the stop shop for client focused dynamic Islamic Shariah, compatible products and the responsour services using our reach network we had clients and potential clients access due global business, and investment, opportunities in this regard we created a new working group then the name is figh.

Which is a glare, were inventors and businessman can come and to discuss, to each other, to create ideas of project and with follow up of ICD to help this project to be developed to promote to the finance. We invest in all the projects, which have development impact and with profitability and sustainability more than manufacturing, information technology, health, education, financial industries, agriculture, pharmacy, transportation, etc. What will interest you as business groups, is how to apply and what can you have from ICD. The eligibility of company which apply should be a private sector company or company under privatization integrity.
Halalworld Brand” in Austria Chamber of Commerce

In a meeting with Carl Hartlb, Vice General Secretary of Austria Chamber of Commerce, Executive Manager of ICRIC while introducing “Halalworld Brand” emphasized the importance of this brand for entering Austrian food industries to Islamic Countries Markets. He also suggested that the Austria Chamber of Commerce to hold a seminar with this subject for the authorities of Austrian Industries. Mr. Hartlb welcomed and accepted this suggestion and added:

“I have already heard about Halal Brand but with this explanations, but I came to know that Austria Chamber of Commerce has to take some measurement that Austrian factories can export their products with Halalworld Brand to Islamic countries. He also declared the readiness of Chamber of Commerce to hold a seminar in Autumn. Mr. Zigmund Nehmati, Director of the East Asia and Iran in Austria Chamber, has been chosen to follow this issue and he also asked ICRIC to establish an office in Austria to answer the questions of the Austrian Industries.

Awarding Halal English magazine to Malaysian Officials

In the fringe of the 6th Malaysia International Halal Exhibition (MIHAS) and scientific conference on “World Halal Research”, copies of the English Halal magazine of ICRIC which consisted of Halalworld Standard according to “Common Bases of all Islamic Mithabs”, gathered by ICRIC, presented to Prime Minister of Malaysia, Najib AbdulRazagh and Minister of Islamic communications, Prime Minister’s wife, and the professors participants in this conference. They have been asked to present their views on this standard which prepared for the first time.
The 6th Malaysia International Halal Exhibition (MIHAS)

In the 6TH International Halal Exhibition which was celebrated on 6th till 10th May 2009, in Kuala Lumpur, by MIHAS and the support of Matrid Exhibition Center, about 600 companies from different countries were presented their Halal products and services. Except food products other services such as cosmetics and hygienic, banking, investment and transportation were presented.

In the official opening ceremony, the Minister of International Trade and Industry of Malaysia, gave a report of Halal trade in the world and Malaysia, then the new prime Minister of Malaysia Najib Abdulrazagh, declared about the development of Halal trade and the role of Malaysia in this filed. This exhibition that has been held in Malaysia for some years is an opportunity for this country to introduce Malaysia as an Islamic country having an axial role in Halal trade.

Halal in discussion with Secretary General of the Council of Religions in Switzerland

The council composed of representatives of the religions of Islam, Christians, Jews and it was established in 2006 and its duty is the promotion of cooperation among the religions in the filed of common interests for understanding and coexistence of the followers of religions living in Switzerland.

Mr. Tomas Vypf the head of the Protestant Christian Council who is now the periodic head of “Swiss Council of Religions” introduced the council and listed some of the issues of the council activities especially in confronting extremist groups against religions and said that this council meets the President twice a year to discuss their problems.

Executive Manager of ICRIC while explaining the importance of “Halal” in Muslim’s life, enumerated ICRIC’s activities in this direction (for unifying standard of different Islamic Madhhab’s) suggested that the Council of Religions in cooperation with ICRIC can begin the research on commons concepts in religions around the topic of food and for this work can hold a seminar for presenting scientific articles to the experts of religious so that this practical step will cause better understanding and proximity between followers of religions. This suggestion was welcomed by him and assigned to discuss and pursue that in the Council of Religions.
Visiting of the Central Office of Switzerland Muslims

Executive manager of ICRIC visited the Central Office of Switzerland Muslims in Bern which is one of the subordinate centers of CEUSS (Organization of Coordination of Switzerland Islamic Institutions) and includes mosque, religious training center and women Muslim activity center (Dar-ul noor). Sheikh Ahmed Omar, clergy who leads daily prayers, explained about history of establishment of Halal center in Switzerland and declared that ICRIC's initiatives in compiling Halal Food Standards according to Common Bases of all Islamic Madhhabes are the best solution to universalize Halal Brand. Concerning the presence of 60 nations and nationalities who are living in Switzerland, he suggested that CEUSS Center which is the representative of all Muslims in Switzerland follows the issue of Halalworld as its representative there.

Halalworld Brand in Switzerland

In a meeting with the Director of CEUSS (Organization of Coordination of Switzerland Islamic Institutions of three hundreds centers, Islamic councils and institutes), the Executive Manager of ICRIC introduced ICRIC’s projects, especially the success of “Halalworld Brand”. They expressed their satisfaction of “Halalworld Brand” which has been prepared according the common Islamic regulations of Islamic Religious Branches and they agreed that with regard to the different nations and nationalities in Europe, this common standard will be very useful. The Director of CEUSS declared the request of being the representative of “Halalworld “in Europe, especially in Switzerland. It was assigned that the necessary studies to implement this request will be followed by two sides and a MOU will be signed in near future.
"Halal" Trade in the Session of Iran & Turkey Merchants in Ankara

The meeting of the Development of Commercial Relations and Investment among Iran and Turkey held with Trade Ministers of two countries and responsible authorities in bank affairs, insurance, custom, and trade development in two countries and 180 Iranian merchants and artisan and also Turkey industrial activists, with joint efforts of Iran Chamber of Commerce Industries and Mines and the Organization of Trade Development in Hotel Crown Plaza, Turkey.

Two ministers emphasized the necessity to find opportunities for trade of Halal productions and cooperation in this filed.

In this session, a copy of English Halal magazine which included “Global Standards on Halal food according to Bases of all Islamic Madhhab” was presented to Mr. Koorshad Touzman (Turkey Trade Minister) and Mr. Msoud Mirzazemei (Iran Trade Minister) by Executive Manager of ICRC and he explained this important step will improve Halal-world production trade. Both ministers welcomed the idea and promised to support this effort.

Halalworld Brand in the Second Conference of Turkey Food and Halal Certification

Second Conference on Halal Food was held in Istanbul on 25-26 April 2009. Executive Manager of ICRC from Iran, also deputy and advisor of the Organization of Standard and Industrial Research from Iran were presented.

In this conference which was held by effort of the Institution of Halal Products Research Institute of GIMDES from Turkey, about 20 Halal centers from different countries have been attended and lecturers from Indonesia, America, Malaysia, Australia, Kazakhstan, Turkey and etc., were speaking about importance of Halal trade, criteria and standards for audiences and then answered to the questions.

In this meeting, the necessity of a global and common standard for Halal productions was stressed and then the representative of Halalworld Brand in Turkey, Dr. Zehforoosh, distributed HalaL Magazine among attendees in conference and announced that ICRC with the grace of God and for the first time has been able to prepare Global Standard on Halal Food according to Common Bases of all Islamic Madhhab which prepared in Halal English Magazine. He added that all Halal institution in the world with the permission of ICRC can use it. This matter brought happiness among the attendees and it was determined that the centers be in contact and coordination with ICRC to perform this Global Standard everywhere.
Meeting and Discussion with SMIDEC’s Managers

Following a meeting with managers from SMIDEC center and Executive manager of ICRIC in Tehran, another meeting held with the managers of Small and Medium Industry Development Company (SMIDEC) in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. In this meeting, they discussed about the ways of cooperation in Halal industry and also cooperation and informing about Malaysia Small and Medium Industry Company with Halal projects and also with the OIC Networking SME Agencies. ONSA, of ICRIC was discussed and decided to continue bilateral cooperation in this filed.

Meeting and Discussion with Malaysia Halal’s Managers

In a meeting with Executive Manager of ICRIC and the managers of Halal Industry Development Corporation (HDC) which was done by the cooperation of Malaysia Small and Medium Industry Development Company (SMIDEC), they discussed about existing problems in united Halal Brand in Islamic World and ICRIC’s suggestion regarding a united Halal Brand according to “Common Bases of all Islamic Branches”. A MOU will be signed in this filed between HDC and ICRIC in the future.
Visiting of “Research Institute of Halal Productions”

Professor Yaakov Bin Che Man (the Head of Research Institute of Halal Production of Putra University of Malaysia (UPM) invited the Executive Manager of ICRIC. Executive Manager of ICRIC visited this institute and its equipped Halal laboratory on 6/5/2009 in Putrajaya, Malaysia and made familiar with the methods of examinations related to Halal which has been done by professors and students. Dr. Yaakov stated that students of M.S and P.H.D from different nationalities are studying Halal subjects in this institute. They talked also about the necessity of a United Halal Brand according to “Common Bases of all Islamic Madhhabs” and professor Yaakov agreed upon this idea.

Cooperation with two exhibitions in China

In a meeting with Dr. Jang v, the Head of the Development of China International Trade, and his accompanying delegation consisting of some of the owners of Chinese industries and trade managers with the Executive Manager of ICRIC, emphasized on necessity of world Halal brand and certification for exporting food products, pharmaceutical, hygienic and cosmetics of China to Islamic countries and the position of ICRIC in management of International Halal Brand. Also he informed the Chinese delegation about the agreements among Ninshia and Yinchoan Province with ICRIC and announced ICRIC’s readiness for signing MOU with other provinces. Dr. Jang while approving this issue, explained the initiatives for holding two international Halal exhibitions in Shening and Yinchoan within ten days and invited Iranian producers to presence these exhibitions.
WorldHalal Brand in the 2nd Forum of Tourism in Islamic Countries in Kish Island

The meeting regarding the achievements of the 3rd International Conference on Investment and Privatization and 2nd Forum of Tourism in Islamic Countries was held in ICCIM with the attendance of Head of ICCIM, Managing Director of Kish Free Trade Zone Organization, Deputy Head of Iran's Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism Organization, Managing Director of Iranian Privatization Organization and a group of managers from the private sector. According to the report of ICCIM Public Relations; Head of ICCIM, "Mohammad Nahavandian" pointed to the importance of these two seminars, noting that these seminars show a practical group cooperation and coordination of the private sector in this movement.

Emphasizing on the promotion of regional cooperation after the global economic crisis, he said the countries in the region should give priority to regional cooperation and Islamic countries should establish closer relationship in this regard. He also added if Islamic countries want to achieve their goals they should develop their cooperation in the economic sector and pay more attention to long-term joint investments. Executive Director of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center, "Abdolhossein Fakhr" expressed that Halal brand is being used in Iran and in some European and Eastern Asian countries and it is for the first time that Halal food is being packaged with the acceptance of all Islamic schools.

Signing a MOU between Halal world and Ministry Of Health

The First MOU between the Ministry of Health Treatment and Medical Education and ICRIC on Halal World issues was signed between Dr. Dinarvand, Deputy of Food and Medicine of Ministry of Health and Dr. Nahavandian, Director of Islamic Chamber of Research and Information Center in the following topics of cooperation:

1. Expert and scientific cooperation on assessment process of producing Halal foods, Pharmaceutical, Cosmetic and Hygienic Products.
2. Cooperation on Halal assessment of Imported goods to the country.
3. Cooperation on inserting Halal brand on exported and Imported products to the country.
4. Cooperation on holding conferences on Training Scientific Professional in the field of Halal. Experts also, ICRIC has committed to consider viewpoints of Deputy of Food and Medicine in Halal certification granting process, and to use their experts in assessments inside and outside the Country.

In the forth part of this agreement has written:

"According to this agreement, Halal certificate, issued by ICRIC for Domestic Products is known as accredited by Deputy of Food and Medicine of Ministry of Health Treatment and Medical Education and inserting Particular brand of ICRIC will be necessary on these products. Also, the Ministry providing assistance to ICRIC, in development and scientific and laboratorial assessments."
Halal World in New Zealand

New Zealand is one of the most important producers of meat and dairy productions to the different parts of the world among them Islamic countries. For this reason this country is a familiar name for the Muslims. This trade interaction has been caused that since 3 past decades, most of slaughter house engaged slaughtering according to Islamic laws regulations. For the permanent assessment of this processes and also dairy productions according to Halal World Standards and the necessity of unification of Halal brands certifying bodies which are active in this country, travelling to New Zealand and discussing with authorities and industrial actives was planned and came in to implementation.

Dr. Fakharl, Executive manager of ICRIC has travelled to New Zealand and he had the meetings with the Manager of NZFSA (New Zealand Food Safety Authority) and economic authorities of New Zealand Foreign Affairs Ministry. He has been succeeded to explain them about the importance and the observance of Halalworld standard. He added that this standard was approved recently by Islamic countries and ICRIC is designed of pursuing of implementing Halalworld certification in different countries. This subject was welcomed by them not only from the structure of hygiene controls but also from the trade development and they demanded expanding relation with ICRIC.

Separate visits have done in Wellington and Auckland (political and commercial capital of New Zealand), Chamber of Commerce of Auckland, Responsible of Meat Industry Association (MIA) and Fish Industry Council of New Zealand, New Zealand and Middle East Trade Council, representative of investors group of New Zealand (who are interested in investment in Halal projects in Islamic countries). After each meeting they declared their interests to be present in Halal market by ICRIC’s consulting of its experts. It was agreed that Al- Rasoul Company (ICRICs’ Halal delegation in Oceanic Area) to be the liaison between two parts. Al- Rasoul Company is a non-governmental non-profit organization in New Zealand, as ICRIC’s representative in Halal issues that, present consultation services to industrial organizations and enterprises in the region.

A visiting was done of the well equipped and industrial abattoir, Green Lee, in the industrial city of Hamilton (120 KM from Auckland) that slaughters animals by Islamic religious laws. In this meeting, they assigned that proposed changes for completion of Halal process will be presented to them. It is clear that ICRIC took an effective step with this journey towards the Halal development in Oceanic Region.
Halal World Brand in Europe

The First awarding ceremony of Halal Brand in Europe was being held in Vienna, capital of Austria, on January 14, 2010 in auditorium of Radisson Hotel. Dr. Nahavandian, the Head of Islamic Chamber of Research and Information Center (ICRIC) and the Head of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM), H.E the Ambassador of Islamic Republic of Iran, Austria Ambassador in Iran and a group of official authorities of two countries, managements from Ottakringer Brewery Company and Kilos Food Industries Complex, were presented in this ceremony. First, the ambassadors of two countries expressed important subjects on promoting of economical relations, friendship background and the old cooperation between two countries. Then Dr. Nahavandian emphasized to the economical managers attention to the bilateral advantage of two countries in the economical scope away from political challenges. He was pointing to the subject of Halal Trade as a path for cooperation of Islamic world with other countries.

The presence of food, pharmaceutical, cosmetics and hygienic producers and also Halal issue in services such as: hoteling, catering, banking and even manufacturing of machinery tools according to defined standards of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), which was finalized recently in COMCEC, will attract a noticeable share of extensive Halal trade from non-Muslim countries. At the end of this ceremony, Halal certification of those two important companies was awarded by the Head of ICRIC. Kilos Food Industries Complex from Iran and Ottakringer Brewery Company are producing "barely water" beverage with high standard and without alcohol.

Halal World Introduction in Denmark

Denmark is one of the major exporters of food products to the world and since "Halal" brand is a kind of permission of these products for Muslims. Therefore this country should be familiar with the process of receiving Halal certificate and its standard for these products.

Dr. Nahavandian the Head of Islamic Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines discussed about "Halal" in different meetings with the authorities of Denmark Chamber, Denmark Industries Confederation, Deputy of Foreign Ministry, the Head of Denmark Trade Council, the Directors of Middle East, international affairs and also industrial activists of this country. He informed about necessities and the process of joining to Halal and he has also emphasized about holding the First International Halal Fair and Forum in Tehran on March 2-5, 2010 which is an opportunity for presenting of Denmark Companies in this Exhibition. He also invited Denmark Companies to present in this event.
Cooperation of ECO Members on "Halal"

Dr. Nahavandian, the head of Iran Chamber of Commerce, Industries and Mines (ICCIM) and the head of Islamic Chamber of Research and Information Center (ICRIC) attended in the 10th General Assembly and 13th Executive Committee Meetings of ECO Chamber of Commerce and Industry on December 23-24, 2009 in Istanbul, Turkey. In the meetings and discussions he spoke about the importance of the "Halal" issue and he evaluated the achievements on compiling "Halal Food Standard" in COMCEC meetings of the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) with the presence of representatives of standard organizations of 30 Islamic countries in Turkey. He appreciated the role of Iran and Turkey in fulfillment of this event.

Also, he has invited the heads of ECO's chambers to participate actively in the First International Halal Fair and Forum which will be held on March 2-5, 2010 in Tehran to take the advantages of the opportunity of holding this kind of exhibitions and forums to develop Halal trade and knowledge. In this meeting, posters and brochures of the Exhibition and Forum were distributed and the heads of ECO's Chambers promised for all kinds of cooperation.

Halal World Brand in Cyprus

The first applicant food producer companies of Halal world brand in Cyprus were audited by experts and assessors of ICIRC. During a journey on Wednesday to Cyprus Dr. Karsali, member of the Board of Director of ICIRC and Dr. Zehforoosh, representative of Halal World in Turkey visited producing processes of cheese and dairy products of two factories MERIC and AKGOL and discussed with their product managers about producing processes and additives. It was assigned that in case of being qualified of these factories for receiving Halal certification; these certificates will be award during a ceremony simultaneously with the First International Halal Fair and Forum in Tehran.
الموضوع: رسالة تذكير لتسجيل نطاقات 

الמשך: 2023/02

نادي عالمي

المرسل: نادي عالمي

المرسلة: له التوقيع

لا يزال هناك نطاقة من شركة ICANN لا تزال غير مسجلة بشكل صحيح. نتمنى أن تقوم بتسجيل النطاقات بشكل صحيح.

المرسل: نادي عالمي

لا يزال هناك نطاقة من شركة ICANN لا تزال غير مسجلة بشكل صحيح. نتمنى أن تقوم بتسجيل النطاقات بشكل صحيح.

المرسل: نادي عالمي

لا يزال هناك نطاقة من شركة ICANN لا تزال غير مسجلة بشكل صحيح. نتمنى أن تقوم بتسجيل النطاقات بشكل صحيح.

المرسل: نادي عالمي

لا يزال هناك نطاقة من شركة ICANN لا تزال غير مسجلة بشكل صحيح. نتمنى أن تقوم بتسجيل النطاقات بشكل صحيح.

المرسل: نادي عالمي

لا يزال هناك نطاقة من شركة ICANN لا تزال غير مسجلة بشكل صحيح. نتمنى أن تقوم بتسجيل النطاقات بشكل صحيح.
To:
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the ECO Cultural Institute (ECI) fully supports the application for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the President, I confirm that I have the authority of ECI to be writing to you on this matter.

ECO Cultural Institute (ECI) is affiliated with The Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) and aims at fostering understanding and the preservation of the rich cultural heritage of its members through common projects in the field of the media, literature, art, philosophy, sport and education.

ECI believes that these gTLDs will be used as the internet base for the presence of the Muslim Community and their beliefs in the countries of the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO).

Hojatollah Ayoubi
President
ECO Cultural Institute
The Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) is an intergovernmental organization involving seven Asian and three Eurasian nations, part of the South-central Asian Union. It provides a platform to discuss ways to improve development and promote trade, and investment opportunities. The ECO is an ad hoc organization under the United Nations Charter (Chap. VIII). The common objective is to establish a single market for goods and services, much like the European Union. ECO’s secretariat and cultural department are located in Tehran, its economic bureau is in Turkey and its scientific bureau is situated in Pakistan. The organization's population is 416,046,863 and the area is 8,620,697 km². The organization was founded by Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.

Introduction

Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), is an intergovernmental regional organization established in 1985 by Iran, Pakistan and Turkey for the purpose of promoting economic, technical and cultural cooperation among the Member States.

ECO is the successor organization of Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD) which remained in existence since 1964 up to 1979.

In 1992, the Organization was expanded to include seven new members, namely: Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Republic of Azerbaijan, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Republic of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan. The date of the Organization’s expansion to its present strength, 28th November, is being observed as the ECO Day.
The ECO region is full of bright trading prospects. Despite its young age, ECO has developed into a thriving regional organization. Its international stature is growing. Nevertheless, the organization faces daunting challenges with respect to realization of its objectives and goals. Most importantly, the region is lacking in appropriate infrastructure and institutions which the Organization is seeking to develop, on priority basis, to make full use of the available resources in the region.

Over the past 12 years the member states have been collaborating to accelerate the pace of regional development through their common endeavors. Besides shared cultural and historic affinities, they have been able to use the existing infrastructural and business links to further fortify their resolve to transfer their hopes and aspirations into a tangible reality. ECO has embarked on several projects in priority sectors of its cooperation including energy, trade, transportation, and agriculture and drug control.

**Current Membership:** Islamic State of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan Republic, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan

**Finance Source:** Member contributions.

**Language:** English.

**Key Executive:** Secretary General.

**Secretariat Staff:** International staff of the General Secretariat of ECO includes the Secretary General, 3 deputy secretaries general, 6 directors, 3 assistant directors and other professionals and technical, administrative and support personnel. The total number of staff is over 60.

**Regional institutions & Specialized agencies**

- ECO Shipping Company
- ECO Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- ECO Reinsurance Company[6]
- ECO Trade & Development Bank
- ECO Consultancy & Engineering Company
- ECO Supreme Audit Institutions
- ECO Cultural Institute
- ECO Science Foundation
- ECO Educational Institute
- ECO Drug Control Coordination Unit
- ECO Trade promotion Unit
- ECO Post
Rules & Regulations: The ECO cultural Institute (ECI), Tehran is governed by the approved Rules of Procedures, Staff Regulations & Financial Regulations based on the features contained in the Basic Documents of the Institute i.e., Charter, signed by the eight Member States on 15th March, 1995 at Islamabad, Pakistan.

Background of Establishment: The ECO Cultural Institute, as mentioned in the Preamble of the Charter, has been ‘revitalized’ after the closure of the former RCD Cultural Institute in 1983 which had been established in June, 1966 with its headquarters at Tehran and branches in Pakistan and Turkey. Following the expansion of ECO (Economic Cooperation Organization) to ten Member States of the Region having a common cultural heritage, revival of the cultural Institute was visualized in Article II of the Treaty of Izmir with the objective “to consolidate cultural affinities and spiritual and fraternal ties that bind the people of the Member States through social and cultural channels of thought and action” and was confirmed in the Istanbul Declaration of 1993. Subsequently, the Charter of the ECO Cultural Institute was prepared in an Expert Group Meeting held at Tehran in October 1994 and later, approved by the Fifth Meeting of the ECO Council of Ministers in Ashgabat, Turkmenistan on 21-23 January, 1995.

The formal endorsement of the revival of the Cultural Institute under its present name was finally manifested through the signing of its Charter at the Third ECO summit Meeting held at Islamabad on 14-15 March, 1995 by the Member countries of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, Republic of Azerbaijan, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, and Turkmenistan. This event demonstrated the common resolve and true desire of the leadership of these countries to strengthen bonds of affinity and spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation aimed at creating conditions for sustained socio-economic welfare of the Member Countries.
Compared to its predecessor, the ECO Cultural Institute, has not only an extended membership but it has also been assigned a wide ranging role for the promotion of cooperation among peoples of the Region in general and mass media, scholars, intellectuals and artists in particular.

**Aims and Functions:** Having been assigned manifold functions, under Article I of the Charter, the Institute has to function as an initiating, coordinating, financing, and monitoring agency within the framework of ECO for the promotion of the following activities:

**Brief Introduction of ECI**

Recognizing the importance of ECO cultural heritage and its impact on enrichment and development of cooperation in all aspects in the region, the Member States of ECO decided to revive the former RCD Cultural Institute under the name of ECO Cultural Institute during the third ECO Summit Meeting held in Islamabad in March 1995. The headquarters of the Institute are located in Tehran. A President heads the Institute. The management of the affairs of the Institute vests in an Executive Director who shall be assisted by Cultural Experts in different fields from the nationals of the Member States.

It is the only functional entity amongst the ECO Specialized Agencies. Its Charter is ratified by Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan and Tajikistan. Revision & updating the Basic Document has been finalized and Institute is governed by the approved Rules of Procedure, Staff & Financial Regulations. Its 2nd Board of Trustees meeting was held in Tehran in January 2000 approved the official Seal and Emblem of the Institute.

It has carried out translation of 42 children storybooks with the cooperation of UNESCO. It has also circulated its “Long Term Plan” for views of the Member States. The plan is likely to take effect from the year 2003.

ECO Culture Institute is fully functional and carrying out its responsibilities. It is time to convene the 3rd meeting of its Board of Trustees to take decision on some important pending matters like the election of its President.

**Further information about the ECI activities can be obtained from Website:** [www.ecieco.org](http://www.ecieco.org)
Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

Dear Manager,

This letter is to confirm that I, Mr. Mehrabov Mirzakhan, fully support the application for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Edgesayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles. This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

Mr. Mehrabov Mirzakhan,
DIRECTOR OF MUSLIM RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY “AHL AL-BEIT”

MINSK
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way, 
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, Rasheed Ahmad Chughtai, fully support the application for ISLAM. The application for ISLAM. Internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT Systems and Taj Marketing Services Ltd in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for interfaith and IEO purposes, i.e., the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects and general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

President of IUC

Dated: 2012-08-04  
Ref: IUC/ICANN
To: ICANN  
5600 Lindon Ave, Ste 350  
Lindon, UT 84042  

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that the Islamic Centre in Hamburg fully supports the application for an Islamic Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Axis Greco IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. in the new gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for principles of Rounding i.e. the match of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles. This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievements for both authorities and believers of all religions.

Your Sincerely,

Dr. Reza Ramazani
Director of the Islamic Centre Hamburg
ICANN
Suite 330 - 457 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey - CA. 90292
USA
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Objet: la mise en place de l'extension générique : « islam »

Madame, Monsieur,

Je soussigné [nom de l'association], déclare apporter mon soutien total et onler à la demande de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM pour l'activation d'un nom de domaine générique de premier niveau appelé couramment TOP LEVEL DOMAIN (TLD) : « islam » remise à la société ICANN aux États-Unis d'Amérique.

Je tient également à confirmer que la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM vise à mettre en place une communication plus étroite entre les pratiquants et adeptes des différentes confessions et religions à travers le monde et valoriser ainsi la circulation des informations entre ces derniers et œuvrer pour le rapprochement des religions monothéistes.

Favoriser l'activité de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM, permettrait en réalité d'établir un canal de communication entre les responsables et les adeptes de toutes les confessions en vue de promouvoir la culture du dialogue et d'échanges interculturels.

Dans l'attente de votre réponse que j'espère favorable, je vous prie d'agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Fait à Paris, le 31/10/2012

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that Islamic Center in Brazil fully supports the application for .ISLAM internet top level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisiyar San. Ve Tic. Ltd Siti in the New gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Islamic Centre in Brazil

Nasreddin Kharraji
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676, Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that Islamic Institution Arresala fully support the application for .ISLAM Internet top level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgiyaver San. Ve Tic. Ltd Ssi in the New gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

Islamic Institution Arresala
Sheikh Taleb Al-Khaled
ICANN
Suite 330 – 467 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey - CA, 90292
USA
Attention : New gTLD Evaluation Process

Objet : la mise en place de l’extension générique : « Islam »

Madame, Monsieur,

Je soussigné Mohamad Nasereddine, déclare apporter mon soutien total et entier à la demande de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM pour l’activation d’un nom de domaine générique de premier niveau appelé couramment TOP LEVEL DOMAIN (TLD) : « Islam » remise à la société ICANN aux États-Unis d’Amérique.

Je tiens également à confirmer que la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM vise à mettre en place une communication plus étroite entre les pratiquants et adeptes des différentes confessions et religions à travers le monde et valoriser ainsi la circulation des informations entre ces derniers et œuvrer pour le rapprochement des religions monotheistes.

Favoriser l’activité de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM permettrait en réalité d’établir un canal de communication entre les responsables et les adeptes de toutes les confessions en vue de promouvoir la culture du dialogue et d’échanges interculturels.

Dans l’attente de votre réponse que j’espère favorable, je vous prie d’accorder, Madame, Monsieur, l’assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Fait à Paris, le

Mohamad Nasereddine
Président de
L’association Culturelle Musulmane de Paris
11 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Sayın Yetkili,

Konu: .HALAL için Destek Mektubu

Aras Der. olarak, bu mektupla Yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde, Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Şti’ın .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üste Seviye Alan Adı) için ICANN’a yapmış olduğu başvuruyu destekliyoruz.

İnternet dünyasını yenilikler getirecek olan Top Level Domain Names çalışmalarından dolayı ICANN’a teşekkür ediyoruz. Bu program çerçevesinde başarını ulaşmasını beklediğimiz gTLD sisteminin İnternet dünyasına sağlayacağı katkıları heyecanla bekliyoruz.

Saygılarımıza

[İmzalar]

Aksemsettin Mah. Sarıgüzel cad. No:56/2 Fatih – İstanbul
Tel: (+90)212.523.46.15
Aras Justice, Freedom and Solidarity Association

Established in 2012 in Istanbul.

As a Non-government and non-profit organization, Aras’s mission is to support victims and protect their rights and help them to solve their problems. And creating public awareness in order to uphold political freedom and prevent inhumane conduct.

For this reason, Aras organizes panels, Symposia and conferences in Turkey and Azerbaijan. Aras is keep public informed through the release of periodicals, press releases. Aras makes use of the internet, as well as radio and TV broadcasts preparing, organizing contests, demonstrations, dinners and evening performances.

Apart from these, Aras finances scholarships for poor students and opens the student dormitory.

Website: http://www.arasbulten.org
الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لروم تسجيل ISLAM

صحة تمهيداً ويبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييداً على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للعهم: "HALAL. ISLAM"

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكاننا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمكنه أن تكون إجابات الناقد واستقبالهم الواضح في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أساليبهم المذهبة، فترى بينهم ويفهم من جدته طرفهم الدقيق، من خلال لمسة حسابي العالم الذي ينتج عنها "فما" وأفكرونا "بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعهم يكون لها إعجابهم بالإيجابية الإيجابية العالمية.

نسألكم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
11 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Sayın Yetkili,

Konu: .HALAL için Destek Mektubu

Beyan Kültür Merkezi, bu mektupla Yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde, Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Şti’nin .ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üste Seviye Alan Adı) için ICANN’a yaptığını başvuruyu desteklediğini belirtir.

Beyan Kültür Merkezi olarak, farklı kültürlerden insanların birbirlerini daha iyi tanınması noktasında yapılan gTLD programından dolayı ICANN yetkililerine teşekkürlerimizi sunuyoruz. Bir kültür derneği olarak bu programı kültürler bir çalışma olarak değerlendirerekByVersion için, programa katkıda bulunmaktadır memnuniyet duyacağımızı belirtir başarılardır.

Saygılarırmızla

Beyan Kültür Merkezi.

Akşemsettin mah. Şehit Mehmet Sarper Alus Sk. No:30/3 Fatih – İstanbul

Tel: (+90)212.534.11.55
Beyan Cultural Center

Beyan started its activities in 2012 in İstanbul. The main object of the Beyan Cultural Center is to provide better understanding of Islam for Muslims and non-Muslims in Turkey.

Therefore, they organizes such activities as conference, symposium, meetings.
إلى:

ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

( New gTLDs)

الموضوع: رسالة نداً بوضع تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة

( HALAL و ISLAM)

نفهم هذه الرسالة تنوي تعين تأسيس عروض الموافقة للنطاقات HALAL و ISLAM، ونعد على تلبية هذا الطلب للنطاقات HALAL و ISLAM في برنامج ICANN. نحن نعد على تلبية هذا الطلب.

ويصفي التكاليف كما يطلب من ICANN.

هذا الكتاب الكريم.

نتفهم أن أي سلطة لإصدار ملء تلقيها في مجال النطاق والموجب على من قبل ICANN، والعديد من النطاقات TLDs، والتي تعززها تلقيها TLDs من ضمنها النطاقات HALAL و ISLAM.

ويحتج المجتمع المسلم أيضاً للنطاقات، حيث أن السيناريوهات تلعب دوراً كبيراً في تعزيز المجتمع الإسلامي عبر نشاط الإنترنت، وذلك بالإلتقاء على مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإبداع، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاحترام المتبادل الآلي.

شكركم لكم الفرصة الم늑ة لنا التعبير عن ديناً لهذه النطاقات وعزمكم.

بكل إخلاص

الاسم:

التاريخ:
11 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Sayın Yetkili,

Konu: .ISLAM için Destek Mektubu

Kudüs Der. olarak, bu mektupla Yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde, Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Şti’in .ISLAM adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üste Seviye Alan Adı) için ICANN’a yapmış olduğu başvuruyu destekliyoruz.

Dernek olarak son zamanlarda, medyada yer alan Top Level Domain Names ve gTLD ile ilgili haberleri ilgiyle takip ediyoruz. Söz konusu programı düşünmen ve hayata geçirmeye çalışan ICANN’a teşekkür ediyoruz. Bu programın sonuçlanmasıyla birliktede internet dili tek dil olacak ve o dilde kullanıcıların ana dili olacak. Ayrıca, bu programın farklı dinlerin ve farklı mezheplerin takipçilerini birbirlerini daha iyi anlayacaklarını umut ediyoruz.

Saygılarımızla

Kudüs Der.

Kıztaşı Cad. No:43/5 fatih – İstanbul
Tel: (+90)212.523.41.13
Kudüs DER

Founded in 2012, the association's headquarters in Istanbul. The association was founded to help the Palestinian people.

Kudüs DER assistance not only humanitarian aid but also inform Turkish public about Palestinian issue by organizing media conferences, meetings in Turkey.

Website: http://www.kudusdernegi.org.tr
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Iran’s Halal Supreme Council fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

Iran’s Halal Supreme Council is an authorized Certification Body for Halal products and service based on the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Halal food standard.

I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely
Dr. M. Nahavandian
President
14 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Sayın Yetkili,

Konu: ISLAM ve HELAL için Destek Mektubu.

Fatih Akrımları Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Kültür Derneği olarak bu mektuba yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Şti’nin .ISLAM ve HELAL adlı top level domain names (üst seviye alan adları) için ICANN’a yapmış olduğu başvuruyu destekler.

Fatih Akrımları Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Kültür Derneği, kendi bünyesinde gençler, hanımlar ve çocuklar için oluşturmuş komisyonlar gözetiminde, sosyal, kültürel ve sportif faaliyetler yürütmektedir.

Saygılarımda

[Signature]

Adres: Contact Information Redacted
Tel: Contact Information Redacted
Akıncılar Social Solidarity and Cultural Association

Akıncılar social solidarity and cultural association was founded in the 1970s in İstanbul district Fatih.

Akıncılar, aims to meet the needs of those who are suffering poverty or hunger.

**Social Aid:** food aid and organizations during the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner, qurban programs.

**Educational Aid:** delivering school bags, educational sets, and supplementary materials to needy students.

**Website:** [www.fatihakincileri.com](http://www.fatihakincileri.com)
To: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the President of the Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products, I confirm that I have the authority of the Association to be writing to you on this matter.

This association is formed by the support of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center to act as a facilitator of the Halal Trade among Islamic countries.

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Amir Esmaeil Saghafinia
President

www.halalassociation.net E-mail:info@halalassociation.net
August 6, 2012
Suite 330, 4676 Avenida Way, Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I Syed Baqir Sajjad on behalf of my association of journalists covering foreign policy in Pakistan, DCAP, fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bhd/ Carlos S. Ye Tay Ltd Sdn Bhd in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Syed Baqir Sajjad

President
Diplomatic Correspondents Association of Pakistan (DCAP)
&
Foreign affairs and national security correspondent for Dawn

Note: Diplomatic Correspondents Association of Pakistan (DCAP) is the professional body for journalists covering foreign policy issues in Pakistan. Our membership includes the senior editors of Pakistan's media and major international news organizations based in Pakistan. The association stands for the professional interests of the diplomatic press corps here. DCAP advocates open meetings, news media access, freedom of information and the fair distribution of public information.

Address: Dawn Media Group, Zero Point Islamabad
Email: DCAP@journalist.com
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM**

This letter is to confirm that I Rana Ansar Bhatti fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the reach of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Rana Ansar Bhatti
Central Secretary General
Peoples Youth Organization

Dated: 2012-08-05
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676, Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,
Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that BRAZIL HALAL FOODS fully support the application for .ISLAM internet top level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System. Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

BRAZIL HALAL FOODS
Mohammad Hadi Parvaz
Rua (Street) João Reis 211
90501-000 Sao Paulo - SP
Tel: 14.298.488/0001-301
Fax: 14.298.488/0002-303
www.brazilhalalfoods.com.br
www.saoalexhalal.com.br
To: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support to .ISLAM and .HALA TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, [name of the signee] as the representative of [name of the organization] fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALA internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Walid M. Ali
General Director
09/08/2012
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

İnternetsel Sayılar ve İşimler Kurumu / ICANN Müdürlüğüne

Bizler Ehlibeyt Aliimleri Derneği / Ehla-Der olarak internette .halal, .islam uzantılarının kaydedilmesi ve kullanımına olanak sağlaması başvurusunda bulunan, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Şirketinin bu talebinin desteklemektediriz.


Adres: Yenibosna mah. Güneşli Cad. No: 17 Bahçelievler / İstanbul
Tel: 0090 212 515 51 33
Web: www.ehlader.com
e-mail: Contact Information Redacted
Ehlibeyt Alimleri Derneği (Association of Ahlulbayt Scholars) was founded in May 31, 2011 in İstanbul.

The short name is Ehla-Der and the Head Office is in Yenibosna - Istanbul. Currently, 18 people work in Headquarters Building. There are 190 Ahlulbayt Scholar members of the association who work in different cities in Turkey.

The purpose of Ehla-Der is contribute to the spread of social unity and brotherhood in the country. And provide correct information about Ahlulbayt.

Ehla-Der organizes cultural and social activities throughout Turkey.

Website: [http://www.ehlibeytalimleri.com](http://www.ehlibeytalimleri.com)
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way

Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Halal Export Consortium fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the General Secretary of the Halal Export Consortium, I confirm that I have the authority of this Consortium to be writing to you on this matter.

The target of establishing Consortium is to become workable the activists in the field of Halal in HalalWorld member countries and benefiting from a group activity for export capacity building of all producers and exporter of Halal products.

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Kamyar Montaser

Secretary for Founding Staff
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL и .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت لمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتها يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


الإلغاء وصولاً إلى برنامج ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتترب ببينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الsignature

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي "HALAL و .ISLAM"

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلياً نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتمناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: _______________________

التوقيع: ________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسؤولة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتسرب بينهم وتنخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً "بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للمؤسسة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نأمل أن هذا التسجيل يملأ العديد من الإجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتشتت من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "القيم" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

 وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً"قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إتكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونودك جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية، على مختلف إتفاقياتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ما مبروك محمد

التوقيع: [مصدر توقيع]

[عثرة]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج .gTLD الجديد.

ولكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .ISLAM و .HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .ISLAM و .HALAL

الشركة المقدمة من "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكما تقتضى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبة، فتتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


الإضافة إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إтенاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحسن من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي ستوفر فتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقوم بينهم وتعزف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وفكرة" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمرسوم المقدم من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتترقب بينهم وتحتفظ من حدة تطرفهم الدين، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجمع.

الاسم: [الاسم]
التوفيق:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمرشد .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبية، فتتقلب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مثمرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقدير جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [إسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانياتهم المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حالة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إصدار ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيم وفكرة" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ولكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمداداتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحقق من عادة تطويرهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة التواصل المشارك التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:

قبرص حمزة الريحاني
وفقفر. قبرص الحمزة الريحاني 1193
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على
الأُنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في
عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فترغم
بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً
"قيما" وأفكارًا وشراكسة وبناء فعالة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل ISLAM و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى ISLAM و HALAL.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إيماهم المجهريه، فتقترب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما" و "أفكار" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إعحاكاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

تشكركم ونتقد جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التقى:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في:

. HALAL و . ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الجديد

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN

gTLD

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ胴اتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


cالإضافة إلى برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني. من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً مبتكرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونتذكر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

cTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإسلامية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييذ لإدراج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييذنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يتضمن العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبة، فنقرب بينهم ونخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكارا، بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: 

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 1423/14
رئيس الجمعية
21/10/19
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل XLAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي "HALAL و ISLAM" المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أطرافهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا وأفكارًا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

[توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد ل 注册HALAL ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في تطوير الحركة الإسلامية في العالم.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
 إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماؤاتهم المذهبية، فترد بينهم وترتفع من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية hềژية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
[الاسم]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً " بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: _______________________
التاريخ: ____________________

جمعية البيانا الإجتماعية
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت لل👇
المقدمة من شركة: .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا تأكد أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في
عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبي، فتقترب
بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة ال

قواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ____________________
التوقع: ____________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM " Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فتترتب بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لzung تسجيل ISLAM و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فترتب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقا" قيما" وأفكارا" بناء مؤشرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti."

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتفاضاتهم المذهبية، فقترب بينهم وترتفع من حدة تطرفهم الفني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً موثقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ـ غير مكتوب

التوقيع: ـ غير مكتوب
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL и .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنيةهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتكشف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يُكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للهدي.se.HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Stiً إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقترح جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ماهر محمد كبر
التقديع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و.ISLAM:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

to the International .ICANN

للدومي ضمن برنامح .gTLD

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فستكون بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة الالتزام المشترك التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم وننصح جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM المتقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانت ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إفمااراتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسؤولة .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكتنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناواتهم المذهبة، فلتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة اليومن المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً"قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: د. عبد الحليم
التقديم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للنسبي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتنصب بينهم وتفتح من حيث تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيس .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلياً نثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجموعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتلقب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" و أفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة: .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتطلع أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتوفر بينهم وتحدّب من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتطاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاستها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجمع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيء .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتحافظ على جزء متماثل من دينهم، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: 

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 07/ 34
رئيس الجمعية

07/ 10/ 20
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيh .HALAL و.ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتحقق من حصة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم، تكون لها إبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناواتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعفاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [имя]
التوقيع: [подпись]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM:

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف فتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنية المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتكشف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:

جمعية البيان الإسلامية
الإمارات العربية المتحدة
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكما أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي ستوفر فتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتتفرد في بينهم وتهزف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة " Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti " إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتمناهم المذهبية، فتتربع بينهم وتتحف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقا "قيما" وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى برنامج gTLD الجديد ضمن برنامج ICANN الدولي.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوي بينهم وتهذب من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونذكر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الدولي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" و"أفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التقى:
الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماهم المذهبي، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارًا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل 

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للنساء 

القديمة من شركة: HALAL و ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكثيراً ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عمليات التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبة، فتوجب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فيما" وأفكاراً "بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 

التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نفهم أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتتقل بعدهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الشعبي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

[اسم]

[وقت ومكان التوقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في الاستفادة من شركة HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانت لنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أنواع الخصائص المذهبية، فتعلق بينهم وتضيف من حدة تنافسهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة الفوائد المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر الثقة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ___________________________;
التاريخ: ________________

[التوقيع]

[البؤرة العربية]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي HALAL و ISLAM المقدم من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتشاراتهم المذهبية، فتتفرد بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً " بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: حيدر أحمد
التقديم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gtLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لمشروع تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمشي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانتا كلمة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتناعاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكراً ومقدراً لجهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل الكثير من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتيازاتهم المذهبيّة، فتقوم بينهم وتخفض من حدة تطرفهم الدني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً" قيمًا" وأفكارًا ببناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها تأثراً إيجابياً الإيجابية الإقليمية والأجنبية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نفق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماهااتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتحتف من جدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:
إسم:
جمعية علماء المسلمين
chief 01/10/09
رئيس الجمعية
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبية، فت krótk بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لتسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسما .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتمااتهم المذهبيه، فقرب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفيهم الدين، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فيما" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إنجاعاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: [signature]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الانترنت للمحلي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من الشركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

خلال برنامج ICANN الدولي ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تقترح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتتارض بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاعات ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤقتة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاستها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكراً ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
توقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساعدة من شركات Halal و Islarn

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتمامات المذهبية، فتتقلب بينهم وتفتح من عدة تطورات الدينية، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيم" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجاباتتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [الاسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزموم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي. .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتمام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزورم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجاباتهم المذهبية، فترضي بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة 
"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتسند من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [مكتوب]
التوقيت: [مكتوب]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتترب ببينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لازم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا السجل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتمي لائحقاً فيهما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: محمد سمى
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكليًا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل الكثير من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أطيافها، ويقرر بينهم وتوحيد من حدة تطويرهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للنسيج ISLAM و HALAL المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف انتماءاتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]

التوقيع: [توقيع]
To: ICANN

Suite 33G, 4670 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Faysal Alashmar as the representative of Research Services Group, website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgiasar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Name: Faysal Alashmar

Position in Organization: editor in chief
TO: ICANN
Suite 330, 4076 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support to .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Sheik Mohammad Amro as the representative of http://www.wahdatislamya.org/ website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet, and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Sheik Mohammad Amro

Position in Organization: General Manager
13 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süresi

Sayın Yetkili

Konusu: .ISLAM, .SHIA ve .HALAL için Destek Mektubu

Medyam 14 Radyo Televizyon Yayınくん A.Ş., bu mektupla yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde, Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San ve Tic.Ltd.Şti’nin .ISLAM, .SHIA ve .HELAL ADLI Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adı) için ICANN’a yapmış olduğu başvuruyu desteklediğini belirtilir.

Medyam 14 Radyo Televizyon Yayınくん A.Ş., merkezi İstanbul’da bulunan ve Türkiye geneline yayın yapan On 4 TV’nin resmi sahibidir. Yaptığı yayınla geniş bir kitleye hitap eden On 4 TV bünyesinde onlarca muhabir, gazeteci v.s çalıştırılmakta ve kısa zamanda milyonlarca izleyici kitlesine ulaşmayı hedeflemektedir.

Medyam 14 Radyo Televizyon Yayınくん A.Ş

Adres: [Redacted]

Contact Information Redacted
Tel: [Redacted]
Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayıncılık A.Ş

Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayıncılık A.Ş is the owner of On4 TV, On4 TV is a nation-wide television channel in Turkey. The channel was established by the Turkish businessmen in 2012.

On4 TV delivers the latest breaking news and information on the latest top stories, weather, business, entertainment, politics, and more.

Headquarters is located in Istanbul and more than 100 journalists, reporters etc. work in it.
Fatih-İSTANBUL
TE: 0212 659 63 12
Fax: 0212 659 50 48

Sayın: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Dikkat: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Konu: Yeni .ISLAM ve .HALAL için destek mektubu.

Bu mektup KÜDÜS MEDYA A.Ş.’nin ICANN’ın yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde yapılan .ISLAM ve .HALAL başvurularına tam destek verdiğini ifade etmek için yazılmıştır.

Kurum’un Yönetim Kurulu Başkanı olarak, bu mektuba yazdığınız şeylerle yetkili olduğumu onaylıyorum.

Enler, ICANN’ın farklı topluluklarını (İslami değerlerle uyumlu gTLD’ler dahil) TLD’lerini barındırmak olarak olunun karşılamadığını inatçı olur ve aynı şekilde Müslüman topluluklarının bu alanları kendisi TLD’leri için olamayacağını düşünebilir. Ayrıca, .ISLAM ve .HALAL başlangıç dillerine saygı, temel insan hakları ifade ve inanç özgürlüğine dayalı olun, siber alanında İslami değerleri desteklemesi noktasında önemli rol oynayabilirler.

Bu TLD’yi destekleme fırsat verdiğini için teşekkürler.

Saygılarımla

ALİ YAZICI
Kudüs Medya A.Ş
Yönetim Kralı, Bşk.
İşveren: Kevser Basın Yayıncılık

Adres: Haznedar mah. Şevketdağ cad. No: 67/A Güngören/ İstanbul
Tel: Contact Information Redacted
Web: www.kevseryayincilik.com

Müdür
Çınin AKYÜZ

KEVSER BASIN YAYIN EGT. ORG.
VE KİRT. MALZ. İTH. IRAN. TIC. LTD. STİ.
Contact Information Redacted

Contact Information Redacted
Tel: 548 015 8025
Kevser Basın Yayın

Kevser Basın Yayınçılık (Kevser Press Publishing) has about 200 branches and distribution networks throughout Turkey and 10 distribution networks abroad. Headquarters is located in Istanbul Asaray and one of the leading Press publishing companies in Turkey.

Website: [www.kevseryayincilik.com](http://www.kevseryayincilik.com)
إلى: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

(New gTLDs)

HALAL
ISLAM

الموضوع: رسالة تأيد تفويض تفاوض الإنجاز في برنامج ICANN، ضمن مجموعة "HALAL" و"ISLAM".

يرجى أن تأخذوا في الاعتبار أن إنشاء "HALAL" و"ISLAM" يهدف إلى الدفاع عن حقوق الإنسان في مجتمعنا الإسلامي، حيث يجب أن تكون "ISLAM" و"HALAL" جزءاً من المجازات المنسجمة.

شكراً لتواصلكم.

بكل إخلاص

عبد الناصر الجبري

Contact: info@ad-nisra.com
Phone: +9699994322
Mobile: +9699994322
Fax: +9699994322

Ad-Nisra TV, Al-Fahud Center, Al-Mahmutiya, P.O. Box 9999, Dammam, Saudi Arabia

www.ad-nisra.com

Ad-Nisra TV, Al-Fahud Center, Al-Mahmutiya, P.O. Box 9999, Dammam, Saudi Arabia

www.ad-nisra.com
موقع العهد الإداري

www.alahednews.com/la

العنوان:
ICANN

ال موضوع:
رسالة تأديب تشير طاقات

نسبة عالية بحث

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود أن نستلم الطلاب في مجال الاتصال الأعلى على الإنترنت للموسيقى

HALL - ISLAM

الحفل من شركة:
"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى المنطقة:
ICANN

الاذا على برنامج ICANN

وكلمة عن هذا الدليل ينطوي عدد من الاتصالات التي سوف تنفتح المجال الرسماً في عملية التدخل بين الناس والرسائل الإلكترونية على نظام الإنترنت. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة. فكل هذا ينطوي على حلول لضمان آفاقهم الناجحة.

الشريك وندرك هجمات لم تأخذ مساحة المعم
ال Сообщة: هيئة تطوير النطاقات الجديدة (New gTLD)

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لازوم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة - ISLAM و HALAL

البحث: هذه الرسالة تحمل قرار الهيكلية الإسلامية تؤكد على قليلنا الكامل للنطاقات NEW gTLDsand ICANN للوجه الجديد.

ويستعرض التحليل كمدير تقنيًا، أرسل أن لدى السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لـ ICANN تحن نومن أن في المجال المحايد والمرجح به من قبل TLDs الخاصين، ويسئط النطاقات، من ضرورة النطاقات TLDs التي تتعرض مع نظام الإسلام، ويستعرض وسر يمزج TLDs أي نظام الإسلام، حيث أن النطاقات TLDs يبرز أو تسجيلها "ISLAM و HALAL" في هيئة تطوير النطاقات الإسلامية عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالإرادة على مدى حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الخطاب على مدى الإخراج المتبادل للذين.

شكراً لكم الفرصة المفيدة للتعبير عن تأييدنا لهذه النطاقات TLDs بكل إخلاص.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

إلى: RIPE نظم النطاقات العالمية
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

(بالإنجليزية: هيئة تقييم الطلبات الجديدة (New gTLD))

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة ISLAM و HALAL

جواب هذه الرسالة ينعف قنوات النطاقات العالمية تؤكد على ثباتها الكامل لنموذج تسجيل النطاقات ISLAM و HALAL في برنامج gTLD الجديد ICANN، المقدم إلى RIPE.

ووفقًا للنقاط التالية، يمكنني أن أؤكد أن النطاق النسائي ICANN تحتوي أيضًا على المجالات والحرفية من قبل نطاق ISLAM والمحفظة للمجتمعات من ضمنها النطاقات TLDs المسماة أيضًا النطاقات. حيث أن النطاقات ISLAM و HALAL للمجتمع المسلم أيضًا النطاقات، حيث أن النطاقات ISLAM و HALAL لبعض النطاقات كبيرة في التعزيز في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر القضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالإشارة على مدى حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع المحافظة على نبأ الإحترام الشامل للأديان.

شكراً لك، معايدة من خلال الرسالة، للاستمتاع بهذا النطاق TLDs.

بكل إخلاص

(توقيع: RIPE المقيم)
Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, Mansoor Hashmi, fully support the applications for ISLAM - internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Assis Green IT System Bilgisyar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Mansoor Hashmi

Dated: 2012-08-04
To: ICANN
Suite 330, 6676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90232

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALA TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, mostafa khaazen as the representative of Alblad magazine fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALA internet top level domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilingual Sam. Ye TIC Ltd. 501 in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to the world through Internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely,

Name: mostafa khaazen
Position in Organization: editor in chief
موقع الانتقاد
www.alfntiqad.com

التاريخ: 1 / 4 / 2013

الجيماء:

ICANN

الخليج العربي لتسويق النطاقات

الموضوع: رسالة نزلة تسجيل النطاقات

الناشط:

HAFA — ISLAM

الشريكة:

بالإضافة إلى المبرمجة أعلاه، نود تنفيذ تسجيل النطاقات في مجال الخدمة الأخرى على الأثر بالإنترنت

الشريكة:

HAFA — ISLAM

*Asia Green IT System Bilgilayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

في إطار برنامج ICANN النبلي للنطاقات الجديدة gTLD.

نشكر هذه الإضافة مساعدة نحن الداخليون بين السحاب وتطوير لمنشأة شركتنا وتعزز تبعها على سائر الأمم بالعالم.

نشكركم ونذكركم بما في صناحي جميع
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I M GONDAL fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Aasi Green IT System Bilgakay Sar. Ve Tec Ltd Sdn in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding, i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

M. GONDAL

Dated: 2012-08-04
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM.


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية وعالمية.

شكراً ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: _______________________

التوقيع: ________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فترتب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة 

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ناقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتمامهم المذهبة، فتتولب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالبية.

نشكركم ونتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الأسم: [חתمة]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأول على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتلاكاتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقترح جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في:\n
"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti\nإلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمكن أن يكون إيجابياً لعديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثماكاتهم المذهبية، فتنبأ بينهم وتحفظ من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء مراجعة القوانين المشتركة التي تنوي لاحقاً فيما وأفكارها، بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إرداكاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين علم وخبر 0/6/1344
رئيس الجمعية

0.1.2010
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL ، و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة فيuki .HALAL ، و .ISLAM

marymane من شركة .HALAL ، و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

to , إلى برنامج gTLD

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبي، فتخرج بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتها يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتذر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوي الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهما" و"أفكار" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]

[البطاقة الدبلومية]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للماسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتفرّب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكراً ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل 

الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM

باحترام إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ轮胎اتهم المذهبيه، فتترب
بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتبااع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقد جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [ลาย]
التاريخ: [ลาย]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبي، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسما HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداتهم المذهبية، فتقرر بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً " الدنيا" و أفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرزة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة المجتمع.

الاسم:

التوفيق:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ祺اءاتهم المذهبية، فتتقلب بينهم وتفتح من حد تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [مسمى
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستقبل المشرق "HALAL و .ISLAM" على "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" في gTLD الجديد ضمن برنامج ICANN الدولي.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجات المذهبية، فتتربت بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقا "قيما" وأفكارا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآلي على الإنترنت للمسيى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلما ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فتربى بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقصر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: _______________________
التوقع: ______________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما و أفكارًا بناء موثوقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاجاتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم، يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع: [имя]

الاسم: [إسم]
Ref: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

3Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I ABDUL QAYUM fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Hilgigayar San. Ve Ti.Ltd Siti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

DATED: 2012-08-04
(New gTLD)

HALAL

ISLAM

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد تزويج النطاقات الجديدة

(EN)

I am pleased to inform you that ICANN will be adding new gTLDs to the gTLD program.

I believe that it is important to add more TLDs that reflect the diversity of the Islamic world. The use of the new TLDs will help to promote the values of the Islamic community, which is in line with the principles of the Islamic community.

I am looking forward to working with ICANN to ensure that the new TLDs are used in a manner that is consistent with the values of the Islamic community.

Thank you.

[Signature]

[Name]
إلى

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

(New gTLD)

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لثوم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة

HALAL وISLAM

BYوجب هذه الرسالة توجر جريدة تؤكد على تأييدنا الكامل للنطاقات الجديدة في برنامج ICANN TLD

ويستندي التأييد كريس تحرير لها، أوكر أن لدي السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لهم.

تحت نحن أنه في المجال المتأهل والمختلف له من قبل ICANN TLDs المختلفة النطاقات (عندما تکون مع القام الإسلام)، يجب

تحت مجتمع المسلم أيضًا لتسجيلها، حيث أن النطاقات HALAL وISLAM

حري أن تحل دورًا كبيرًا في تعزيز الدين في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالاكتشاف على مبدأ

حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاختيار المتبادل للألبام.

TLDs

شكراً لكم الفئة المنظمة لنا لتعزيز عن تأييدنا لهذه النطاقات

بكل إخلاص

الرسالة

العنوان الرسالة
To: ICANN
Suite 33C, 4C70 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Mahmoud Raya as the representative of INBAA website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgiyayt San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Mahmoud Raya
Position in Organization: editor in chief
To: ICANN
Suite 330, 4076 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Sheik Mohammad Amro as the representative of http://www.wahdatislamya.org/ website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to the world through internet, and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Sheik Mohammad Amro

Position in Organization: General Manager
Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I MALIK ABDUL QAYUM KHAN fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Malik Abdul Qayum Khan

Dated: 2012-08-04
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,  
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, IMAM ALI SHAH, fully support the applications for ISLAM Internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgiasyar San, Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

IMAM ALI SHAH

Dated: 2012-08-04
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسجل .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ولكننا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إقاراتهم المذهبية، فقترب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الشريعة، من خلال إعداد مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثاثاتهم المذهبية، فقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" و أفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الدين، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإسلامية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد ل harga تسجيل .HALAL .و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL .و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

المؤسسة الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN
gTLD الجديد.

وكليا، ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حالة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً، بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع

الاسم: [اسم]

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 1374
رئيس الجمعية
01/05/12
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل "HALAL" و "ISLAM".

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت لل偎سي "HALAL" و "ISLAM" المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتجاوز بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنطلق لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثماهاتهم الذهنية، فتنقر بينهم وتنخفق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارًا" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ما هو اسم
التوقيع: [ลาย توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM.

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للإمارات المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM:


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفاتهم الدينية، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:

جمعية السلام الإسلامية
المية العربية

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL .و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL .و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنتا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتّمالاتهم المذهبيّة، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتّساء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" و"أفكار" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ____________________________
التوقف: ____________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنظمة المتماثلة من شركة HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة " Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti 

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكئنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستوى المقدم من شركة: .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمنحك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إرساءاتها المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتلتزم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وفكرةً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشككم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: م. ه.*
التاريخ: **
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في المنتج.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبي، فترتفع بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسهامها في ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إمكاناتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانياتهم المذهبة، فتترب من بينهم وتنخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكراً لكم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقترب بينهم وتعزز من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:

تثمنية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمؤسسة "HALAL" و"ISLAM"، التي تقدمها شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

وكانت نظرًا أن هذا التسجيل يتلقى العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبي، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطويرهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقًا "قيمة وأفكار" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع: 

الاسم: [الاسم المستعار]
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,  
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I Rasheed Ahmad Chughtai fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

Rasheed Ahmad Chughtai
Chief Editor

Ref: The page/icann. Dated: 06-08-2012

P.O.Box #1435, suite #14, Mezzanine Floor, Muhammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue  
Blue Area, Islamabad (Pakistan).  
TEL: 2274850, FAX: 2274849, E-mail: Contact Information Redacted
جامعة الإمارات العربية المتحدة
المعهد العالي للальные
رقم: 2013/197
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(NEWTLED)
To: ICANN
Site 338-4636 Admiralty Way
Menlo Park, CA 94022
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that the Islamic Centre in Hamburg fully supports the application for a new internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Atlas Green IT System Bilguyar San Ve Tic Ltd Sti.

The gTLD will be used for principles of Roundup, i.e., the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Sayyed Masoud Masoumi
Director of the Islamic Academy Germany
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآلي على الانترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقرر بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: العربية
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحيه طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمة.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوار تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


التي تُضاف إلى برنامج ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا قلنا أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماهم المذهبي، فتكتب بينهم وتعزف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


اتصلنا إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وته浓浓ف من جدّة تطرفهم الدنيي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقع: 
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل halal و islam

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى halal و islam.

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN.
gTLD الجديد.

 وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا، وأفكارًا، بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والمحلية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة المجتمع.

التوقيع:
الاسم:

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر ١٣١٩/٢٠١٠، رئيس الجمعية
١٩١٣/١٠/٢٠
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل 

HALAL وISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على 

الإنترنت للمساوح ISLAM وHALAL المقدمة من شركة: 

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti 

gTLD sprinkle international ضمن برنامج ICANN 

الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في 
عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناواتهم المذهبية، فتتقلب 
بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً " 
قيما" وأفكارا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأولي على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشاره إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج .gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنجعاصاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع: 
جمعية البيان الإسلاميّة (اللغة العربية)
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمرسوم .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدم من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" البالغة عن منظمة ICANN، ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا تأكد أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسهام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وفكرًا" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: __________________________
التوقع: __________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للמסماوى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاعة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهما" وأفكاراً. بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيلHALAL وISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسىHALAL وISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى برنامج ICANN الدولي ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ семейاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفة من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقترن جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيّّر Halal و Islam المقدم من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ胴ائه المذهبي، فلتقرر بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الطبي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [إسم]

التقى: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤيد تأسيس هيئة تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في تطوير مشروع "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" الذي يشمل برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي ستوفر فتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إبتكاراتهم المذهبية، فتتربع بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الفني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 

التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إحداث ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لرزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكن لها انتخاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

توقيع: موظف المحكمة الشرعية رقم 13191
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti."

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبيّة، فتّقرب بينهم وتحفيق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقًا "قيما" وأفكارًا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقيع:
ICANN
Suite 330 - 467 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey - CA. 90292
USA
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Objet: la mise en place de l'extension générique: « .islam »

Madame, Monsieur,

Je soussigné, declare apporter mon soutien total et entier à la demande de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM pour l'activation d'un nom de domaine générique de premier niveau appelé couramment TOP LEVEL DOMAIN (TLD): « .islam » remise à la société ICANN aux États-Unis d'Amérique.

Je tiens également à confirmer que la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM vise à mettre en place une communication plus étroite entre les pratiquants et adeptes des différentes confessions et religions à travers le monde et valoriser ainsi la circulation des informations entre ces derniers et œuvrer pour le rapprochement des religions monothéistes.

Favoriser l'activité de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM, permettrait en réalité d'établir un canal de communication entre les responsables et les adeptes de toutes les confessions en vue de promouvoir la culture du dialogue et d'échanges interculturels.

Dans l'attente de votre réponse que j'espère favorable, je vous prie d'agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Fait à Paris, le 9 Août 2016

[Signature]

Tél. Contact Information Redacted
Père Michel Lelong
Contact Information Redacted
Tél. : Contact Information Redacted

Né à Angers, le 25 février 1925. Licencié ès-lettres (Licence d'arabe). Docteur ès-lettres.
Thèse principale : "Le patrimoine musulman dans l'enseignement tunisien".
Thèse complémentaire : "Les relations entre l'Eglise catholique et l'islam en Tunisie, de 1930 à 1968".
Chargé d'Enseignement à l'Institut de Sciences et de Théologie des Religions (ISTR) de l'Institut
Cofondateur du Groupe d'Amitié Islamo-Chrétienne (GAIC).
Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur.
Officier de l'Ordre National du Mérite.

Principales publications :

Pour un dialogue avec les athées (Le Cerf, 1965)
J'ai rencontré l'Islam (Le Cerf, 1976)
Le don qu'il vous a fait (Le Centurion, 1977)
Deux fidélité, une espérance (Le Cerf, 1979)
La tradition islamique (en collaboration avec Sahar Moharram) (Club du Livre et du Disque, 1979)
L'Islam et l'Occident (Albin Michel, 1982)
Guerre ou Paix à Jérusalem ? (Albin Michel, 1983)
L'Eglise nous parle de l'Islam : du Concile de Jean-Paul II (Le Chalet, 1984)
Si Dieu l'avait voulu (Tougui, 1984)
De la prière du Christ au message du Coran (Tougui, 1991)
L'Eglise catholique et l'Islam (Maisonneuve et Larose, 1993)
La vérité rend libre (François-Xavier de Guibert, 1999)
Jean-Paul II et l'Islam (François-Xavier de Guibert, 2003)
Le choix de Cécile (roman) (François-Xavier de Guibert, 2005)
Prêtre de Jésus Christ parmi les Musulmans (François Xavier de Guibert, 2007)
Chrétiens et Musulmans, adversaires ou partenaires ? (L'Harmattan, 2007)
Les Papes et l'Islam (Koutoubia, Editions Alphée 2009)
Le retour des religions, péril ou espoir ? (François Xavier de Guibert, 2009)
Le message de la croix (Encre d'Orient, 2011)
Pour la nécessaire réconciliation (Nouvelles Editions Latines, 2011)
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM من حيث التدوين lifecycle للمساهمة من شركة Halal و Islum

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكما نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجات المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمة وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

تشيرون ومقدرون جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيّرين .HALAL و .ISLAM .

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوق تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبة، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" أفكارًا ببناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لرمز تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نعتقد أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتمنح بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إملاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ: 
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نقدر أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتنب ع

بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفيهم الثقافي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج احتقا

 فيما" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل عدد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عمليات التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ.unknownهم المذهبي، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الطيني، من خلال إضفاء سلامة القواسم المشتركة التي تنبرج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل Halal و Islam

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدين على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي Halal و Islam المقدم من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانيات المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاكاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطويرهم到这里، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]

التوقيع: [توقيع]

[الطابع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نودك تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا تأكد أن هذا التسجيل يمكن أن يكون واحدًا من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقترب بينهم وتحرم من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

tوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكعنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداءاتهم المذهبية، فتتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقد جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقع:

المؤرخ: 
الأمر، والموقع، والبرمجة

تاريخ: 
السن، مدة، التاريخ
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت لمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فاقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأيید للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيیدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الاعلى على الإنترنت للمسیح، .HALAL و .ISLAM، المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فترتب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الفكري، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [подпись]
التاريخ: [подпись]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتناوب بينهم وتحتفز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً. بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

إسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ونثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فترتيب بينهم وتفاقم من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: البكلاء
التوقيع: البكلاء
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنيةاتهم المذهبية، فتقوب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ما هجر محمد كيلان
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


 arrivals الدول في برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثماهاتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقا" قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاثاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:
معهد الدعوة الجامعي للدراسات الإسلامية

العنوان: بن حسن - قرب السفارة الكويتية - بيروت
الهاتف: 01/854069 / فاكس: 01/854072
الصفحة الإلكترونية: admin@daawanet.com
 البريد الإلكتروني:

القوانين والمراسيم
معهد الدعوة جامعي للدراسات الإسلامية مرخص بموجب المرسوم رقم 1947 تاريخ 21/12/1999 يخضع لشروط المرسوم رقم 96/8864 (شروط
إنشاء معهد جامعي للتكنولوجيا).

شروط عامة

 اللغة التدريس: العربية والإنكليزية

نظام التدريس:

الاختلافات والشهادات

الاختلافات:
- الإجازة: 4 سنوات في الشريعة، النظام الإسلامي والإدارة، أصول الدين، علم الاجتماع
الإسلامي.
- الماجستير: ستين + أطروحة في فقه وأصول الدين، تفسير علوم القرآن، حديث وعلومه،
دعوة وأصول الدين.
- الدكتوراه: 3 سنوات
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


 إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانت نتائج هذا التسجيل يمتكن العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثراً في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: د. ز. ش. ب

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي ستوفر فتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبة، فتتربى بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلياً نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إسماءاتهم المذهبية، فترفع بينهم وتعزف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]

التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و.ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD من برنامج ICANN الدولي ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما و أفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقبل جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثماةاتهم المذهبية، فقانون بينهم وترفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقيع:
جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 824/د
رئيس الجمعية
01/11/18
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM
تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM
"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ونحن نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتجمع بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لجوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نوكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:  

جمعية النساء الإسلاميّة
اللغة: الانجليزية
الجهة: المرأة
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتمائاتهم المذهبية، فتُقرب بينهم وتفُخف من جدية تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [подпись]
التاريخ: [подпись]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتيازاتها المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً. بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لترويج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسجّم .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti " إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقراء بينهم وتحتفظ من حدة تطرفهم الحقيقي، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً" قيمًا وأفكارًا" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM، المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التقى: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيحيون: HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إแนثاتهم المذهبية، فتتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وفكاً" بناءً مؤثراً في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى العلوي على الإنترنت للمسج .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكأنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من هذا تطورهم الديني. من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمًا وأفكارًا بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم للاهتمام بالصلاة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تغية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN

gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقر
بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً

"فما" و أفكاراً بناءة موثوقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإسلامية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييدهم لزوم تسجيل 


تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدهم على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانت نتائج التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرر

بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، ومن خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتح لاحقا

"قيما" وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها تعكساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
Dear Sir/ Madam

This letter is to confirm that, I, Majid Tafreshi, as a British-Iranian Historian and researcher and the manager of MTS production (Media, Thought, Studies), fully support the application for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

I am an active researcher and writer in this field for about 25 years and I am aware of the importance of the requested matter.

The gTLDs will be used to Principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic communities on the general principles. Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be a satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

These applications are being submitted as community-based applications, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. 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.

I think it is very important for many members and believers of the Muslim communities around the world to have these names available for obtaining a domain name attached to them.

If you need further information about this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me via email and/ or phone:

Yours sincerely

Majid Tafreshi

12-04-12
ICANN
Suite330,4676 admiralty way
Marina del rey, CA 90292

(New g TLD) 

HALAL, ISLAM.

The purpose: Creating new TLDs in the Halal and Islam domain.

We, the undersigned, hereby declare our intention to submit the following TLDs to ICANN for consideration:

HALAL, ISLAM.

We understand that the acceptance of these TLDs by ICANN will require the creation of new ICANN policies and procedures.

We also understand that these TLDs may require changes to existing standards and practices.

We request that ICANN take into account the unique needs of the Halal and Islamic communities.

We also request that ICANN provide adequate resources to support the development of these TLDs.

We thank you for your consideration of these TLDs and we look forward to working with ICANN to ensure the success of these new domains.

Signed:
[Names]
[Date]

[Logo]

Contact Information Redacted
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter is to confirm that I – Fathi El-Abed, Chairman of the Danish Palestinian Friendship Association, fully support the application for .ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgiasyar San. Ve Ltd Sti in the New GTLD program.

The GTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Fathi El-Abed
Chairman – The Danish Palestinian Friendship Association

Copenhagen the 5th of August, 2012
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [نوكثر]
التاريخ: [نوكثر]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للفئتين: .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتخرج بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلياً لثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: _________________________

التوقيع: _________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

 إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانياته المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الدني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقّع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لـ زوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمؤسس .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتجاهاتهم المذهبي، فتعلم منهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مثبتة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 1324/3
رئيس الجمعية

0.13/11/12
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاعة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إِنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إِسهام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: م. ه. م.
التقديم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزعم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للناطقين باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل الكثير من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والجماعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتها المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قضايا وأفكار" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ____________________________

التاريخ: ____________________________

جمعية البيانات الإسلامية
الوطنية للقرآن الكريم
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيلHALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآلي على الإنترنت للمرسوم HALAL و ISLAM المقدم من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلما ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً موثقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ____________________________
التاريخ: ____________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكاراً." بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لقombre تسجيل ISLAM, و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا: ISLAM و HALAL

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفظ من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: __________________________
التاريخ: __________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM وافيلاً للإنسانية

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [لا يوجد]
التقى: [لا يوجد]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسج .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إيماءاتهم المذهبية، فلتتوقف بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكار" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: 

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti 

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبيّة، فتقترب بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" و أفكاراً "بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ماهر محمد كبار

التقريج:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM

المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثياماتهم المذهية، فتفوق بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إسعاد ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قبضاً وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم كون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: [ SIGNATURE ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للنسبي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكعنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتخاباتهم المذهبية، فتقلب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى العالي على الإنترنت للمسيس .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكما نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا وأفكارًا" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية عن مختلف إمتيازاتهم المذهبة، فتتربى بينهم وتحتفظ من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القياس المشترك التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكارًا، بناءً على تعاون مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم البغي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً موثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التقديم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الانترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد.

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM BILGISAYAR SAN. VE TIC. LTD. STI إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقدر بينهم وتحفظ من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة موثوقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقف:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبي، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً "بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ما هرفي منير

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتحرف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
توقيع: 

جمعية البنية الاجتماعية الإسلامية
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمSites .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجموعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنائيات المذهبية، فترقب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني. من خلال إضاءة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [ลง الاسم]
التاريخ: [写下日期]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدّة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما وأفكار" بناءً مؤتة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقتدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM.

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في الأندية المشتركة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ Enumerations المذهبية، فشوب بينهم وشتفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً صقاً وأفاكاراً بناءً مؤثرات في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتتلقب بينهم وتشتت من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:  
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساحدثة HALAL و ISLAM:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN
gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إ Remediant المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للملس .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنيةهم المذهبة، فتقدم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [(NAME)]
التواقيع: [SIGNATURE]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و.ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم التفتيش، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:


gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إותههم المذهبي، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: __________________________
التوقيع: _______________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأكيد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تنفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفخف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: د. محمد
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاشاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للتسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا قمة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إiations المذهبة، فتطرف بينهم وتفخف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتّماثاتهم المذهبيّة، فتتّرقب بينهم وتحكّم من جادة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتزيد بينهم وتخفق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء منصة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم بكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتذر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الأسم: عماد

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخير 6/3
رئيس الجمعية
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN العالمية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتجاهاتهم المذهبيه، فتترب من هذة التطورات الدينية، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]

التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لرمز تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي fin.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدائمة ضمن برنامج

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتّفاعاتهم المذهبيّة، فتقرّب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرّفهم الدّيني، من خلال إتّفاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وافقاً بناء مؤهّة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعائمة.

شكركم ونُقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستوى المرجعي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني؛ من خلال إضفاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ____________________________
التاريخ: ____________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM من شركة .Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ونحن ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فترتب بينهم وترفع من حدة تطرفهم الذين، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وفكرةً" بناءً مؤثر وملئاً في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
 موضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بتسهيل التواصل بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم التوافقي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قايا" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزور تسجيل ISLAM و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى ISLAM و HALAL، المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتتربن بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [مغشوش]
التوقيع: [مغشوش]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسح .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنا عشراتهم المذهبية، فتتربص بينهم وتفتح منحية تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونذكر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الإسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تقبلا طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمرسوم .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبة، فتتطلب بينهم وتشتهر من عدة تطورات الدينية، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيمها وأفكارها بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

gTLD

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرأ بينهم وتعجب من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إنشاء سلسلة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [توقيع signature]

وقت التوقيع: [الحزمةешريية رقم 1423]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
الإلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الدنيوي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL .و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستوى .HALAL .و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتنمائه المذهبية، فتقبل بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ذيب الجلاد
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيس .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدم من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيء .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلىمنظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتزداد بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبة، فترحب بينهم وترحيف من حدة تطرفهم الدين، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وآفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

[الاسم]
[التوقيع]
العنوان:
رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

التحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبية، فتتطلب بينهم وتحتفظ من حدث تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

جامعة تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخير 8/34
رئيس الجمعية

الاسم: سماء
التاريخ: 10/6/0
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسين .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديدة.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتفحف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إيجاد ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ولكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع: 

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتيازاتهم المذهبية، فتتبرع بينهم وتتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسهام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءً موثوقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة المجتمع.

الإسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي. .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطورهم الفني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقد جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [подпись]
التاريخ: [подпись]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تتفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبية، فالتربة بينهم وتشتت من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

وكليًا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتناماتهم المذهبية, فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم البيني. من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا وأفكارًا" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فلتقرب بينهم وتبنيهم من جهة، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيها أفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]

التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

التي تمت زمام برنامج ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فترحب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركه التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناية مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

في منظمة ICANN والدناميك الجديد gTLD.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الراسخ في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فتمت فتحه وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للنمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الداخلي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع: 
وقت إصدار: 26-1-1428هـ
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي. .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتفاءاتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

المؤلف:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM...

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM، المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"، إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الانترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبيات، فتترتب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا قلّة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبية، فتتسبّب بينهم وتشفيهما من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
للمنظمة الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN
للتوسيع الجديد gTLD".

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبي، فتقترب بينهم وتشتت من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأول على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفهد من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وآفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التوقع:

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 1324 د
رئيس الجمعية
0.12.10/0
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزم تسجيل حلال وإسلام

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للنسيج 
HALAL وإسلام المقدمة من شركة: 

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti 
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في 
عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم 
بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً 
"قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


وكلياً ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجموعات الإسلامية على مختلف أمتائاتهم المذهبة، فتتربع بينهم وتحقق من حدة تطرفهم الديني من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إتكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: [ إسم الشخص]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فترى بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إقامة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً " فيما وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

 إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنيةهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفحص من عدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إشعاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمة" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلا ما نثق أنه هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتجربة بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الفعلي، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إثارة الاستفادة الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى برنامج ICANN الدوالي ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتها المذهبية، فتؤمن بينهم وتعزف عن حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قينا وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: تأييد لـ "HALAL" و "ISLAM" للتسجيل في الإنترنت

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة المقدمة من شركة "HALAL" و "ISLAM".

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وتنخفف من عدة تطوعهم الدينية، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتها يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [مخطوب]
التوقيع: [مخطوب]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لذوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا تعة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فترتب بينهم وتحسفي من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التقنين:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمية .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتنمتهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التوقع: [توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti " إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إرتماهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفقه من هناد تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقعي:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إفماهاتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتفهم من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسهام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تتنج لاحقاً "قيم" وأفكاراً متنوعة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها أبعادهم الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فترحب ببينهم وتحزم من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإِِمَّام: د. م. الْحَّمَّامِي
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي HALAL و ISLAM المقدم من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

الإضافة إلى برنامج ICANN الجديد gTLD.

وكليًا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتها المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتحفي من خدمة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنبعاثاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمرسوم .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل ممتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتمايتها المذهبية. فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نتشكوكم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتشتت من حدة تطرفهم الدنيوي، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مبهرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل عدد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبة، فتقرب بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفهم الدين. من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإعلامية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: 

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخبر 893
رئيس الجمعية
01/10/13
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إтенاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقًا "قيماً وأفكارًا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التواقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في.

._HALAL و .ISLAM

المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبية، فتبقي بينهم وتفتح من بيئة تطرفهم الديني. من خلال إدخال ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتها يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعواصم.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ما هو محمد

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود أن ننوه على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستقبل .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD.

فلبر نأمل أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتكشف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقد جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: __________________
التاريخ: __________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنية المذهبية، تقترب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إزالة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ________________________________
التاريخ: ________________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكثيراً ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تقتحم المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فترد بينهم وترتفع من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر ماضي في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوار تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنتربت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانيات المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من جهة تطويرهم الديني، من خلال إقامة ساحة القواص المشترك التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تهاني طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نتوجه تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساعدة .HALAL و .ISLAM، المقدمة من شركة .Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti، إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمكانياتها المذهبة، فتعلق بينهم وتنخفف من حدة تطرفهم الحدي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تتجمع لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً، بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: محمد سليم
التوقيع: (חתام)
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لـ "رمز تسجيل ISLAM" وهـ HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى العلـى المتقدم من شركة ISLAM وHALAL " Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

الذي ينتمي إلى منظمة ICANN العالمية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتصالاتها المذهبيـة، فتقترب بينهم وتجفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القوام المشتركـة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمـا وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكراً ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتربية بينهم وتحفيز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما و أفكاراً بناء مثيرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتنماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيحي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدم إلى شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

وإلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإجابات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم بكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ___________________________
التاريخ: ___________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيلHALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


الملحق للبروتوكول الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديده.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إeecاماتهم المذهبية، فتقوم به وبينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فما" وأفكاراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعادراتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ح. ص. الم理論
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتدادات المذهبية، فبترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تقبلاً طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتنبهر بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتها بكونها أبحاثها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطويرهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وفكاراً بناءً مؤثرها في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لござ تسجيل .HALAL .و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL .و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبيه، فتقرب بينهم وتشتت من ندة تطمحهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنجز لاحقاً "فهماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الابتكارات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

نكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقد "بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة الواجهة المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:

[لوجو]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستوى المحترم:

. HALAL و . ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN

gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبيه، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواس السامر المشرفة التي تفتح أحقا" قيما" وأفكارا" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التاريخ: 

جمعية المياه الإجتماعية

ال Этية الجمعية

 весьма والماء
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وعذب,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إرتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الإسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة 'Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti' إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إرتفاعات المذهبية، فتترب بعدهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتترقب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلا لتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل `HALAL` و `ISLAM` 

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى `HALAL` و `ISLAM` المقدمة من شركة `Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti` إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتتربى بينهم وترتفع من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ماهي الصيانة
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لzpom تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسير .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

 إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إimentiاتهم المذهبية، فتتَرقّب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:...
التوقيع:...
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتنخفض من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل *HALAL و ISLAM*

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيرة **HALAL و ISLAM** المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً موثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [ลาย]

التوقيع: [ลาย]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتعزز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيم" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 

التاريخ:
In the name of God

2007/87

29 May, 2012

To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way

Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Iran Tajikistan Friendship Association (ITFA) fully supports the application for .ISLAM and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the Chairman of the Board of Directors, I confirm that I have the authorization from ITFA to write to you on this matter.

ITFA is a non-political, non-profit NGO established in September 2007 in order to promote sustainable friendly relations between two Persian speaking nations of Tajikistan and Iran.

ITFA believes that these gTLDs will be used to strengthen the religious connections of the Iranian and Tajik Muslim Communities.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ashraf Mojtabah Shabestari,

Chairman of the Board of Directors,

Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association

8898909898

http://irantajik.blogfa.com
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأثر للاسم .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدم من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكانت ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرأ بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي ننتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti تابعة لـ gTLD الجديد ضمن برنامج ICANN الدولي.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فتقوب بينهم وتسهم من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاستها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [ملف]
التوقيع: [ملف]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتترسب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لرمز تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت لل.names .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكليما نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتبع
بينهم وتفهم من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكارًا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتناماتهم المذهبة، فتقلب بينهم وترفع من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع مساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمًا" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: علماء العالم المسلمين

رئس الجمعية

01-3-01
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتسهيل التفاهم من جهة، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكارا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع: 

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL .و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدم من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتخاباتهم المذهبية، فتترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: ما مheet منبر

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت المسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الدیني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعهم يكون لها إعجاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التوقيع: 

جمعية النيل الإجتماعيية
المؤقتة للقيادة
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساح .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يتمثّل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فترحب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]
التاريخ: [تاريخ]

[توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمنسوب .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إтенاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكار" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لتروم تسجيل ISLAM و HALAL
تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأثير بشراكة ISLAM و HALAL.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإجابات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتداءاتهم المذهبي، فتقوم بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الدني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعثاثاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و.ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد


إلى منظمة الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتنخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:  
التاريخ: 
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسما .HALAL و .ISLAM.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: __________________________
التوقيع: ________________________
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناها الإبداعية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً فائقة ومؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمات من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمضاءاتهم المذهبية، فقترب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الشريعي، من خلال إتساع ساحة القوام المشترك الذي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً ببناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف مناطقهم المذهبيه، فتقرأ بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها أبعادها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم: [اسم]

الإسم: [اسم]

التوقيع:

التوقيع:

التوقيع:

التوقيع:

التوقيع:
Annex 17
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: Kosher Marketing Assets LLC

Application Downloaded On: 08 Jul 2014

String: KOSHER

Application ID: 1-1013-67544

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   Kosher Marketing Assets LLC

2. Address of the principal place of business
   391 Troy Avenue Brooklyn, New York - 11213 US

3. Phone number
   +01 718 756 7500

4. Fax number
   +01 718 756 7503

5. If applicable, website or URL
Primary Contact

6(a). Name
John Kane

6(b). Title
Vice President, Corporate Services

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number

6(f). Email Address
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Alex Howerton

7(b). Title
Account Manager

7(c). Address

7(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

7(e). Fax Number
7(f). Email Address
Contact Information Redacted

Proof of Legal Establishment

8(a). Legal form of the Applicant
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
New York State

8(c). Attach evidence of the applicant’s establishment.
Attachments are not displayed on this form.

9(a). If applying company is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.

9(c). If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.

Applicant Background

11(a). Name(s) and position(s) of all directors

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>Jesse Delaney Hornbacher</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares
11(d). For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders: Name(s) and position(s) of all individuals having legal or executive responsibility

**Committee For the Advancement of Torah**
**Not Applicable**

**Applied-for gTLD string**

13. Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If an IDN, provide the U-label.

*KOSHER*

14A. If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with "xn--").

14B. 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.

14C1. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (in English).

14C2. If an IDN, provide the language of the label (as referenced by ISO-639-1).

14D1. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (in English).

14D2. If an IDN, provide the script of the label (as referenced by ISO 15924).
14E. If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.

15A. 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.

15B. Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and sources used.

15C. List any variants to the applied-for gTLD string according to the relevant IDN tables.

16. Describe the applicant’s efforts to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string. If such issues are known, describe steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in software and other applications.

Kosher Marketing Assets, supported by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services, anticipates the introduction of this TLD without operational or rendering problems. Based on a decade of experience launching and operating new TLDs, Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD, is confident the launch and operation of this TLD presents no known challenges. The rationale for this opinion includes:

• The string is not complex and is represented in standard ASCII characters and follows relevant technical, operational and policy standards;
• The string length is within lengths currently supported in the root and by ubiquitous Internet programs such as
web browsers and mail applications;  
• There are no new standards required for the introduction of this TLD;  
• No onerous requirements are being made on registrars, registrants or Internet users, and;  
• The existing secure, stable and reliable Afilias SRS, DNS, WHOIS and supporting systems and staff are amply provisioned and prepared to meet the needs of this TLD.

17. OPTIONAL.  
Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/).

18A. Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

The mission of the .KOSHER TLD is to promote Kosher food certification. Only those who pass rigorous certification will be granted use of domains under this TLD. Given existing data on certification and a conservative forecast for adoption of .KOSHER domains, we forecast having approximately 636 Domains Under Management (DUMs) by the third year of operation. Our financial responses in #45 though #50 go into detail on our funding, cost and revenue projections.

18B. How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?

i. General goals  
The .KOSHER TLD and all domains under it will be used to provide reliable information about Kosher certification, as an industry and as concerns Kosher certified products.

Kosher Marketing Assets, LLC will promote awareness of the TLD through press releases and direct communications. We anticipate that the companies and organizations who manage .KOSHER domains to drive the promotion and awareness of the TLD and its constituent domains, and customers marketing their brand on the resulting websites will enhance market awareness.

ii. How .KOSHER adds to the current space  
Currently there is a plethora of websites representing many different aspects of the kosher certification process and resources. The .KOSHER TLD will specialize in Kosher Certification, providing an information resource which clearly expresses its specialty in an area where interested parties have heretofore struggled to find accurate and concise information. In short, .KOSHER will add content-specific, authenticated domains to the current namespace.

iii. User experience goals  
.KOSHER TLD aspires to become the premiere reliable source of information on the Internet about everything to do with Kosher certification.
Domains under this TLD will only be made available to companies that have been visited, inspected, and are known to be using the domain to promote Kosher Certification. Kosher Marketing Assets, LLC will also create several informative websites explaining this and the details of Kosher certification, building confidence among end users about the accuracy and reliability of information available under the TLD. Thus, end-users will have confidence the information they view in a .KOSHER website or emails from the respective domain are about legitimate, verified Kosher products and establishments.

iv. Registry policies
All domains under this TLD will only be made available to companies that have been visited, inspected, and are known to intend to use a domain to promote Kosher Certification.

The roll-out of our TLD is anticipated to feature the following phases:
• Reservation of reserved names and premium names, which will be distributed through special mechanisms (detailed below).
• Sunrise — the required period for trademark owners to secure their domains before availability to the general public. This phase will feature applications for domain strings, verification of trademarks via Trademark Clearinghouse and a trademark verification agent, and a Trademark Claims Service.
• General Availability period — real-time registrations, made on a first-come first-served basis. Trademark Claims Service will be in use at least for the first 60 days after General Availability applications open.

The registration of domain names in the .KOSHER TLD will follow the standard practices, procedures and policies Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services, currently has in place. This includes the following:
• Domain registration policies (for example, grace periods, transfer policies, etc.) are defined in response #27.
• Abuse prevention tools and policies, for example, measures to promote WHOIS accuracy and efforts to reduce phishing and pharming, are discussed in detail in our response #28.
• Rights protection mechanisms and dispute resolution mechanism policies (for example, UDRP, URS) are detailed in #29.

Other detailed policies for this domain include policies for reserved names.

Reserved names

Registry reserved names
We will reserve the following classes of domain names, which will not be made generally available to registrants via the Sunrise or subsequent periods:
• All of the reserved names required in Specification 5 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement;
• The geographic names required in Specification 5 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement, and may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the government and country-code manager;
• The registry operator’s own name and variations thereof, and registry operations names (such as registry.tld, and www.tld), for internal use;
• Names related to ICANN and Internet standards bodies (iana.tld, ietf.tld, w3c.tld, etc.), and may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with ICANN.

The list of reserved names will be published publicly before the Sunrise period begins, so that registrars and
potential registrants will know which names have been set aside.

v. Privacy and confidential information protection
As per the New gTLD Registry Agreement, we will make domain contact data (and other fields) freely and publicly available via a Web-based WHOIS server. This default set of fields includes the mandatory publication of registrant data. Our Registry-Registrar Agreement will require that registrants consent to this publication.

We shall notify each of our registrars regarding the purposes for which data about any identified or identifiable natural person (“Personal Data”) submitted to the Registry Operator by such registrar is collected and used, and the intended recipients (or categories of recipients) of such Personal Data (the data in question is essentially the registrant and contact data required to be published in the WHOIS). We will require each registrar to obtain the consent of each registrant in the TLD for the collection and use of such Personal Data. The policies will be posted publicly on our TLD web site. As the registry operator, we shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data in any way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

Our privacy and data use policies are as follows:
• As registry operator, we do not plan on selling bulk WHOIS data. We will not sell contact data in any way. We will not allow, enable, or otherwise support the transmission by e-mail, telephone, or facsimile of mass unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations.
• We may use registration data in the aggregate for marketing purposes.
• DNS query data will never be sold in a way that is personally identifiable.
• We may from time to time use the demographic data collected for statistical analysis, provided that this analysis will not disclose individual Personal Data and provided that such use is compatible with the notice provided to registrars regarding the purpose and procedures for such use.

As the registry operator we shall take significant steps to protect Personal Data collected from registrars from loss, misuse, unauthorized disclosure, alteration, or destruction. In our responses to Question 30 (“Security Policy”) and Question 38 (“Escrow”) we detail the security policies and procedures we will use to protect the registry system and the data contained therein from unauthorized access and loss.

Please see our response to Question 26 (“WHOIS”) regarding “searchable WHOIS” and rate-limiting. That section contains details about how we will limit the mining of WHOIS data by spammers and other parties who abuse access to the WHOIS.

In order to acquire and maintain accreditation for our TLD, we will require registrars to adhere to certain information technology policies designed to help protect registrant data. These will include standards for access to the registry system and password management protocols. Our response to Question 30, “Security Policy” provides details of implementation.

We will allow the use of proxy and privacy services, which can protect the personal data of registrants from spammers and other parties that mine zone files and WHOIS data. We are aware that there are parties who may use privacy services to protect their free speech rights, or to avoid religious or political persecution.
Kosher Marketing Assets, supported by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services, has adopted the above-mentioned and other policies to ensure fair and equitable access and cost structures to the Internet community, including:

- no new burdens placed on the Internet community to resolve name disputes
- utilization of standard registration practices and policies (as detailed in responses to questions 27, 28, 29)
- protection of trademarks at launch and on-going operations (as detailed in the response to question 29)
- fair and reasonable wholesale prices
- fair and equitable treatment of registrars

As per the ICANN Registry Agreement, we will use only ICANN-accredited registrars, and will provide non-discriminatory access to registry services to those registrars.

### Pricing Policies and Commitments

Applicant reserves the right to reduce pricing for promotional purposes in a manner available to all accredited registrars. Registry Operator reserves the right to work with ICANN to initiate an increase in the wholesale price of domains if required. Registry Operator will provide reasonable notice to the registrars of any approved price increase.

---

19. Is the application for a community-based TLD?

**No**

20A. 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.

20B. Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified in 20(a).
20C. Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

20D. Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a).

20E. 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.

20F. 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.

21A. Is the application for a geographic name?

No

22. 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.

We will protect names with national or geographic significance by reserving the country and territory names at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD, as per the requirements in the New TLD Registry Agreement (Specification 5, paragraph 5).

We will employ a series of rules to translate the geographical names required to be reserved by Specification 5, paragraph 5 to a form consistent with the “host names” format used in domain names.

Considering the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advice “Principles regarding new gTLDs”, these domains will be blocked, at no cost to governments, public authorities, or IGOs, before the TLD is introduced (Sunrise), so that no parties may apply for them. We will publish a list of these names before Sunrise, so our registrars and their prospective applicants can be aware that these names are reserved.
We will define a procedure so that governments can request the above reserved domain(s) if they would like to take possession of them. This procedure will be based on existing methodology developed for the release of country names in the .INFO TLD. For example, we will require a written request from the country’s GAC representative, or a written request from the country’s relevant Ministry or Department. We will allow the designated beneficiary (the Registrant) to register the name, with an accredited Afilias Registrar, possibly using an authorization number transmitted directly to the designated beneficiary in the country concerned.

As defined by Specification 5, paragraph 5, such geographic domains may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s). Registry operator will work with respective GAC representatives of the country’s relevant Ministry or Department to obtain their release of the names to the Registry Operator.

If internationalized domains names (IDNs) are introduced in the TLD in the future, we will also reserve the IDN versions of the country names in the relevant script(s) before IDNs become available to the public. If we find it advisable and practical, we will confer with relevant language authorities so that we can reserve the IDN domains properly along with their variants.

Regarding GAC advice regarding second-level domains not specified via Specification 5, paragraph 5: All domains awarded to registrants are subject to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), and to any properly-situated court proceeding. We will ensure appropriate procedures to allow governments, public authorities or IGO’s to challenge abuses of names with national or geographic significance at the second level. In its registry-registrar agreement, and flowing down to registrar-registrant agreements, the registry operator will institute a provision to suspend domains names in the event of a dispute. We may exercise that right in the case of a dispute over a geographic name.

23. 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:

A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers.
B. Dissemination of TLD zone files.
C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois service).
D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered.
E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC). The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Additional proposed registry services that are unique to the registry must also be described.

Throughout the technical portion (#23 – #44) of this application, answers are provided directly from Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD. Kosher Marketing Assets chose Afilias as its back-end
provider because Afilias has more experience successfully applying to ICANN and launching new TLDs than any other provider. Afilias is the ICANN-contracted registry operator of the .INFO and .MOBI TLDs, and Afilias is the backend registry services provider for other ICANN TLDs including .ORG, .ASIA, .AERO, and .XXX.

Registry services for this TLD will be performed by Afilias in the same responsible manner used to support 16 top level domains today. Afilias supports more ICANN-contracted TLDs (6) than any other provider currently. Afilias’ primary corporate mission is to deliver secure, stable and reliable registry services. This TLD will utilize an existing, proven team and platform for registry services with:

- A stable and secure, state-of-the-art, EPP-based SRS with ample storage capacity, data security provisions and scalability that is proven with registrars who account for over 95% of all gTLD domain name registration activity (over 375 registrars);
- A reliable, 100% available DNS service (zone file generation, publication and dissemination) tested to withstand severe DDoS attacks and dramatic growth in Internet use;
- A WHOIS service that is flexible and standards compliant, with search capabilities to address both registrar and end-user needs; includes consideration for evolving standards, such as RESTful, or draft-kucherawy-wierds;
- Experience introducing IDNs in the following languages: German (DE), Spanish (ES), Polish (PL), Swedish (SV), Danish (DA), Hungarian (HU), Icelandic (IS), Latvian (LV), Lithuanian (LT), Korean (KO), Simplified and Traditional Chinese (CN), Devanagari (HI-DEVA), Russian (RU), Belarusian (BE), Ukrainian (UK), Bosnian (BS), Serbian (SR), Macedonian (MK) and Bulgarian (BG) across the TLDs it serves;
- A registry platform that is both IPv6 and DNSSEC enabled;
- An experienced, respected team of professionals active in standards development of innovative services such as DNSSEC and IDN support;
- Methods to limit domain abuse, remove outdated and inaccurate data, and ensure the integrity of the SRS, and;
- Customer support and reporting capabilities to meet financial and administrative needs, e.g., 24x7 call center support, integration support, billing, and daily, weekly, and monthly reporting.

Afilias will support this TLD in accordance with the specific policies and procedures of Kosher Marketing Assets (the “registry operator”), leveraging a proven registry infrastructure that is fully operational, staffed with professionals, massively provisioned, and immediately ready to launch and maintain this TLD.

The below response includes a description of the registry services to be provided for this TLD, additional services provided to support registry operations, and an overview of Afilias’ approach to registry management.

Registry services to be provided

To support this TLD, Kosher Marketing Assets and Afilias will offer the following registry services, all in accordance with relevant technical standards and policies:

- Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration for domain names and nameservers, and provision to registrars of status information relating to the EPP-based domain services for registration, queries, updates, transfers, renewals, and other domain management functions. Please see our responses to questions #24, #25, and #27 for full details, which we request be incorporated here by reference.
- Operation of the registry DNS servers: The Afilias DNS system, run and managed by Afilias, is a massively provisioned DNS infrastructure that utilizes among the most sophisticated DNS architecture, hardware, software and redundant design created. Afilias’ industry-leading system works in a seamless way to incorporate nameservers from any number of other secondary DNS service vendors. Please see our response to question #35 for full details,
which we request be incorporated here by reference.

- Dissemination of TLD zone files: Afilias’ distinctive architecture allows for real-time updates and maximum stability for zone file generation, publication and dissemination. Please see our response to question #34 for full details, which we request be incorporated here by reference.
- Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain registrations: A port 43 WHOIS service with basic and expanded search capabilities with requisite measures to prevent abuse. Please see our response to question #26 for full details, which we request be incorporated here by reference.
- Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs): Ability to support all protocol valid Unicode characters at every level of the TLD, including alphabetic, ideographic and right-to-left scripts, in conformance with the ICANN IDN Guidelines. Please see our response to question #44 for full details, which we request be incorporated here by reference.
- DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC): A fully DNSSEC-enabled registry, with a stable and efficient means of signing and managing zones. This includes the ability to safeguard keys and manage keys completely. Please see our response to question #43 for full details, which we request be incorporated here by reference.

Each service will meet or exceed the contract service level agreement. All registry services for this TLD will be provided in a standards-compliant manner.

Security
Afilias addresses security in every significant aspect – physical, data and network as well as process. Afilias’ approach to security permeates every aspect of the registry services provided. A dedicated security function exists within the company to continually identify existing and potential threats, and to put in place comprehensive mitigation plans for each identified threat. In addition, a rapid security response plan exists to respond comprehensively to unknown or unidentified threats. The specific threats and Afilias mitigation plans are defined in our response to question #30(b); please see that response for complete information. In short, Afilias is committed to ensuring the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of all information.

New registry services
No new registry services are planned for the launch of this TLD.

Additional services to support registry operation
Numerous supporting services and functions facilitate effective management of the TLD. These support services are also supported by Afilias, including:
- Customer support: 24x7 live phone and e-mail support for customers to address any access, update or other issues they may encounter. This includes assisting the customer identification of the problem as well as solving it. Customers include registrars and the registry operator, but not registrants except in unusual circumstances. Customers have access to a web-based portal for a rapid and transparent view of the status of pending issues.
- Financial services: billing and account reconciliation for all registry services according to pricing established in respective agreements.

Reporting is an important component of supporting registry operations. Afilias will provide reporting to the registry operator and registrars, and financial reporting.
Reporting provided to registry operator
Afilias provides an extensive suite of reports to the registry operator, including daily, weekly and monthly reports with data at the transaction level that enable the registry operator to track and reconcile at whatever level of detail preferred. Afilias provides the exact data required by ICANN in the required format to enable the registry operator to meet its technical reporting requirements to ICANN.

In addition, Afilias offers access to a data warehouse capability that will enable near real-time data to be available 24x7. This can be arranged by informing the Afilias Account Manager regarding who should have access. Afilias’ data warehouse capability enables drill-down analytics all the way to the transaction level.

Reporting available to registrars
Afilias provides an extensive suite of reporting to registrars and has been doing so in an exemplary manner for more than ten years. Specifically, Afilias provides daily, weekly and monthly reports with detail at the transaction level to enable registrars to track and reconcile at whatever level of detail they prefer.

Reports are provided in standard formats, facilitating import for use by virtually any registrar analytical tool. Registrar reports are available for download via a secure administrative interface. A given registrar will only have access to its own reports. These include the following:
• Daily Reports: Transaction Report, Billable Transactions Report, and Transfer Reports;

Weekly registrar reports are maintained for each registrar for four weeks. Weekly reports older than four weeks will be archived for a period of six months, after which they will be deleted.

Financial reporting
Registrar account balances are updated real-time when payments and withdrawals are posted to the registrars’ accounts. In addition, the registrar account balances are updated as and when they perform billable transactions at the registry level.

Afilias provides Deposit-Withdrawal Reports that are updated periodically to reflect payments received or credits and withdrawals posted to the registrar accounts.

The following reports are also available: a) Daily Billable Transaction Report, containing details of all the billable transactions performed by all the registrars in the SRS, b) daily e-mail reports containing the number of domains in the registry and a summary of the number and types of billable transactions performed by the registrars, and c) registry operator versions of most registrar reports (for example, a daily Transfer Report that details all transfer activity between all of the registrars in the SRS).

Afilias approach to registry support
Afilias, the back end registry services provider for this TLD, is dedicated to managing the technical operations and support of this TLD in a secure, stable and reliable manner. Afilias has worked closely with Kosher Marketing
Assets to review specific needs and objectives of this TLD. The resulting comprehensive plans are illustrated in technical responses #24-44, drafted by Afilias given Kosher Marketing Assets requirements. Afilias and Kosher Marketing Assets also worked together to provide financial responses for this application which demonstrate cost and technology consistent with the size and objectives of this TLD.

Afilias is the registry services provider for this and several other TLD applications. Over the past 11 years of providing services for gTLD and ccTLDs, Afilias has accumulated experience about resourcing levels necessary to provide high quality services with conformance to strict service requirements. Afilias currently supports over 20 million domain names, spread across 16 TLDs, with over 400 accredited registrars.

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way.

With over a decade of registry experience, Afilias has the depth and breadth of experience that ensure existing and new needs are addressed, all while meeting or exceeding service level requirements and customer expectations. This is evident in Afilias’ participation in business, policy and technical organizations supporting registry and Internet technology within ICANN and related organizations. This allows Afilias to be at the forefront of security initiatives such as: DNSSEC, wherein Afilias worked with Public Interest Registry (PIR) to make the .ORG registry the first DNSSEC enabled gTLD and the largest TLD enabled at the time; in enhancing the Internet experience for users across the globe by leading development of IDNs; in pioneering the use of open-source technologies by its usage of PostgreSQL, and; being the first to offer near-real-time dissemination of DNS zone data.

The ability to observe tightening resources for critical functions and the capacity to add extra resources ahead of a threshold event are factors that Afilias is well versed in. Afilias’ human resources team, along with well-established relationships with external organizations, enables it to fill both long-term and short-term resource needs expediently.

Afilias’ growth from a few domains to serving 20 million domain names across 16 TLDs and 400 accredited registrars indicates that the relationship between the number of people required and the volume of domains supported is not linear. In other words, servicing 100 TLDs does not automatically require 6 times more staff than servicing 16 TLDs. Similarly, an increase in the number of domains under management does not require a linear increase in resources. Afilias carefully tracks the relationship between resources deployed and domains to be serviced, and pro-actively reviews this metric in order to retain a safe margin of error. This enables Afilias to add, train and prepare new staff well in advance of the need, allowing consistent delivery of high quality services.

24. 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:

• 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).

Answers for this question (#24) are provided directly from Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD.

THE RESPONSE FOR THIS QUESTION USES ANGLE BRACKETS (THE “〈” and “〉” CHARACTERS), WHICH ICANN INFORMS AFILIAS (CASE ID 11027) CANNOT BE PROPERLY RENDERED IN TAS DUE TO SECURITY CONCERNS. HENCE, THE FULL ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS ATTACHED AS A PDF FILE.

Afilias operates a state-of-the-art EPP-based Shared Registration System (SRS) that is secure, stable and reliable. The SRS is a critical component of registry operations that must balance the business requirements for the registry and its customers, such as numerous domain acquisition and management functions. The SRS meets or exceeds all ICANN requirements given that Afilias:

• Operates a secure, stable and reliable SRS which updates in real-time and in full compliance with Specification 6 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement;
• Is committed to continuously enhancing our SRS to meet existing and future needs;
• Currently exceeds contractual requirements and will perform in compliance with Specification 10 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement;
• Provides SRS functionality and staff, financial, and other resources to more than adequately meet the technical needs of this TLD, and;
• Manages the SRS with a team of experienced technical professionals who can seamlessly integrate this TLD into the Afilias registry platform and support the TLD in a secure, stable and reliable manner.

Description of operation of the SRS, including diagrams
Afilias’ SRS provides the same advanced functionality as that used in the .INFO and .ORG registries, as well as the fourteen other TLDs currently supported by Afilias. The Afilias registry system is standards-compliant and utilizes proven technology, ensuring global familiarity for registrars, and it is protected by our massively provisioned infrastructure that mitigates the risk of disaster.

EPP functionality is described fully in our response to question #25; please consider those answers incorporated here by reference. An abbreviated list of Afilias SRS functionality includes:

- **Domain registration**: Afilias provides registration of names in the TLD, in both ASCII and IDN forms, to accredited registrars via EPP and a web-based administration tool.
- **Domain renewal**: Afilias provides services that allow registrars the ability to renew domains under sponsorship at any time. Further, the registry performs the automated renewal of all domain names at the expiration of their term, and allows registrars to rescind automatic renewals within a specified number of days after the transaction for a full refund.
- **Transfer**: Afilias provides efficient and automated procedures to facilitate the transfer of sponsorship of a domain name between accredited registrars. Further, the registry enables bulk transfers of domains under the provisions of the Registry-Registrar Agreement.
- **RGP and restoring deleted domain registrations**: Afilias provides support for the Redemption Grace Period (RGP) as needed, enabling the restoration of deleted registrations.
- **Other grace periods and conformance with ICANN guidelines**: Afilias provides support for other grace periods that are evolving as standard practice inside the ICANN community. In addition, the Afilias registry system supports the evolving ICANN guidelines on IDNs.

Afilias also supports the basic check, delete, and modify commands.

As required for all new gTLDs, Afilias provides “thick” registry system functionality. In this model, all key contact details for each domain are stored in the registry. This allows better access to domain data and provides uniformity in storing the information.

Afilias’ SRS complies today and will continue to comply with global best practices including relevant RFCs, ICANN requirements, and this TLD’s respective domain policies. With over a decade of experience, Afilias has fully documented and tested policies and procedures, and our highly skilled team members are active participants of the major relevant technology and standards organizations, so ICANN can be assured that SRS performance and compliance are met. Full details regarding the SRS system and network architecture are provided in responses to questions #31 and #32; please consider those answers incorporated here by reference.

**SRS servers and software**

All applications and databases for this TLD will run in a virtual environment currently hosted by a cluster of servers equipped with the latest Intel Westmere multi-core processors. (It is possible that by the time this application is evaluated and systems deployed, Westmere processors may no longer be the “latest”; the Afilias policy is to use the most advanced, stable technology available at the time of deployment.) The data for the registry will be stored on storage arrays of solid state drives shared over a fast storage area network. The virtual environment allows the infrastructure to easily scale both vertically and horizontally to cater to changing demand. It also facilitates effective utilization of system resources, thus reducing energy consumption and carbon footprint.

The network firewalls, routers and switches support all applications and servers. Hardware traffic shapers are
used to enforce an equitable access policy for connections coming from registrars. The registry system accommodates both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses. Hardware load balancers accelerate TLS-SSL handshaking and distribute load among a pool of application servers.

Each of the servers and network devices are equipped with redundant, hot-swappable components and multiple connections to ancillary systems. Additionally, 24x7 support agreements with a four-hour response time at all our data centers guarantee replacement of failed parts in the shortest time possible.

Examples of current system and network devices used are:
- Servers: Cisco UCS B230 blade servers
- SAN storage arrays: IBM Storwize V7000 with Solid State Drives
- SAN switches: Brocade 5100
- Firewalls: Cisco ASA 5585-X
- Load balancers: F5 Big-IP 6900
- Traffic shapers: Procera PacketLogic PL8720
- Routers: Juniper MX40 3D
- Network switches: Cisco Nexus 7010, Nexus 5548, Nexus 2232

These system components are upgraded and updated as required, and have usage and performance thresholds which trigger upgrade review points. In each data center, there is a minimum of two of each network component, a minimum of 25 servers, and a minimum of two storage arrays.

Technical components of the SRS include the following items, continually checked and upgraded as needed: SRS, WHOIS, web admin tool, DNS, DNS distributor, reporting, invoicing tools, and deferred revenue system (as needed).

All hardware is massively provisioned to ensure stability under all forecast volumes from launch through “normal” operations of average daily and peak capacities. Each and every system application, server, storage and network device is continuously monitored by the Afilias Network Operations Center for performance and availability. The data gathered is used by dynamic predictive analysis tools in real-time to raise alerts for unusual resource demands. Should any volumes exceed established thresholds, a capacity planning review is instituted which will address the need for additions well in advance of their actual need.

A sample of the Afilias SRS technical and operational capabilities (displayed in Figure 24-a) include:
- Geographically diverse redundant registry systems;
- Load balancing implemented for all registry services (e.g. EPP, WHOIS, web admin) ensuring equal experience for all customers and easy horizontal scalability;
- Disaster Recovery Point objective for the registry is within one minute of the loss of the primary system;
- Detailed and tested contingency plan, in case of primary site failure, and;
Daily reports, with secure access for confidentiality protection.

As evidenced in Figure 24-a, the SRS contains several components of the registry system. The interconnectivity ensures near-real-time distribution of the data throughout the registry infrastructure, timely backups, and up-to-date billing information.

The WHOIS servers are directly connected to the registry database and provide real-time responses to queries using the most up-to-date information present in the registry.

Committed DNS-related EPP objects in the database are made available to the DNS Distributor via a dedicated set of connections. The DNS Distributor extracts committed DNS-related EPP objects in real time and immediately inserts them into the zone for dissemination.

The Afilias system is architected such that read-only database connections are executed on database replicas and connections to the database master (where write-access is executed) are carefully protected to ensure high availability.

This interconnectivity is monitored, as is the entire registry system, according to the plans detailed in our response to question #42.

Synchronization scheme

Registry databases are synchronized both within the same data center and in the backup data center using a database application called Slony. For further details, please see the responses to questions #33 and #37. Slony replication of transactions from the publisher (master) database to its subscribers (replicas) works continuously to ensure the publisher and its subscribers remain synchronized. When the publisher database completes a transaction the Slony replication system ensures that each replica also processes the transaction. When there are no transactions to process, Slony “sleeps” until a transaction arrives or for one minute, whichever comes first. Slony “wakes up” each minute to confirm with the publisher that there has not been a transaction and thus ensures subscribers are synchronized and the replication time lag is minimized. The typical replication time lag between the publisher and subscribers depends on the topology of the replication cluster, specifically the location of the subscribers relative to the publisher. Subscribers located in the same data center as the publisher are typically updated within a couple of seconds, and subscribers located in a secondary data center are typically updated in less than ten seconds. This ensures real-time or near-real-time synchronization between all databases, and in the case where the secondary data center needs to be activated, it can be done with minimal disruption to registrars.

SRS SLA performance compliance

Afilias has a ten-year record of delivering on the demanding ICANN SLAs, and will continue to provide secure, stable and reliable service in compliance with SLA requirements as specified in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 10, as presented in Figure 24-b.

The Afilias SRS currently handles over 200 million EPP transactions per month for just .INFO and .ORG. Overall,
the Afilias SRS manages over 700 million EPP transactions per month for all TLDs under management.

Given this robust functionality, and more than a decade of experience supporting a thick TLD registry with a strong performance history, Afilias, on behalf of Kosher Marketing Assets, will meet or exceed the performance metrics in Specification 10 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement. The Afilias services and infrastructure are designed to scale both vertically and horizontally without any downtime to provide consistent performance as this TLD grows. The Afilias architecture is also massively provisioned to meet seasonal demands and marketing campaigns. Afilias’ experience also gives high confidence in the ability to scale and grow registry operations for this TLD in a secure, stable and reliable manner.

SRS resourcing plans

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way.

Over 100 Afilias team members contribute to the management of the SRS code and network that will support this TLD. The SRS team is composed of Software Engineers, Quality Assurance Analysts, Application Administrators, System Administrators, Storage Administrators, Network Administrators, Database Administrators, and Security Analysts located at three geographically separate Afilias facilities. The systems and services set up and administered by these team members are monitored 24x7 by skilled analysts at two NOCs located in Toronto, Ontario (Canada) and Horsham, Pennsylvania (USA). In addition to these team members, Afilias also utilizes trained project management staff to maintain various calendars, work breakdown schedules, utilization and resource schedules and other tools to support the technical and management staff. It is this team who will both deploy this TLD on the Afilias infrastructure, and maintain it. Together, the Afilias team has managed 11 registry transitions and six new TLD launches, which illustrate its ability to securely and reliably deliver regularly scheduled updates as well as a secure, stable and reliable SRS service for this TLD.

25. 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.

Answers for this question (#25) are provided by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD.
Afilias has been a pioneer and innovator in the use of EPP. .INFO was the first EPP-based gTLD registry and launched on EPP version 02-00. Afilias has a track record of supporting TLDs on standards-compliant versions of EPP. Afilias will operate the EPP registrar interface as well as a web-based interface for this TLD in accordance with RFCs and global best practices. In addition, Afilias will maintain a proper OT&E (Operational Testing and Evaluation) environment to facilitate registrar system development and testing.

Afilias’ EPP technical performance meets or exceeds all ICANN requirements as demonstrated by:
• A completely functional, state-of-the-art, EPP-based SRS that currently meets the needs of various gTLDs and will meet this new TLD’s needs;
• A track record of success in developing extensions to meet client and registrar business requirements such as multi-script support for IDNs;
• Supporting six ICANN gTLDs on EPP: .INFO, .ORG, .MOBI, .AERO, .ASIA and .XXX
• EPP software that is operating today and has been fully tested to be standards-compliant;
• Proven interoperability of existing EPP software with ICANN-accredited registrars, and;
• An SRS that currently processes over 200 million EPP transactions per month for both .INFO and .ORG. Overall, Afilias processes over 700 million EPP transactions per month for all 16 TLDs under management.

The EPP service is offered in accordance with the performance specifications defined in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 10.

EPP Standards

The Afilias registry system complies with the following revised versions of the RFCs and operates multiple ICANN TLDs on these standards, including .INFO, .ORG, .MOBI, .ASIA and .XXX. The systems have been tested by our Quality Assurance ("QA") team for RFC compliance, and have been used by registrars for an extended period of time:
• 3735 - Guidelines for Extending EPP
• 3915 - Domain Registry Grace Period Mapping
• 5730 - Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)
• 5731 - Domain Name Mapping
• 5732 - Host Mapping
• 5733 - Contact Mapping
• 5734 - Transport Over TCP
• 5910 - Domain Name System (DNS) Security Extensions Mapping for the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)

This TLD will support all valid EPP commands. The following EPP commands are in operation today and will be made available for this TLD. See attachment #25a for the base set of EPP commands and copies of Afilias XSD schema files, which define all the rules of valid, RFC compliant EPP commands and responses that Afilias supports. Any customized EPP extensions, if necessary, will also conform to relevant RFCs.
Afilias staff members actively participated in the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) process that finalized the new standards for EPP. Afilias will continue to actively participate in the IETF and will stay abreast of any updates to the EPP standards.

EPP software interface and functionality

Afilias will provide all registrars with a free open-source EPP toolkit. Afilias provides this software for use with both Microsoft Windows and Unix/Linux operating systems. This software, which includes all relevant templates and schema defined in the RFCs, is available on sourceforge.net and will be available through the registry operator’s website.

Afilias’ SRS EPP software complies with all relevant RFCs and includes the following functionality:

- EPP Greeting: A response to a successful connection returns a greeting to the client. Information exchanged can include: name of server, server date and time in UTC, server features, e.g., protocol versions supported, languages for the text response supported, and one or more elements which identify the objects that the server is capable of managing;
- Session management controls: ⟨login⟩ to establish a connection with a server, and ⟨logout⟩ to end a session;
- EPP Objects: Domain, Host and Contact for respective mapping functions;
- EPP Object Query Commands: Info, Check, and Transfer (query) commands to retrieve object information, and;
- EPP Object Transform Commands: five commands to transform objects: ⟨create⟩ to create an instance of an object, ⟨delete⟩ to remove an instance of an object, ⟨renew⟩ to extend the validity period of an object, ⟨update⟩ to change information associated with an object, and ⟨transfer⟩ to manage changes in client sponsorship of a known object.

Currently, 100% of the top domain name registrars in the world have software that has already been tested and certified to be compatible with the Afilias SRS registry. In total, over 375 registrars, representing over 95% of all registration volume worldwide, operate software that has been certified compatible with the Afilias SRS registry. Afilias’ EPP Registrar Acceptance Criteria are available in attachment #25b, EPP OT&E Criteria.

Free EPP software support

Afilias analyzes and diagnoses registrar EPP activity log files as needed and is available to assist registrars who may require technical guidance regarding how to fix repetitive errors or exceptions caused by misconfigured client software.

Registrars are responsible for acquiring a TLS/SSL certificate from an approved certificate authority, as the registry-registrar communication channel requires mutual authentication; Afilias will acquire and maintain the server-side TLS/SSL certificate. The registrar is responsible for developing support for TLS/SSL in their client application. Afilias will provide free guidance for registrars unfamiliar with this requirement.

Registrar data synchronization

There are two methods available for registrars to synchronize their data with the registry:

- Automated synchronization: Registrars can, at any time, use the EPP ⟨info⟩ command to obtain definitive data from the registry for a known object, including domains, hosts (nameservers) and contacts.
• Personalized synchronization: A registrar may contact technical support and request a data file containing all domains (and associated host (nameserver) and contact information) registered by that registrar, within a specified time interval. The data will be formatted as a comma separated values (CSV) file and made available for download using a secure server.

EPP modifications

There are no unique EPP modifications planned for this TLD.

All ICANN TLDs must offer a Sunrise as part of a rights protection program. Afilias uses EPP extensions that allow registrars to submit trademark and other intellectual property rights (IPR) data to the registry. These extensions are:

• An 〈ipr:name〉 element that indicates the name of Registered Mark.
• An 〈ipr:number〉 element that indicates the registration number of the IPR.
• An 〈ipr:ccLocality〉 element that indicates the origin for which the IPR is established (a national or international trademark registry).
• An 〈ipr:entitlement〉 element that indicates whether the applicant holds the trademark as the original “OWNER”, “CO-OWNER” or “ASSIGNEE”.
• An 〈ipr:appDate〉 element that indicates the date the Registered Mark was applied for.
• An 〈ipr:regDate〉 element that indicates the date the Registered Mark was issued and registered.
• An 〈ipr:class〉 element that indicates the class of the registered mark.
• An 〈ipr:type〉 element that indicates the Sunrise phase the application applies for.

Note that some of these extensions might be subject to change based on ICANN-developed requirements for the Trademark Clearinghouse.

EPP resourcing plans

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way.

108 Afilias team members directly contribute to the management and development of the EPP based registry systems. As previously noted, Afilias is an active member of IETF and has a long documented history developing and enhancing EPP. These contributors include 11 developers and 14 QA engineers focused on maintaining and enhancing EPP server side software. These engineers work directly with business staff to timely address existing needs and forecast registry-registrar needs to ensure the Afilias EPP software is effective today and into the future. A team of eight data analysts work with the EPP software system to ensure that the data flowing through EPP is securely and reliably stored in replicated database systems. In addition to the EPP developers, QA engineers, and data analysts, other EPP contributors at Afilias include: Technical Analysts, the Network Operations Center and
26. Whois: describe

- how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookups 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:

- A high-level Whois system description;
- Relevant network diagram(s);
- IT and infrastructure resources (e.g., servers, switches, routers and other components);
- Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems; and

Frequency of synchronization between servers.
To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:

- Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and
- A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

Answers for this question (#26) are provided by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD.

Afilias operates the WHOIS (registration data directory service) infrastructure in accordance with RFCs and global best practices, as it does for the 16 TLDs it currently supports. Designed to be robust and scalable, Afilias’ WHOIS service has exceeded all contractual requirements for over a decade. It has extended search capabilities, and methods of limiting abuse.

The WHOIS service operated by Afilias meets and exceeds ICANN’s requirements. Specifically, Afilias will:
- Offer a WHOIS service made available on port 43 that is flexible and standards-compliant;
- Comply with all ICANN policies, and meeting or exceeding WHOIS performance requirements in Specification 10 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement;
- Enable a Searchable WHOIS with extensive search capabilities that offers ease of use while enforcing measures to mitigate access abuse, and;
- Employ a team with significant experience managing a compliant WHOIS service.
Such extensive knowledge and experience managing a WHOIS service enables Afilias to offer a comprehensive plan for this TLD that meets the needs of constituents of the domain name industry and Internet users. The service has been tested by our QA team for RFC compliance, and has been used by registrars and many other parties for an extended period of time. Afilias’ WHOIS service currently serves almost 500 million WHOIS queries per month, with the capacity already built in to handle an order of magnitude increase in WHOIS queries, and the ability to smoothly scale should greater growth be needed.

**WHOIS system description and diagram**

The Afilias WHOIS system, depicted in figure 26-a, is designed with robustness, availability, compliance, and performance in mind. Additionally, the system has provisions for detecting abusive usage (e.g., excessive numbers of queries from one source). The WHOIS system is generally intended as a publicly available single object lookup system. Afilias uses an advanced, persistent caching system to ensure extremely fast query response times.

Afilias will develop restricted WHOIS functions based on specific domain policy and regulatory requirements as needed for operating the business (as long as they are standards compliant). It will also be possible for contact and registrant information to be returned according to regulatory requirements. The WHOIS database supports multiple string and field searching through a reliable, free, secure web-based interface.

**Data objects, interfaces, access and lookups**

Registrars can provide an input form on their public websites through which a visitor is able to perform WHOIS queries. The registry operator can also provide a Web-based search on its site. The input form must accept the string to query, along with the necessary input elements to select the object type and interpretation controls. This input form sends its data to the Afilias port 43 WHOIS server. The results from the WHOIS query are returned by the server and displayed in the visitor’s Web browser. The sole purpose of the Web interface is to provide a user-friendly interface for WHOIS queries.

Afilias will provide WHOIS output as per Specification 4 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement. The output for domain records generally consists of the following elements:

- The name of the domain registered and the sponsoring registrar;
- The names of the primary and secondary nameserver(s) for the registered domain name;
- The creation date, registration status and expiration date of the registration;
- The name, postal address, e-mail address, and telephone and fax numbers of the domain name holder;
- The name, postal address, e-mail address, and telephone and fax numbers of the technical contact for the domain name holder;
- The name, postal address, e-mail address, and telephone and fax numbers of the administrative contact for the domain name holder;
- The name, postal address, e-mail address, and telephone and fax numbers of the billing contact for the domain name holder.

The following additional features are also present in Afilias’ WHOIS service:

- Support for IDNs, including the language tag and the Punycode representation of the IDN in addition to Unicode Hex and Unicode HTML formats;
- Enhanced support for privacy protection relative to the display of confidential information.
Afilias will also provide sophisticated WHOIS search functionality that includes the ability to conduct multiple string and field searches.

Query controls
For all WHOIS queries, a user is required to enter the character string representing the information for which they want to search. The object type and interpretation control parameters to limit the search may also be specified. If object type or interpretation control parameter is not specified, WHOIS will search for the character string in the Name field of the Domain object.

WHOIS queries are required to be either an “exact search” or a “partial search,” both of which are insensitive to the case of the input string.

An exact search specifies the full string to search for in the database field. An exact match between the input string and the field value is required.

A partial search specifies the start of the string to search for in the database field. Every record with a search field that starts with the input string is considered a match. By default, if multiple matches are found for a query, then a summary containing up to 50 matching results is presented. A second query is required to retrieve the specific details of one of the matching records.

If only a single match is found, then full details will be provided. Full detail consists of the data in the matching object as well as the data in any associated objects. For example: a query that results in a domain object includes the data from the associated host and contact objects.

WHOIS query controls fall into two categories: those that specify the type of field, and those that modify the interpretation of the input or determine the level of output to provide. Each is described below.

The following keywords restrict a search to a specific object type:
- Domain: Searches only domain objects. The input string is searched in the Name field.
- Host: Searches only nameserver objects. The input string is searched in the Name field and the IP Address field.
- Contact: Searches only contact objects. The input string is searched in the ID field.
- Registrar: Searches only registrar objects. The input string is searched in the Name field.

By default, if no object type control is specified, then the Name field of the Domain object is searched.

In addition, Afilias WHOIS systems can perform and respond to WHOIS searches by registrant name, postal address and contact names. Deployment of these features is provided as an option to the registry operator, based upon registry policy and business decision making.

Figure 26-b presents the keywords that modify the interpretation of the input or determine the level of output to provide.

By default, if no interpretation control keywords are used, the output will include full details if a single match is found and a summary if multiple matches are found.
Unique TLD requirements
There are no unique WHOIS requirements for this TLD.

Sunrise WHOIS processes
All ICANN TLDs must offer a Sunrise as part of a rights protection program. Afilias uses EPP extensions that allow registrars to submit trademark and other intellectual property rights (IPR) data to the registry. The following corresponding data will be displayed in WHOIS for relevant domains:

• Trademark Name: element that indicates the name of the Registered Mark.
• Trademark Number: element that indicates the registration number of the IPR.
• Trademark Locality: element that indicates the origin for which the IPR is established (a national or international trademark registry).
• Trademark Entitlement: element that indicates whether the applicant holds the trademark as the original “OWNER”, “CO-OWNER” or “ASSIGNEE”.
• Trademark Application Date: element that indicates the date the Registered Mark was applied for.
• Trademark Registration Date: element that indicates the date the Registered Mark was issued and registered.
• Trademark Class: element that indicates the class of the Registered Mark.
• IPR Type: element that indicates the Sunrise phase the application applies for.

IT and infrastructure resources
All the applications and databases for this TLD will run in a virtual environment hosted by a cluster of servers equipped with the latest Intel Westmere multi-core processors (or a more advanced, stable technology available at the time of deployment). The registry data will be stored on storage arrays of solid-state drives shared over a fast storage area network. The virtual environment allows the infrastructure to easily scale both vertically and horizontally to cater to changing demand. It also facilitates effective utilization of system resources thus reducing energy consumption and carbon footprint.

The applications and servers are supported by network firewalls, routers and switches.

The WHOIS system accommodates both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses.

Each of the servers and network devices are equipped with redundant hot-swappable components and multiple connections to ancillary systems. Additionally, 24x7 support agreements with our hardware vendor with a 4-hour response time at all our data centers guarantees replacement of failed parts in the shortest time possible.

Models of system and network devices used are:
• Servers: Cisco UCS B230 blade servers
• SAN storage arrays: IBM Storwize V7000 with Solid State Drives
• Firewalls: Cisco ASA 5585-X
• Load balancers: F5 Big-IP 6900
• Traffic shapers: Procera PacketLogic PL8720
• Routers: Juniper MX40 3D
• Network switches: Cisco Nexus 7010, Nexus 5548, Nexus 2232

There will be at least four virtual machines (VMs) offering WHOIS service. Each VM will run at least two WHOIS
server instances - one for registrars and one for the public. All instances of the WHOIS service is made available to registrars and the public are rate limited to mitigate abusive behavior.

Frequency of synchronization between servers

Registration data records from the EPP publisher database will be replicated to the WHOIS system database on a near-real-time basis whenever an update occurs.

Specifications 4 and 10 compliance

The WHOIS service for this TLD will meet or exceed the performance requirements in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 10. Figure 26-c provides the exact measurements and commitments. Afilias has a 10 year track record of exceeding WHOIS performance and a skilled team to ensure this continues for all TLDs under management.

The WHOIS service for this TLD will meet or exceed the requirements in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 4.

RFC 3912 compliance

Afilias will operate the WHOIS infrastructure in compliance with RFCs and global best practices, as it does with the 16 TLDs Afilias currently supports.

Afilias maintains a registry-level centralized WHOIS database that contains information for every registered domain and for all host and contact objects. The WHOIS service will be available on the Internet standard WHOIS port (port 43) in compliance with RFC 3912. The WHOIS service contains data submitted by registrars during the registration process. Changes made to the data by a registrant are submitted to Afilias by the registrar and are reflected in the WHOIS database and service in near-real-time, by the instance running at the primary data center, and in under ten seconds by the instance running at the secondary data center, thus providing all interested parties with up-to-date information for every domain. This service is compliant with the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 4.

The WHOIS service maintained by Afilias will be authoritative and complete, as this will be a “thick” registry (detailed domain contact WHOIS is all held at the registry); users do not have to query different registrars for WHOIS information, as there is one central WHOIS system. Additionally, visibility of different types of data is configurable to meet the registry operator’s needs.

Searchable WHOIS

Afilias offers a searchable WHOIS on a web-based Directory Service. Partial match capabilities are offered on the following fields: domain name, registrar ID, and IP address. In addition, Afilias WHOIS systems can perform and respond to WHOIS searches by registrant name, postal address and contact names.
Providing the ability to search important and high-value fields such as registrant name, address and contact names increases the probability of abusive behavior. An abusive user could script a set of queries to the WHOIS service and access contact data in order to create or sell a list of names and addresses of registrants in this TLD. Making the WHOIS machine readable, while preventing harvesting and mining of WHOIS data, is a key requirement integrated into the Afilias WHOIS systems. For instance, Afilias limits search returns to 50 records at a time. If bulk queries were ever necessary (e.g., to comply with any applicable laws, government rules or requirements, requests of law enforcement, or any dispute resolution process), Afilias makes such query responses available to carefully screened and limited staff members at the registry operator (and customer support staff) via an internal data warehouse. The Afilias WHOIS system accommodates anonymous access as well as pre-identified and profile-defined uses, with full audit and log capabilities.

The WHOIS service has the ability to tag query responses with labels such as “Do not redistribute” or “Special access granted”. This may allow for tiered response and reply scenarios. Further, the WHOIS service is configurable in parameters and fields returned, which allow for flexibility in compliance with various jurisdictions, regulations or laws.

Afilias offers exact-match capabilities on the following fields: registrar ID, nameserver name, and nameserver’s IP address (only applies to IP addresses stored by the registry, i.e., glue records). Search capabilities are fully available, and results include domain names matching the search criteria (including IDN variants). Afilias manages abuse prevention through rate limiting and CAPTCHA (described below). Queries do not require specialized transformations of internationalized domain names or internationalized data fields.

Please see “Query Controls” above for details about search options and capabilities.

Deterring WHOIS abuse

Afilias has adopted two best practices to prevent abuse of the WHOIS service: rate limiting and CAPTCHA.

Abuse of WHOIS services on port 43 and via the Web is subject to an automated rate-limiting system. This ensures that uniformity of service to users is unaffected by a few parties whose activities abuse or otherwise might threaten to overload the WHOIS system.

Abuse of web-based public WHOIS services is subject to the use of CAPTCHA (Completely Automated Public Turing test to tell Computers and Humans Apart) technology. The use of CAPTCHA ensures that uniformity of service to users is unaffected by a few parties whose activities abuse or otherwise might threaten to overload the WHOIS system. The registry operator will adopt a CAPTCHA on its Web-based WHOIS.

Data mining of any sort on the WHOIS system is strictly prohibited, and this prohibition is published in WHOIS output and in terms of service.

For rate limiting on IPv4, there are configurable limits per IP and subnet. For IPv6, the traditional limitations do not apply. Whenever a unique IPv6 IP address exceeds the limit of WHOIS queries per minute, the same rate-limit for the given 64 bits of network prefix that the offending IPv6 IP address falls into will be applied. At the same time, a timer will start and rate-limit validation logic will identify if there are any other IPv6
address within the original 80-bit (/48) prefix. If another offending IPv6 address does fall into the /48 prefix then rate-limit validation logic will penalize any other IPv6 addresses that fall into that given 80-bit (/48) network. As a security precaution, Afilias will not disclose these limits.

Pre-identified and profile-driven role access allows greater granularity and configurability in both access to the WHOIS service, and in volume/frequency of responses returned for queries.

Afilias staff are key participants in the ICANN Security & Stability Advisory Committee’s deliberations and outputs on WHOIS, including SAC003, SAC027, SAC033, SAC037, SAC040, and SAC051. Afilias staff are active participants in both technical and policy decision making in ICANN, aimed at restricting abusive behavior.

WHOIS staff resourcing plans

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way.

Within Afilias, there are 11 staff members who develop and maintain the compliant WHOIS systems. They keep pace with access requirements, thwart abuse, and continually develop software. Of these resources, approximately two staffers are typically required for WHOIS-related code customization. Other resources provide quality assurance, and operations personnel maintain the WHOIS system itself. This team will be responsible for the implementation and on-going maintenance of the new TLD WHOIS service.

27. Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD. The description must:

- explain the various registration states as well as the criteria and procedures that are used to change state;
- describe the typical registration lifecycle of create/update/delete and all intervening steps such as pending, locked, expired, and transferred that may apply;
- clearly explain any time elements that are involved - for instance details of add-grace or redemption grace periods, or notice periods for renewals or transfers; and
- describe resourcing plans for this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).

The description of the registration lifecycle should be supplemented by the inclusion of a state diagram, which captures definitions, explanations of trigger points, and transitions from state to state. If applicable, provide definitions for aspects of the registration lifecycle that are not covered by standard EPP RFCs.
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

The response for this question uses angle brackets (the “<” and “>” characters), which ICANN informs Afilias (Case ID 11027) cannot be properly rendered in TAS due to security concerns. Hence, the full answer to this question is attached as a PDF file.

Answers for this question (#27) are provided by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD.

Afilias has had experience managing registrations for over a decade and supports comprehensive registration lifecycle services including the registration states, all standard grace periods, and can address any modifications required with the introduction of any new ICANN policies.

This TLD will follow the ICANN standard domain lifecycle, as is currently implemented in TLDs such as .ORG and .INFO. The below response includes: a diagram and description of the lifecycle of a domain name in this TLD, including domain creation, transfer protocols, grace period implementation and the respective time frames for each; and the existing resources to support the complete lifecycle of a domain.

As depicted in Figure 27-a, prior to the beginning of the Trademark Claims Service or Sunrise IP protection program, Afilias will support the reservation of names in accordance with the new gTLD Registry Agreement, Specification 5.

Registration period

After the IP protection programs and the general launch, eligible registrants may choose an accredited registrar to register a domain name. The registrar will check availability on the requested domain name and if available, will collect specific objects such as, the required contact and host information from the registrant. The registrar will then provision the information into the registry system using standard Extensible Provisioning Protocol (“EPP”) commands through a secure connection to the registry backend service provider.

When the domain is created, the standard five day Add Grace Period begins, the domain and contact information are available in WHOIS, and normal operating EPP domain statuses will apply. Other specifics regarding registration rules for an active domain include:

- The domain must be unique;
- Restricted or reserved domains cannot be registered;
- The domain can be registered from 1-10 years;
- The domain can be renewed at any time for 1-10 years, but cannot exceed 10 years;
- The domain can be explicitly deleted at any time;
- The domain can be transferred from one registrar to another except during the first 60 days following a successful registration or within 60 days following a transfer; and,
- Contacts and hosts can be modified at any time.

The following describe the domain status values recognized in WHOIS when using the EPP protocol following RFC 5731.

- OK or Active: This is the normal status for a domain that has no pending operations or restrictions.
• Inactive: The domain has no delegated name servers.
• Locked: No action can be taken on the domain. The domain cannot be renewed, transferred, updated, or deleted. No objects such as contacts or hosts can be associated to, or disassociated from the domain. This status includes: Delete Prohibited / Server Delete Prohibited, Update Prohibited / Server Update Prohibited, Transfer Prohibited, Server Transfer Prohibited, Renew Prohibited, Server Renew Prohibited.
• Hold: The domain will not be included in the zone. This status includes: Client Hold, Server Hold.
• Transfer Prohibited: The domain cannot be transferred away from the sponsoring registrar. This status includes: Client Transfer Prohibited, Server Transfer Prohibited.

The following describe the registration operations that apply to the domain name during the registration period.

a. DOMAIN MODIFICATIONS: This operation allows for modifications or updates to the domain attributes to include:
   i. Registrant Contact
   ii. Admin Contact
   iii. Technical Contact
   iv. Billing Contact
   v. Host or nameservers
   vi. Authorization information
   vii. Associated status values

A domain with the EPP status of Client Update Prohibited or Server Update Prohibited may not be modified until the status is removed.

b. DOMAIN RENEWALS: This operation extends the registration period of a domain by changing the expiration date. The following rules apply:
   i. A domain can be renewed at any time during its registration term,
   ii. The registration term cannot exceed a total of 10 years.

A domain with the EPP status of Client Renew Prohibited or Server Renew Prohibited cannot be renewed.

c. DOMAIN DELETIONS: This operation deletes the domain from the Shared Registry Services (SRS). The following rules apply:
   i. A domain can be deleted at any time during its registration term, if the domain is deleted during the Add Grace Period or the Renew/Extend Grace Period, the sponsoring registrar will receive a credit,
   ii. A domain cannot be deleted if it has “child” nameservers that are associated to other domains.

A domain with the EPP status of Client Delete Prohibited or Server Delete Prohibited cannot be deleted.

d. DOMAIN TRANSFERS: A transfer of the domain from one registrar to another is conducted by following the steps below.
   i. The registrant must obtain the applicable <authInfo> code from the sponsoring (losing) registrar.
   • Every domain name has an authInfo code as per EPP RFC 5731. The authInfo code is a six- to 16-character code assigned by the registrar at the time the name was created. Its purpose is to aid identification of the domain owner so proper authority can be established (it is the "password" to the domain).
   • Under the Registry-Registrar Agreement, registrars will be required to provide a copy of the authInfo code to the domain registrant upon his or her request.
ii. The registrant must provide the authInfo code to the new (gaining) registrar, who will then initiate a domain transfer request. A transfer cannot be initiated without the authInfo code.
• Every EPP <transfer> command must contain the authInfo code or the request will fail. The authInfo code represents authority to the registry to initiate a transfer.
iii. Upon receipt of a valid transfer request, the registry automatically asks the sponsoring (losing) registrar to approve the request within five calendar days.
• When a registry receives a transfer request the domain cannot be modified, renewed or deleted until the request has been processed. This status must not be combined with either Client Transfer Prohibited or Server Transfer Prohibited status.
• If the sponsoring (losing) registrar rejects the transfer within five days, the transfer request is cancelled. A new domain transfer request will be required to reinitiate the process.
• If the sponsoring (losing) registrar does not approve or reject the transfer within five days, the registry automatically approves the request.
iv. After a successful transfer, it is strongly recommended that registrars change the authInfo code, so that the prior registrar or registrant cannot use it anymore.
v. Registrars must retain all transaction identifiers and codes associated with successful domain object transfers and protect them from disclosure.
vi. Once a domain is successfully transferred the status of TRANSFERPERIOD is added to the domain for a period of five days.
vii. Successful transfers will result in a one year term extension (resulting in a maximum total of 10 years), which will be charged to the gaining registrar.

e. BULK TRANSFER: Afilias, supports bulk transfer functionality within the SRS for situations where ICANN may request the registry to perform a transfer of some or all registered objects (includes domain, contact and host objects) from one registrar to another registrar. Once a bulk transfer has been executed, expiry dates for all domain objects remain the same, and all relevant states of each object type are preserved. In some cases the gaining and the losing registrar as well as the registry must approved bulk transfers. A detailed log is captured for each bulk transfer process and is archived for audit purposes.

Kosher Marketing Assets will support ICANN’s Transfer Dispute Resolution Process. Kosher Marketing Assets will work with Afilias to respond to Requests for Enforcement (law enforcement or court orders) and will follow that process.

1. Auto-renew grace period
The Auto-Renew Grace Period displays as AUTORENEWPERIOD in WHOIS. An auto-renew must be requested by the registrant through the sponsoring registrar and occurs if a domain name registration is not explicitly renewed or deleted by the expiration date and is set to a maximum of 45 calendar days. In this circumstance the registration will be automatically renewed by the registry system the first day after the expiration date. If a Delete, Extend, or Transfer occurs within the AUTORENEWPERIOD the following rules apply:
i. DELETE. If a domain is deleted the sponsoring registrar at the time of the deletion receives a credit for the auto-renew fee. The domain then moves into the Redemption Grace Period with a status of PENDING DELETE RESTORABLE.
ii. RENEW-EXTEND. A domain can be renewed as long as the total term does not exceed 10 years. The account of the sponsoring registrar at the time of the extension will be charged for the additional number of years the registration is renewed.
iii. TRANSFER. (other than ICANN-approved bulk transfer). If a domain is transferred, the losing registrar is
credited for the auto-renew fee, and the year added by the operation is cancelled. As a result of the transfer, the expiration date of the domain is extended by minimum of one year as long as the total term does not exceed 10 years. The gaining registrar is charged for the additional transfer year(s) even in cases where a full year is not added because of the maximum 10 year registration restriction.

2. Redemption grace period
During this period, a domain name is placed in the PENDING DELETE RESTORABLE status when a registrar requests the deletion of a domain that is not within the Add Grace Period. A domain can remain in this state for up to 30 days and will not be included in the zone file. The only action a registrar can take on a domain is to request that it be restored. Any other registrar requests to modify or otherwise update the domain will be rejected. If the domain is restored it moves into PENDING RESTORE and then OK. After 30 days if the domain is not restored it moves into PENDING DELETE SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE before the domain is released back into the pool of available domains.

3. Pending delete
During this period, a domain name is placed in PENDING DELETE SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE status for five days, and all Internet services associated with the domain will remain disabled and domain cannot be restored. After five days the domain is released back into the pool of available domains.

Other grace periods

All ICANN required grace periods will be implemented in the registry backend service provider’s system including the Add Grace Period (AGP), Renew-Extend Grace Period (EKP), Transfer Grace Period (TGP), Auto-Renew Grace Period (ARPG), and Redemption Grace Period (RGP). The lengths of grace periods are configurable in the registry system. At this time, the grace periods will be implemented following other gTLDs such as .ORG. More than one of these grace periods may be in effect at any one time. The following are accompanying grace periods to the registration lifecycle.

Add grace period

The Add Grace Period displays as ADDPERIOD in WHOIS and is set to five calendar days following the initial registration of a domain. If the domain is deleted by the registrar during this period, the registry provides a credit to the registrar for the cost of the registration. If a Delete, Renew-Extend, or Transfer operation occurs within the five calendar days, the following rules apply.

i. DELETE. If a domain is deleted within this period the sponsoring registrar at the time of the deletion is credited for the amount of the registration. The domain is deleted from the registry backend service provider’s database and is released back into the pool of available domains.

ii. RENEW-EXTEND. If the domain is renewed within this period and then deleted, the sponsoring registrar will receive a credit for both the registration and the extended amounts. The account of the sponsoring registrar at the time of the renewal will be charged for the initial registration plus the number of years the registration is extended. The expiration date of the domain registration is extended by that number of years as long as the total term does not exceed 10 years.

iii. TRANSFER (other than ICANN-approved bulk transfer). Transfers under Part A of the ICANN Policy on Transfer of Registrations between registrars may not occur during the ADDPERIOD or at any other time within the first 60
days after the initial registration. Enforcement is the responsibility of the registrar sponsoring the domain name registration and is enforced by the SRS.

Renew / extend grace period

The Renew / Extend Grace Period displays as RENEWPERIOD in WHOIS and is set to five calendar days following an explicit renewal on the domain by the registrar. If a Delete, Extend, or Transfer occurs within the five calendar days, the following rules apply:

i. DELETE. If a domain is deleted within this period the sponsoring registrar at the time of the deletion receives a credit for the renewal fee. The domain then moves into the Redemption Grace Period with a status of PENDING DELETE RESTORABLE.

ii. RENEW/EXTEND. A domain registration can be renewed within this period as long as the total term does not exceed 10 years. The account of the sponsoring registrar at the time of the extension will be charged for the additional number of years the registration is renewed.

iii. TRANSFER (other than ICANN-approved bulk transfer). If a domain is transferred within the Renew-Extend Grace Period, there is no credit to the losing registrar for the renewal fee. As a result of the transfer, the expiration date of the domain registration is extended by a minimum of one year as long as the total term for the domain does not exceed 10 years.

If a domain is auto-renewed, then extended, and then deleted within the Renew-Extend Grace Period, the registrar will be credited for any auto-renew fee charged and the number of years for the extension. The years that were added to the domain’s expiration as a result of the auto-renewal and extension are removed. The deleted domain is moved to the Redemption Grace Period with a status of PENDING DELETE RESTORABLE.

Transfer Grace Period

The Transfer Grace period displays as TRANSFERPERIOD in WHOIS and is set to five calendar days after the successful transfer of domain name registration from one registrar to another registrar. Transfers under Part A of the ICANN Policy on Transfer of Registrations between registrars may not occur during the TRANSFERPERIOD or within the first 60 days after the transfer. If a Delete or Renew-Extend occurs within that five calendar days, the following rules apply:

i. DELETE. If the domain is deleted by the new sponsoring registrar during this period, the registry provides a credit to the registrar for the cost of the transfer. The domain then moves into the Redemption Grace Period with a status of PENDING DELETE RESTORABLE.

ii. RENEW-EXTEND. If a domain registration is renewed within the Transfer Grace Period, there is no credit for the transfer. The registrar’s account will be charged for the number of years the registration is renewed. The expiration date of the domain registration is extended by the renewal years as long as the total term does not exceed 10 years.

Auction

This TLD will conduct an auction for certain domain names. Afilias will manage the domain name auction using existing technology. Upon the completion of the auction, any domain name acquired will then follow the standard
Registration lifecycle resources

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way. Virtually all Afilias resource are involved in the registration lifecycle of domains.

There are a few areas where registry staff devote resources to registration lifecycle issues:

a. Supporting Registrar Transfer Disputes. The registry operator will have a compliance staffer handle these disputes as they arise; they are very rare in the existing gTLDs.

b. Afilias has its development and quality assurance departments on hand to modify the grace period functionality as needed, if ICANN issues new Consensus Policies or the RFCs change.

Afilias has more than 30 staff members in these departments.

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 described below.

- 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
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;

- Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (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:
  - Requiring multi-factor authentication (i.e., strong passwords, tokens, one-time passwords) from registrants to process update, transfers, and deletion requests;
  - Requiring multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests; and
  - Requiring the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 20 pages.

Kosher Marketing Assets, working with Afilias, will take the requisite operational and technical steps to promote WHOIS data accuracy, limit domain abuse, remove outdated and inaccurate data, and other security measures to ensure the integrity of the TLD. The specific measures include, but are not limited to:

- Posting a TLD Anti-Abuse Policy that clearly defines abuse, and provide point-of-contact information for reporting suspected abuse;
- Committing to rapid identification and resolution of abuse, including suspensions;
- Ensuring completeness of WHOIS information at the time of registration;
- Publishing and maintaining procedures for removing orphan glue records for names removed from the zone, and;
- Establishing measures to deter WHOIS abuse, including rate-limiting, determining data syntax validity, and implementing and enforcing requirements from the Registry-Registrar Agreement.

Abuse policy

The Anti-Abuse Policy stated below will be enacted under the contractual authority of the registry operator through the Registry-Registrar Agreement, and the obligations will be passed on to and made binding upon registrants. This policy will be posted on the TLD web site along with contact information for registrants or users to report suspected abuse.

The policy is designed to address the malicious use of domain names. The registry operator and its registrars will make reasonable attempts to limit significant harm to Internet users. This policy is not intended to take
the place of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) or the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS), and it is not to be used as an alternate form of dispute resolution or as a brand protection mechanism. Its intent is not to burden law-abiding or innocent registrants and domain users; rather, the intent is to deter those who use domain names maliciously by engaging in illegal or fraudulent activity.

Repeat violations of the abuse policy will result in a case-by-case review of the abuser(s), and the registry operator reserves the right to escalate the issue, with the intent of levying sanctions that are allowed under the TLD anti-abuse policy.

The below policy is a recent version of the policy that has been used by the .INFO registry since 2008, and the .ORG registry since 2009. It has proven to be an effective and flexible tool.

.KOSHER Anti-Abuse Policy

The following Anti-Abuse Policy is effective upon launch of the TLD. Malicious use of domain names will not be tolerated. The nature of such abuses creates security and stability issues for the registry, registrars, and registrants, as well as for users of the Internet in general. The registry operator definition of abusive use of a domain includes, without limitation, the following:

- Illegal or fraudulent actions;
- Spam: The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited bulk messages. The term applies to email spam and similar abuses such as instant messaging spam, mobile messaging spam, and the spamming of web sites and Internet forums;
- Phishing: The use of counterfeit web pages that are designed to trick recipients into divulging sensitive data such as personally identifying information, usernames, passwords, or financial data;
- Pharming: The redirecting of unknowing users to fraudulent sites or services, typically through, but not limited to, DNS hijacking or poisoning;
- Willful distribution of malware: The dissemination of software designed to infiltrate or damage a computer system without the owner’s informed consent. Examples include, without limitation, computer viruses, worms, keyloggers, and Trojan horses.
- Malicious fast-flux hosting: Use of fast-flux techniques with a botnet to disguise the location of web sites or other Internet services, or to avoid detection and mitigation efforts, or to host illegal activities.
- Botnet command and control: Services run on a domain name that are used to control a collection of compromised computers or “zombies,” or to direct distributed denial-of-service attacks (DDoS attacks);
- Illegal Access to Other Computers or Networks: Illegally accessing computers, accounts, or networks belonging to another party, or attempting to penetrate security measures of another individual’s system (often known as “hacking”). Also, any activity that might be used as a precursor to an attempted system penetration (e.g., port scan, stealth scan, or other information gathering activity).

Pursuant to the Registry-Registrar Agreement, registry operator reserves the right at its sole discretion to deny, cancel, or transfer any registration or transaction, or place any domain name(s) on registry lock, hold, or similar status, that it deems necessary: (1) to protect the integrity and stability of the registry; (2) to comply with any applicable laws, government rules or requirements, requests of law enforcement, or any dispute resolution process; (3) to avoid any liability, civil or criminal, on the part of registry operator, as well as its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, and employees; (4) per the terms of the registration agreement and this Anti-Abuse Policy, or (5) to correct mistakes made by registry operator or any registrar in connection with a domain name registration. Registry operator also reserves the right to place upon registry lock, hold, or similar status a domain name during resolution of a dispute.
The policy stated above will be accompanied by notes about how to submit a report to the registry operator’s abuse point of contact, and how to report an orphan glue record suspected of being used in connection with malicious conduct (see below).

Abuse point of contact and procedures for handling abuse complaints

The registry operator will establish an abuse point of contact. This contact will be a role-based e-mail address of the form “abuse@registry.KOSHER”. This e-mail address will allow multiple staff members to monitor abuse reports on a 24x7 basis, and then work toward closure of cases as each situation calls for. For tracking purposes, the registry operator will have a ticketing system with which all complaints will be tracked internally. The reporter will be provided with the ticket reference identifier for potential follow-up. Afilias will integrate its existing ticketing system with the registry operator’s to ensure uniform tracking and handling of the complaint. This role-based approach has been used successfully by ISPs, e-mail service providers, and registrars for many years, and is considered a global best practice.

The registry operator’s designated abuse handlers will then evaluate complaints received via the abuse system address. They will decide whether a particular issue is of concern, and decide what action, if any, is appropriate.

In general, the registry operator will find itself receiving abuse reports from a wide variety of parties, including security researchers and Internet security companies, financial institutions such as banks, Internet users, and law enforcement agencies among others. Some of these parties may provide good forensic data or supporting evidence of the malicious behavior. In other cases, the party reporting an issue may not be familiar with how to provide such data or proof of malicious behavior. It is expected that a percentage of abuse reports to the registry operator will not be actionable, because there will not be enough evidence to support the complaint (even after investigation), and because some reports or reporters will simply not be credible.

The security function includes a communication and outreach function, with information sharing with industry partners regarding malicious or abusive behavior, in order to ensure coordinated abuse mitigation across multiple TLDs.

Assessing abuse reports requires great care, and the registry operator will rely upon professional, trained investigators who are versed in such matters. The goals are accuracy, good record-keeping, and a zero false-positive rate so as not to harm innocent registrants.

Different types of malicious activities require different methods of investigation and documentation. Further, the registry operator expects to face unexpected or complex situations that call for professional advice, and will rely upon professional, trained investigators as needed.

In general, there are two types of domain abuse that must be addressed:

a) Compromised domains. These domains have been hacked or otherwise compromised by criminals, and the registrant is not responsible for the malicious activity taking place on the domain. For example, the majority of domain names that host phishing sites are compromised. The goal in such cases is to get word to the registrant (usually via the registrar) that there is a problem that needs attention with the expectation that the registrant will address the problem in a timely manner. Ideally such domains do not get suspended, since suspension would disrupt legitimate activity on the domain.
b) Malicious registrations. These domains are registered by malefactors for the purpose of abuse. Such domains are generally targets for suspension, since they have no legitimate use.

The standard procedure is that the registry operator will forward a credible alleged case of malicious domain name use to the domain’s sponsoring registrar with a request that the registrar investigate the case and act appropriately. The registrar will be provided evidence collected as a result of the investigation conducted by the trained abuse handlers. As part of the investigation, if inaccurate or false WHOIS registrant information is detected, the registrar is notified about this. The registrar is the party with a direct relationship with—and a direct contract with—the registrant. The registrar will also have vital information that the registry operator will not, such as:

- Details about the domain purchase, such as the payment method used (credit card, PayPal, etc.);
- The identity of a proxy-protected registrant;
- The purchaser’s IP address;
- Whether there is a reseller involved, and;
- The registrant’s past sales history and purchases in other TLDs (insofar as the registrar can determine this).

Registrars do not share the above information with registry operators due to privacy and liability concerns, among others. Because they have more information with which to continue the investigation, and because they have a direct relationship with the registrant, the registrar is in the best position to evaluate alleged abuse. The registrar can determine if the use violates the registrar’s legal terms of service or the registry Anti-Abuse Policy, and can decide whether or not to take any action. While the language and terms vary, registrars will be expected to include language in their registrar-registrant contracts that indemnifies the registrar if it takes action, and allows the registrar to suspend or cancel a domain name; this will be in addition to the registry Anti-Abuse Policy. Generally, registrars can act if the registrant violates the registrar’s terms of service, or violates ICANN policy, or if illegal activity is involved, or if the use violates the registry’s Anti-Abuse Policy.

If a registrar does not take action within a time period indicated by the registry operator (usually 24 hours), the registry operator might then decide to take action itself. At all times, the registry operator reserves the right to act directly and immediately if the potential harm to Internet users seems significant or imminent, with or without notice to the sponsoring registrar.

The registry operator will be prepared to call upon relevant law enforcement bodies as needed. There are certain cases, for example, Illegal pharmacy domains, where the registry operator will contact the Law Enforcement Agencies to share information about these domains, provide all the evidence collected and work closely with them before any action will be taken for suspension. The specific action is often dependent upon the jurisdiction of which the registry operator, although the operator in all cases will adhere to applicable laws and regulations.

When valid court orders or seizure warrants are received from courts or law enforcement agencies of relevant jurisdiction, the registry operator will order execution in an expedited fashion. Compliance with these will be a top priority and will be completed as soon as possible and within the defined timelines of the order. There are certain cases where Law Enforcement Agencies request information about a domain including but not limited to:

- Registration information
- History of a domain, including recent updates made
- Other domains associated with a registrant’s account
- Patterns of registrant portfolio
Requests for such information is handled on a priority basis and sent back to the requestor as soon as possible. Afilias sets a goal to respond to such requests within 24 hours.

The registry operator may also engage in proactive screening of its zone for malicious use of the domains in the TLD, and report problems to the sponsoring registrars. The registry operator could take advantage of a combination of the following resources, among others:
- Blocklists of domain names and nameservers published by organizations such as SURBL and Spamhaus.
- Anti-phishing feeds, which will provide URLs of compromised and maliciously registered domains being used for phishing.
- Analysis of registration or DNS query data [DNS query data received by the TLD nameservers.]

The registry operator will keep records and track metrics regarding abuse and abuse reports. These will include:
- Number of abuse reports received by the registry’s abuse point of contact described above;
- Number of cases and domains referred to registrars for resolution;
- Number of cases and domains where the registry took direct action;
- Resolution times;
- Number of domains in the TLD that have been blacklisted by major anti-spam blocklist providers, and;
- Phishing site uptimes in the TLD.

Removal of orphan glue records
By definition, orphan glue records used to be glue records. Glue records are related to delegations and are necessary to guide iterative resolvers to delegated nameservers. A glue record becomes an orphan when its parent nameserver record is removed without also removing the corresponding glue record. (Please reference the ICANN SSAC paper SAC048 at: http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf.) Orphan glue records may be created when a domain (example.tld) is placed on EPP ServerHold or ClientHold status. When placed on Hold, the domain is removed from the zone and will stop resolving. However, any child nameservers (now orphan glue) of that domain (e.g., ns1.example.tld) are left in the zone. It is important to keep these orphan glue records in the zone so that any innocent sites using that nameserver will continue to resolve. This use of Hold status is an essential tool for suspending malicious domains.

Afilias observes the following procedures, which are being followed by other registries and are generally accepted as DNS best practices. These procedures are also in keeping with ICANN SSAC recommendations.

When a request to delete a domain is received from a registrar, the registry first checks for the existence of glue records. If glue records exist, the registry will check to see if other domains in the registry are using the glue records. If other domains in the registry are using the glue records then the request to delete the domain will fail until no other domains are using the glue records. If no other domains in the registry are using the glue records then the glue records will be removed before the request to delete the domain is satisfied. If no glue records exist then the request to delete the domain will be satisfied.

If a registrar cannot delete a domain because of the existence of glue records that are being used by other domains, then the registrar may refer to the zone file or the “weekly domain hosted by nameserver report” to find out which domains are using the nameserver in question and attempt to contact the corresponding registrar to request that they stop using the nameserver in the glue record. The registry operator does not plan on performing mass updates of the associated DNS records.
The registry operator will accept, evaluate, and respond appropriately to complaints that orphan glue is being used maliciously. Such reports should be made in writing to the registry operator, and may be submitted to the registry’s abuse point-of-contact. If it is confirmed that an orphan glue record is being used in connection with malicious conduct, the registry operator will have the orphan glue record removed from the zone file. Afilias has the technical ability to execute such requests as needed.

Methods to promote WHOIS accuracy
The creation and maintenance of accurate WHOIS records is an important part of registry management. As described in our response to question #26, WHOIS, the registry operator will manage a secure, robust and searchable WHOIS service for this TLD.

WHOIS data accuracy
The registry operator will offer a “thick” registry system. In this model, all key contact details for each domain name will be stored in a central location by the registry. This allows better access to domain data, and provides uniformity in storing the information. The registry operator will ensure that the required fields for WHOIS data (as per the defined policies for the TLD) are enforced at the registry level. This ensures that the registrars are providing required domain registration data. Fields defined by the registry policy to be mandatory are documented as such and must be submitted by registrars. The Afilias registry system verifies formats for relevant individual data fields (e.g. e-mail, and phone-fax numbers). Only valid country codes are allowed as defined by the ISO 3166 code list. The Afilias WHOIS system is extensible, and is capable of using the VAULT system, described further below.

Similar to the centralized abuse point of contact described above, the registry operator can institute a contact email address which could be utilized by third parties to submit complaints for inaccurate or false WHOIS data detected. This information will be processed by Afilias’ support department and forwarded to the registrars. The registrars can work with the registrants of those domains to address these complaints. Afilias will audit registrars on a yearly basis to verify whether the complaints being forwarded are being addressed or not. This functionality, available to all registry operators, is activated based on the registry operator’s business policy.

Afilias also incorporates a spot-check verification system where a randomly selected set of domain names are checked periodically for accuracy of WHOIS data. Afilias’.PRO registry system incorporates such a verification system whereby 1% of total registrations or 100 domains, whichever number is larger, are spot-checked every month to verify the domain name registrant’s critical information provided with the domain registration data. With both a highly qualified corps of engineers and a 24x7 staffed support function, Afilias has the capacity to integrate such spot-check functionality into this TLD, based on the registry operator’s business policy. Note: This functionality will not work for proxy protected WHOIS information, where registrars or their resellers have the actual registrant data. The solution to that problem lies with either registry or registrar policy, or a change in the general marketplace practices with respect to proxy registrations.

Finally, Afilias’ registry systems have a sophisticated set of billing and pricing functionality which aids registry operators who decide to provide a set of financial incentives to registrars for maintaining or improving WHOIS accuracy. For instance, it is conceivable that the registry operator may decide to provide a discount for the domain registration or renewal fees for validated registrants, or levy a larger cost for the domain registration or renewal of proxy domain names. The Afilias system has the capability to support such incentives
on a configurable basis, towards the goal of promoting better WHOIS accuracy.

Role of registrars
As part of the RRA (Registry Registrar Agreement), the registry operator will require the registrar to be responsible for ensuring the input of accurate WHOIS data by their registrants. The Registrar-Registered Name Holder Agreement will include a specific clause to ensure accuracy of WHOIS data, and to give the registrar rights to cancel or suspend registrations if the Registered Name Holder fails to respond to the registrar’s query regarding accuracy of data. ICANN’s WHOIS Data Problem Reporting System (WDPRS) will be available to those who wish to file WHOIS inaccuracy reports, as per ICANN policy (http://wdprs.internic.net/).

Controls to ensure proper access to domain functions
Several measures are in place in the Afilias registry system to ensure proper access to domain functions, including authentication provisions in the RRA relative to notification and contact updates via use of AUTH-INFO codes.

IP address access control lists, TLS-SSL certificates and proper authentication are used to control access to the registry system. Registrars are only given access to perform operations on the objects they sponsor.

Every domain will have a unique AUTH-INFO code. The AUTH-INFO code is a 6- to 16-character code assigned by the registrar at the time the name is created. Its purpose is to aid identification of the domain owner so proper authority can be established. It is the “password” to the domain name. Registrars must use the domain’s password in order to initiate a registrar-to-registrar transfer. It is used to ensure that domain updates (update contact information, transfer, or deletion) are undertaken by the proper registrant, and that this registrant is adequately notified of domain update activity. Only the sponsoring registrar of a domain has access to the domain’s AUTH-INFO code stored in the registry, and this is accessible only via encrypted, password-protected channels.

Information about other registry security measures such as encryption and security of registrar channels are confidential to ensure the security of the registry system. The details can be found in the response to question #30b.

Validation and abuse mitigation mechanisms
Afilias has developed advanced validation and abuse mitigation mechanisms. These capabilities and mechanisms are described below. These services and capabilities are discretionary and may be utilized by the registry operator based on their policy and business need.

Afilias has the ability to analyze the registration data for known patterns at the time of registration. A database of these known patterns is developed from domains and other associated objects (e.g., contact information) which have been previously detected and suspended after being flagged as abusive. Any domains matching the defined criteria can be flagged for investigation. Once analyzed and confirmed by the domain anti-abuse team members, these domains may be suspended. This provides proactive detection of abusive domains.

Provisions are available to enable the registry operator to only allow registrations by pre-authorized and verified contacts. These verified contacts are given a unique code that can be used for registration of new domains.
Registrant pre-verification and authentication

One of the systems that could be used for validity and identity authentication is VAULT (Validation and Authentication Universal Lookup). It utilizes information obtained from a series of trusted data sources with access to billions of records containing data about individuals for the purpose of providing independent age and id verification as well as the ability to incorporate additional public or private data sources as required. At present it has the following: US Residential Coverage - 90% of Adult Population and also International Coverage - Varies from Country to Country with a minimum of 80% coverage (24 countries, mostly European).

Various verification elements can be used. Examples might include applicant data such as name, address, phone, etc. Multiple methods could be used for verification include integrated solutions utilizing API (XML Application Programming Interface) or sending batches of requests.

- Verification and Authentication requirements would be based on TLD operator requirements or specific criteria.
- Based on required WHOIS Data; registrant contact details (name, address, phone)
- If address-ZIP can be validated by VAULT, the validation process can continue (North America +25 International countries)
- If in-line processing and registration and EPP-API call would go to the verification clearinghouse and return up to 4 challenge questions.
- If two-step registration is required, then registrants would get a link to complete the verification at a separate time. The link could be specific to a domain registration and pre-populated with data about the registrant.
- If WHOIS data is validated a token would be generated and could be given back to the registrar which registered the domain.
- WHOIS data would reflect the Validated Data or some subset, i.e., fields displayed could be first initial and last name, country of registrant and date validated. Other fields could be generic validation fields much like a “privacy service”.
- A “Validation Icon” customized script would be sent to the registrants email address. This could be displayed on the website and would be dynamically generated to avoid unauthorized use of the Icon. When clicked on the Icon would should limited WHOIS details i.e. Registrant: jdoe, Country: USA, Date Validated: March 29, 2011, as well as legal disclaimers.
- Validation would be annually renewed, and validation date displayed in the WHOIS.

Abuse prevention resourcing plans

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way. Abuse prevention and detection is a function that is staffed across the various groups inside Afilias, and requires a team effort when abuse is either well hidden or widespread, or both. While all of Afilias’ 200+ employees are charged with responsibility to report any detected abuse, the engineering and analysis teams, numbering over 30, provide specific support based on the type of abuse and volume and frequency of analysis required. The Afilias security and support teams have the authority to initiate mitigation.
Afilias has developed advanced validation and abuse mitigation mechanisms. These capabilities and mechanisms are described below. These services and capabilities are discretionary and may be utilized by the registry operator based on their policy and business need.

This TLD’s anticipated volume of registrations in the first three years of operations is listed in response #46. Afilias and the registry operator’s anti-abuse function anticipates the expected volume and type of registrations, and together will adequately cover the staffing needs for this TLD. The registry operator will maintain an abuse response team, which may be a combination of internal staff and outside specialty contractors, adjusting to the needs of the size and type of TLD. The team structure planned for this TLD is based on several years of experience responding to, mitigating, and managing abuse for TLDs of various sizes. The team will generally consist of abuse handlers (probably internal), a junior analyst, (either internal or external), and a senior security consultant (likely an external resource providing the registry operator with extra expertise as needed). These responders will be specially trained in the investigation of abuse complaints, and will have the latitude to act expeditiously to suspend domain names (or apply other remedies) when called for.

The exact resources required to maintain an abuse response team must change with the size and registration procedures of the TLD. An initial abuse handler is necessary as a point of contact for reports, even if a part-time responsibility. The abuse handlers monitor the abuse email address for complaints and evaluate incoming reports from a variety of sources. A large percentage of abuse reports to the registry operator may be unsolicited commercial email. The designated abuse handlers can identify legitimate reports and then decide what action is appropriate, either to act upon them, escalate to a security analyst for closer investigation, or refer them to registrars as per the above-described procedures. A TLD with rare cases of abuse would conform to this structure.

If multiple cases of abuse within the same week occur regularly, the registry operator will consider staffing internally a security analyst to investigate the complaints as they become more frequent. Training an abuse analyst requires 3-6 months and likely requires the active guidance of an experienced senior security analyst for guidance and verification of assessments and recommendations being made.

If this TLD were to regularly experience multiple cases of abuse within the same day, a full-time senior security analyst would likely be necessary. A senior security analyst capable of fulfilling this role should have several years of experience and able to manage and train the internal abuse response team.

The abuse response team will also maintain subscriptions for several security information services, including the blocklists from organizations like SURBL and Spamhaus and anti-phishing and other domain related abuse (malware, fast-flux etc.) feeds. The pricing structure of these services may depend on the size of the domain and some services will include a number of rapid suspension requests for use as needed.

For a large TLD, regular audits of the registry data are required to maintain control over abusive registrations. When a registrar with a significant number of registrations has been compromised or acted maliciously, the registry operator may need to analyze a set of registration or DNS query data. A scan of all the domains of a registrar is conducted only as needed. Scanning and analysis for a large registrar may require as much as a week of full-time effort for a dedicated machine and team.
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 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 also include additional measures specific to rights protection, such as abusive use policies, takedown procedures, registrant pre-verification, or authentication procedures, or other covenants. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

Rights protection is a core responsibility of the TLD operator, and is supported by a fully-developed plan for rights protection that includes:

- Establishing mechanisms to prevent unqualified registrations (e.g., registrations made in violation of the registry’s eligibility restrictions or policies);
- Implementing a robust Sunrise program, utilizing the Trademark Clearinghouse, the services of one of ICANN’s approved dispute resolution providers, a trademark validation agent, and drawing upon sunrise policies and rules used successfully in previous gTLD launches;
- Implementing a professional trademark claims program that utilizes the Trademark Clearinghouse, and drawing upon models of similar programs used successfully in previous TLD launches;
- Complying with the URS requirements;
- Complying with the UDRP;
- Complying with the PDDRP, and;
- Including all ICANN-mandated and independently developed rights protection mechanisms (“RPMs”) in the registry-registrar agreement entered into by ICANN-accredited registrars authorized to register names in the TLD.

The response below details the rights protection mechanisms at the launch of the TLD (Sunrise and Trademark Claims Service) which comply with rights protection policies (URS, UDRP, PDDRP, and other ICANN RPMs), outlines additional provisions made for rights protection, and provides the resourcing plans.

Safeguards for rights protection at the launch of the TLD

The launch of this TLD will include the operation of a trademark claims service according to the defined ICANN processes for checking a registration request and alerting trademark holders of potential rights infringement.
The Sunrise Period will be an exclusive period of time, prior to the opening of public registration, when trademark and service mark holders will be able to reserve marks that are an identical match in the .KOSHER domain. Following the Sunrise Period, Kosher Marketing Assets will open registration to qualified applicants. The anticipated Rollout Schedule for the Sunrise Period will be approximately as follows:

Launch of the TLD – Sunrise Period begins for trademark holders and service mark holders to submit registrations for their exact marks in the .KOSHER domain.

Quiet Period – The Sunrise Period will close and will be followed by a Quiet Period for testing and evaluation. One month after close of Quiet Period – Registration in the .KOSHER domain will be opened to qualified applicants.

Sunrise Period Requirements & Restrictions

Those wishing to reserve their marks in the .KOSHER domain during the Sunrise Period must own a current trademark or service mark listed in the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Notice will 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 (as defined in the Trademark Clearing House) to the name to be registered during Sunrise.

Each Sunrise registration will require a minimum term of five years.

Kosher Marketing Assets will establish the following Sunrise eligibility requirements (SERs) as minimum requirements, verified by Clearinghouse data, and incorporate a Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy (SDRP). The SERs include: (i) ownership of a mark that satisfies the criteria set forth in section 7.2 of the Trademark Clearing House specifications, (ii) description of 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.

The SDRP will allow challenges based on the following four grounds: (i) at time the challenged domain name was registered, the registrants 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.

Ongoing rights protection mechanisms

Several mechanisms will be in place to protect rights in this TLD. As described in our responses to questions #27 and #28, measures are in place to ensure domain transfers and updates are only initiated by the appropriate domain holder, and an experienced team is available to respond to legal actions by law enforcement or court...
orders.

This TLD will conform to all ICANN RPMs including URS (defined below), UDRP, PDDRP, and all measures defined in Specification 7 of the new TLD agreement.

Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS)
Kosher Marketing Assets will implement decisions rendered under the URS on an ongoing basis. Per the URS policy posted on ICANN’s Web site as of this writing, the registry operator will receive notice of URS actions from the ICANN-approved URS providers. These emails will be directed immediately to the registry operator’s support staff, which is on duty 24x7. The support staff will be responsible for creating a ticket for each case, and for executing the directives from the URS provider. All support staff will receive pertinent training.

As per ICANN’s URS guidelines, 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 remain in the TLD DNS zone file and will thus continue to resolve. The support staff will “lock” the domain by associating the following EPP statuses with the domain and relevant contact objects:

- ServerUpdateProhibited, with an EPP reason code of “URS”
- ServerDeleteProhibited, with an EPP reason code of “URS”
- ServerTransferProhibited, with an EPP reason code of “URS”

The registry operator’s support staff will then notify the URS provider immediately upon locking the domain name, via email.

The registry operator’s support staff will retain all copies of emails from the URS providers, assign them a tracking or ticket number, and will track the status of each opened URS case through to resolution via spreadsheet or database.

The registry operator’s support staff will execute further operations upon notice from the URS providers. The URS provider is required to specify the remedy and required actions of the registry operator, with notification to the registrant, the complainant, and the registrar.

As per the URS guidelines, if the complainant prevails, 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 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.”

Rights protection via the RRA
The following will be memorialized and be made binding via the Registry-Registrar and Registrar-Registrant Agreements:

- The registry may reject a registration request or a reservation request, or may delete, revoke, suspend, cancel, or transfer a registration or reservation under the following criteria:
  a. to enforce registry policies and ICANN requirements; each as amended from time to time;
  b. that is not accompanied by complete and accurate information as required by ICANN requirements and-or registry
policies or where required information is not updated and/or corrected as required by ICANN requirements and/or registry policies;
c. to protect the integrity and stability of the registry, its operations, and the TLD system;
d. to comply with any applicable law, regulation, holding, order, or decision issued by a court, administrative authority, or dispute resolution service provider with jurisdiction over the registry;
e. to establish, assert, or defend the legal rights of the registry or a third party or to avoid any civil or criminal liability on the part of the registry and/or its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, representatives, employees, contractors, and stockholders;
f. to correct mistakes made by the registry or any accredited registrar in connection with a registration; or
g. as otherwise provided in the Registry-Registrar Agreement and/or the Registrar-Registrant Agreement.

Reducing opportunities for behaviors such as phishing or pharming

In our response to question #28, Kosher Marketing Assets has described its anti-abuse program. Rather than repeating the policies and procedures here, please see our response to question #28 for full details.

In the case of this TLD, Kosher Marketing Assets will apply an approach that addresses registered domain names (rather than potentially registered domains). This approach will not infringe upon the rights of eligible registrants to register domains, and allows Kosher Marketing Assets internal controls, as well as community-developed UDRP and URS policies and procedures if needed, to deal with complaints, should there be any.

Afilias is a member of various security fora which provide access to lists of names in each TLD which may be used for malicious purposes. Such identified names will be subject to the TLD anti-abuse policy, including rapid suspensions after due process.

Rights protection resourcing plans

Since its founding, Afilias is focused on delivering secure, stable and reliable registry services. Several essential management and staff who designed and launched the Afilias registry in 2001 and expanded the number of TLDs supported, all while maintaining strict service levels over the past decade, are still in place today. This experiential continuity will endure for the implementation and on-going maintenance of this TLD. Afilias operates in a matrix structure, which allows its staff to be allocated to various critical functions in both a dedicated and a shared manner. With a team of specialists and generalists, the Afilias project management methodology allows efficient and effective use of our staff in a focused way.

Supporting RPMs requires several departments within the registry operator as well as within Afilias. The implementation of Sunrise and the Trademark Claims service and on-going RPM activities will pull from the 102 Afilias staff members of the engineering, product management, development, security and policy teams at Afilias, which is on duty 24x7, and the support staff of the registry operator. A trademark validator will also be assigned within the registry operator, whose responsibilities may require as much as 50% of full-time employment if the domains under management were to exceed several million. No additional hardware or software resources are required to support this as Afilias has fully-operational capabilities to manage abuse today.
30A. 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).

The answer to question #30a is provided by Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD.

Afilias aggressively and actively protects the registry system from known threats and vulnerabilities, and has deployed an extensive set of security protocols, policies and procedures to thwart compromise. Afilias’ robust and detailed plans are continually updated and tested to ensure new threats are mitigated prior to becoming issues. Afilias will continue these rigorous security measures, which include:
- Multiple layers of security and access controls throughout registry and support systems;
- 24x7 monitoring of all registry and DNS systems, support systems and facilities;
- Unique, proven registry design that ensures data integrity by granting only authorized access to the registry system, all while meeting performance requirements;
- Detailed incident and problem management processes for rapid review, communications, and problem resolution, and;
- Yearly external audits by independent, industry-leading firms, as well as twice-yearly internal audits.

Security policies and protocols

Afilias has included security in every element of its service, including facilities, hardware, equipment, connectivity-Internet services, systems, computer systems, organizational security, outage prevention, monitoring, disaster mitigation, and escrow-insurance, from the original design, through development, and finally as part of production deployment. Examples of threats and the confidential and proprietary mitigation procedures are detailed in our response to question #30(b).

There are several important aspects of the security policies and procedures to note:
- Afilias hosts domains in data centers around the world that meet or exceed global best practices.
- Afilias’ DNS infrastructure is massively provisioned as part of its DDoS mitigation strategy, thus ensuring sufficient capacity and redundancy to support new gTLDs.
• Diversity is an integral part of all of our software and hardware stability and robustness plan, thus avoiding any single points of failure in our infrastructure.
• Access to any element of our service (applications, infrastructure and data) is only provided on an as-needed basis to employees and a limited set of others to fulfill their job functions. The principle of least privilege is applied.
• All registry components – critical and non-critical – are monitored 24x7 by staff at our NOCs, and the technical staff has detailed plans and procedures that have stood the test of time for addressing even the smallest anomaly. Well-documented incident management procedures are in place to quickly involve the on-call technical and management staff members to address any issues.

Afilias follows the guidelines from the ISO 27001 Information Security Standard (Reference: http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue-catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=42103 ) for the management and implementation of its Information Security Management System. Afilias also utilizes the COBIT IT governance framework to facilitate policy development and enable controls for appropriate management of risk (Reference: http://www.isaca.org/cobit). Best practices defined in ISO 27002 are followed for defining the security controls within the organization. Afilias continually looks to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our processes, and follows industry best practices as defined by the IT Infrastructure Library, or ITIL (Reference: http://www.itil-officialsite.com/).

The Afilias registry system is located within secure data centers that implement a multitude of security measures both to minimize any potential points of vulnerability and to limit any damage should there be a breach. The characteristics of these data centers are described fully in our response to question #30(b).

The Afilias registry system employs a number of multi-layered measures to prevent unauthorized access to its network and internal systems. Before reaching the registry network, all traffic is required to pass through a firewall system. Packets passing to and from the Internet are inspected, and unauthorized or unexpected attempts to connect to the registry servers are both logged and denied. Management processes are in place to ensure each request is tracked and documented, and regular firewall audits are performed to ensure proper operation. 24x7 monitoring is in place and, if potential malicious activity is detected, appropriate personnel are notified immediately.

Afilias employs a set of security procedures to ensure maximum security on each of its servers, including disabling all unnecessary services and processes and regular application of security-related patches to the operating system and critical system applications. Regular external vulnerability scans are performed to verify that only services intended to be available are accessible.

Regular detailed audits of the server configuration are performed to verify that the configurations comply with current best security practices. Passwords and other access means are changed on a regular schedule and are revoked whenever a staff member’s employment is terminated.

Access to registry system
Access to all production systems and software is strictly limited to authorized operations staff members. Access to technical support and network operations teams where necessary are read only and limited only to components required to help troubleshoot customer issues and perform routine checks. Strict change control procedures are in place and are followed each time a change is required to the production hardware/application. User rights are kept to a minimum at all times. In the event of a staff member’s employment termination, all access is removed.
immediately.

Afilias applications use encrypted network communications. Access to the registry server is controlled. Afilias allows access to an authorized registrar only if each of the authentication factors matches the specific requirements of the requested authorization. These mechanisms are also used to secure any web-based tools that allow authorized registrars to access the registry. Additionally, all write transactions in the registry (whether conducted by authorized registrars or the registry’s own personnel) are logged.

EPP connections are encrypted using TLS-SSL, and mutually authenticated using both certificate checks and login-password combinations. Web connections are encrypted using TLS-SSL for an encrypted tunnel to the browser, and authenticated to the EPP server using login-password combinations.

All systems are monitored for security breaches from within the data center and without, using both system-based and network-based testing tools. Operations staff also monitor systems for security-related performance anomalies. Triple-redundant continual monitoring ensures multiple detection paths for any potential incident or problem. Details are provided in our response to questions #30(b) and #42. Network Operations and Security Operations teams perform regular audits in search of any potential vulnerability.

To ensure that registrar hosts configured erroneously or maliciously cannot deny service to other registrars, Afilias uses traffic shaping technologies to prevent attacks from any single registrar account, IP address, or subnet. This additional layer of security reduces the likelihood of performance degradation for all registrars, even in the case of a security compromise at a subset of registrars.

There is a clear accountability policy that defines what behaviors are acceptable and unacceptable on the part of non-staff users, staff users, and management. Periodic audits of policies and procedures are performed to ensure that any weaknesses are discovered and addressed. Aggressive escalation procedures and well-defined Incident Response management procedures ensure that decision makers are involved at early stages of any event.

In short, security is a consideration in every aspect of business at Afilias, and this is evidenced in a track record of a decade of secure, stable and reliable service.

Independent assessment

Supporting operational excellence as an example of security practices, Afilias performs a number of internal and external security audits each year of the existing policies, procedures and practices for:

- Access control;
- Security policies;
- Production change control;
- Backups and restores;
- Batch monitoring;
- Intrusion detection, and
- Physical security.

Afilias has an annual Type 2 SSAE 16 audit performed by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC). Further, PwC performs testing of the general information technology controls in support of the financial statement audit. A Type 2
report opinion under SSAE 16 covers whether the controls were properly designed, were in place, and operating effectively during the audit period (calendar year). This SSAE 16 audit includes testing of internal controls relevant to Afilias’ domain registry system and processes. The report includes testing of key controls related to the following control objectives:

- Controls provide reasonable assurance that registrar account balances and changes to the registrar account balances are authorized, complete, accurate and timely.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that billable transactions are recorded in the Shared Registry System (SRS) in a complete, accurate and timely manner.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that revenue is systemically calculated by the Deferred Revenue System (DRS) in a complete, accurate and timely manner.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that the summary and detail reports, invoices, statements, registrar and registry billing data files, and ICANN transactional reports provided to registry operator(s) are complete, accurate and timely.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that new applications and changes to existing applications are authorized, tested, approved, properly implemented and documented.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that changes to existing system software and implementation of new system software are authorized, tested, approved, properly implemented and documented.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that physical access to data centers is restricted to properly authorized individuals.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that logical access to system resources is restricted to properly authorized individuals.
- Controls provide reasonable assurance that processing and backups are appropriately authorized and scheduled and that deviations from scheduled processing and backups are identified and resolved.

The last Type 2 report issued was for the year 2010, and it was unqualified, i.e., all systems were evaluated with no material problems found.

During each year, Afilias monitors the key controls related to the SSAE controls. Changes or additions to the control objectives or activities can result due to deployment of new services, software enhancements, infrastructure changes or process enhancements. These are noted and after internal review and approval, adjustments are made for the next review.

In addition to the PricewaterhouseCoopers engagement, Afilias performs internal security audits twice a year. These assessments are constantly being expanded based on risk assessments and changes in business or technology.

Additionally, Afilias engages an independent third-party security organization, PivotPoint Security, to perform external vulnerability assessments and penetration tests on the sites hosting and managing the Registry infrastructure. These assessments are performed with major infrastructure changes, release of new services or major software enhancements. These independent assessments are performed at least annually. A report from a recent assessment is attached with our response to question #30(b).

Afilias has engaged with security companies specializing in application and web security testing to ensure the security of web-based applications offered by Afilias, such as the Web Admin Tool (WAT) for registrars and registry operators.

Finally, Afilias has engaged IBM’s Security services division to perform ISO 27002 gap assessment studies so as
to review alignment of Afilias’ procedures and policies with the ISO 27002 standard. Afilias has since made adjustments to its security procedures and policies based on the recommendations by IBM.

Special TLD considerations

Afilias’ rigorous security practices are regularly reviewed; if there is a need to alter or augment procedures for this TLD, they will be done so in a planned and deliberate manner.

Commitments to registrant protection

With over a decade of experience protecting domain registration data, Afilias understands registrant security concerns. Afilias supports a “thick” registry system in which data for all objects are stored in the registry database that is the centralized authoritative source of information. As an active member of IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force), ICANN’s SSAC (Security & Stability Advisory Committee), APWG (Anti-Phishing Working Group), MAAWG (Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group), USENIX, and ISACA (Information Systems Audits and Controls Association), the Afilias team is highly attuned to the potential threats and leading tools and procedures for mitigating threats. As such, registrants should be confident that:
- Any confidential information stored within the registry will remain confidential;
- The interaction between their registrar and Afilias is secure;
- The Afilias DNS system will be reliable and accessible from any location;
- The registry system will abide by all polices, including those that address registrant data;
- Afilias will not introduce any features or implement technologies that compromise access to the registry system or that compromise registrant security.

Afilias has directly contributed to the development of the documents listed below and we have implemented them where appropriate. All of these have helped improve registrants’ ability to protect their domains name(s) during the domain name lifecycle.
- [SAC049]: SSAC Report on DNS Zone Risk Assessment and Management (03 June 2011)
- [SAC044]: A Registrant’s Guide to Protecting Domain Name Registration Accounts (05 November 2010)
- [SAC040]: Measures to Protect Domain Registration Services Against Exploitation or Misuse (19 August 2009)
- [SAC028]: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Impersonation Phishing Attacks (26 May 2008)
- [SAC024]: Report on Domain Name Front Running (February 2008)
- [SAC022]: Domain Name Front Running (SAC022, SAC024) (20 October 2007)
- [SAC011]: Problems caused by the non-renewal of a domain name associated with a DNS Name Server (7 July 2006)
- [SAC010]: Renewal Considerations for Domain Name Registrants (29 June 2006)
- [SAC007]: Domain Name Hijacking Report (SAC007) (12 July 2005)

To protect any unauthorized modification of registrant data, Afilias mandates TLS-SSL transport (per RFC 5246) and authentication methodologies for access to the registry applications. Authorized registrars are required to supply a list of specific individuals (five to ten people) who are authorized to contact the registry. Each such individual is assigned a pass phrase. Any support requests made by an authorized registrar to registry customer service are authenticated by registry customer service. All failed authentications are logged and reviewed regularly for potential malicious activity. This prevents unauthorized changes or access to registrant data by individuals posing to be registrars or their authorized contacts.
These items reflect an understanding of the importance of balancing data privacy and access for registrants, both individually and as a collective, worldwide user base.

The Afilias 24-7 Customer Service Center consists of highly trained staff who collectively are proficient in 15 languages, and who are capable of responding to queries from registrants whose domain name security has been compromised – for example, a victim of domain name hijacking. Afilias provides specialized registrant assistance guides, including specific hand-holding and follow-through in these kinds of commonly occurring circumstances, which can be highly distressing to registrants.

Security resourcing plans

Please refer to our response to question #30b for security resourcing plans.

© Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers.
.kosher Registry Agreement

20 Aug 2015

On 20 August 2015, ICANN and Kosher Marketing Assets LLC, entered into a Registry Agreement under which Kosher Marketing Assets LLC, operates the .kosher top-level domain. The agreement may be viewed by following the links below:

Registry Agreement

- [DOCX](#) | Redline
- [PDF](#) | Redline
- [HTML](#) | Redline

Authorization(s) for Release of Reserved Names

- All Digit/Digit, Letter/Digit, and Digit/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels at the Second Level (01 December 2014)

Note: If multiple versions are provided above, the official document is the Word version. The HTML version is machine-generated and may not display correctly.

Name Collision Occurrence Management Documents

- Name Collision Occurrence Assessment
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

gTLD String:  KOSHER
Applicant Entity Name:  Kosher Marketing Assets LLC
Application ID#:  1-1013-67544

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 [date to be determined at time of contracting], 2013 (or any subsequent form of Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors) 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 [url to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]), as it may be amended 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

[Registry Operator to insert specific application sections here, if applicable]

3.☒ Registry Operator agrees to perform following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through 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 Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

[Registry Operator to insert specific commitments here, if applicable]

The Registry Operator commits to administer registry access in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.

The TLD will not be restricted 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). The Registry Operator will not establish eligibility criteria that excludes registrants on the basis that they are competitors to Registry Operator or its Affiliates (as defined in Section 2.9(c)).

Registry Operator will not impose kosher certification standards or methodologies of the Registry Operator or its Affiliates (as defined in Section 2.9(c)) on any registrants.
Annex 18
DETERMINATION OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC)
RECONSIDERATION REQUEST 14-8
22 MARCH 2014

The Requester DotMusic/CGR E-Commerce Ltd. seeks reconsideration of ICANN staff’s alleged failure (inaction): (1) to properly supervise the ICC\(^1\) with respect to appointment and training of experts; (ii) to advise the ICC and appointed expert panelists about GAC\(^2\) advice; and (iii) to provide an appropriate appeal process.

I. **Brief Summary.**

The Requester, an applicant for .MUSIC, filed community objections against various .MUSIC and .BAND applications, and lost each of those objections. The Requester claims that: (1) ICANN staff failed to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that an appropriately qualified expert was appointed and trained to decide the Requester’s objections; (2) failed to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that experts are free of potential conflicts of interest; (3) failed to advise the ICC and the Panel on GAC advice relating to exclusive access registries; and (4) failed to provide an appropriate appeal process for community objections. In addition, Requester raises a number of other points, without explanation or argument, regarding ICANN’s oversight of the New gTLD Program that Requester claims support reconsideration.

With respect to Requester’s first claim, there is no support in the Applicant Guidebook or otherwise for the Requester’s claim that the Expert should have superior knowledge of the community reflected in the contested applications, or that the Expert lacked the training to address the issues raised in the Requester’s objections.

---

\(^1\) International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.
\(^2\) Governmental Advisory Committee.
With respect to Requester’s second claim, there is no evidence that ICANN, the ICC, or the Expert failed to comply with all relevant policies regarding conflicts of interest.

With respect to Requester’s third and fourth claims, the Requester failed to identify any policy or process violation that supports reconsideration.

Requester’s additional points regarding ICANN’s oversight of the gTLD program do not support reconsideration because they are not buttressed with any details regarding a violation of ICANN policy or procedure and they appear unrelated to Requester’s community objections.

Therefore, the BGC concludes that Request 14-8 should be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Background Facts.

Requester DotMusic/CGR E-Commerce Ltd. (“Requester”) applied for .MUSIC (“Requester’s Application”). While seven other applicants also applied for .MUSIC, this Request relates to community objections filed against six of the seven applications.3

Both Auburn Hollow, LLC, an affiliate of Donuts, Inc., and Red Triangle, LLC, applied for .BAND.

On 13 March 2013, two organizations represented by the Requester, the American Association of Independent Music (“A2IM”) and its member the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (“IFACCA”) filed community objections to the .MUSIC

3 Request 14-8 relates to community objections filed against: (i) Charleston Road Registry, Inc.; (ii) DotMusic, Inc.; (iii) dot Music Limited; (iv) Victor Cross; (v) .music LLC; (vi) and Entertainment Names, Inc. Request 14-8 does not relate to Amazon EU S.a.r.l.’s application for .MUSIC. Requester previously filed a Reconsideration Request (Request 13-22) seeking reconsideration of the expert determination on its community objections against Amazon EU S.a.r.l.’s applications for .MUSIC, .SONG, and .TUNES. http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/13-22/determination-dotmusic-05feb14-en.pdf)
applications relevant to this Request. A2IM also filed community objections to both .BAND applications. The .MUSIC and .BAND objections (collectively, “Requester’s Community Objections”) essentially asserted the same claims: That there was “substantial opposition to the gTLD application[s] from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.” (Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), § 3.2.1; New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”), Art. 2(e).)

On 11 April 2013, the GAC issued its Beijing Communiqué. Among other advice, the GAC advised that “[f]or strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.” (Beijing Communiqué, Annex I, Pg. 11 available at http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-18apr13-en.pdf.) The GAC identified .MUSIC and .BAND, among others, as strings that the GAC considered to be generic terms that should be subject to additional safeguards aimed at ensuring that the strings serve a public interest goal. (See id.)

In June 2013, the ICC appointed Professor Sir Robin Jacob of the Faculty of Laws as the Expert (“Expert” or “Panel”) to evaluate the Requester’s Community Objections.

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC6 accepted the advice contained in the GAC’s Beijing Communiqué regarding applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access for strings the GAC deemed as generic terms, and directed staff to defer contracting with such applicants “pending a dialogue with the GAC” regarding an appropriate definition of “public interest goal”

---

4 IFACC objected to .music LLC’s application. A2IM objected to the applications of: (i) Charleston Road Registry, Inc.; (ii) dot Music Limited; (iii) DotMusic Inc.; (iv) Entertainment Names Inc.; and (v) Victor Cross, LLC. The ICC consolidated A2IM’s .MUSIC Objections into one proceeding.
5 The ICANN Bylaws require the Board to take into account the GAC’s advice on public policy matters. (Bylaws, Art. XI, § 2.1.j.) In the context of the New gTLD Program, there are also specific procedures pursuant to which the GAC may provide advice to ICANN on new gTLDs. (Guidebook, § 3.1.)
6 New gTLD Program Committee.
On 2 July 2013, the NGPC approved revisions to the New gTLD Registry Agreement including a provision prohibiting registry operators from limiting registrations in “generic term” registries exclusively to “a single person or entity and/or that person’s or entity’s ‘Affiliates.’” (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-02jul13-en.htm#1.d; see also http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-item-1d-02jul13-en.pdf, Annex I, New gTLD Agreement.)

On 12 July 2013, the Requester sent a letter to ICANN seeking clarification of ICANN’s recent resolutions accepting GAC advice and how such resolutions may impact pending community objections. The Requester asked ICANN to instruct the ICC and the Panel not to consider any new policies or changes made to applications as a result of resolutions passed after the date the objections were filed and that each application be judged as it was submitted (“Requester’s 12 July 2013 Letter to ICANN”). (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/roussos-to-crocker-et-al-12jul13-en.pdf.)

On 12 August 2013, in each of the Requester’s Community Objections, the Requester sought permission from the Panel to file new information relating to the Beijing Communiqué and ICANN’s response thereto.

---

7 ICANN responded to the Requester’s 12 July 2013 correspondence on 14 August 2013, noting that ICANN does not dictate or limit the scope of the documentation that panelists may request or evaluate (“ICANN’s 14 August 2013 Letter to Requester”). (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/willett-to-roussos-14aug13-en.pdf.)
On 21 August 2013, the Panel issued an interim ruling permitting the Requester to make an additional submission relating to the Beijing Communiqué in each of the Requester’s Community Objections and giving the applicants an opportunity to respond to the submissions, all of which occurred in due course. *(See A2IM v. Red Triangle LLC, EXP/460/ICANN/77, Pgs. 3-5.)*

On 23 December 2013, the Requester filed Request 13-22, challenging an Expert Determination rejecting the Requester’s community objections against Amazon’s applications for .MUSIC, .SONG, and .TUNES. Specifically, in Request 13-22, the Requester sought reconsideration of ICANN’s alleged failure to: (1) properly supervise the ICC to ensure that appropriately qualified experts are appointed and adequately trained to decide community objections; (2) advise the ICC and appointed expert panelists on GAC advice; and (3) provide an appropriate appeal process for community objections. The claims raised by the Requester in Request 13-22 are again raised by the Requester in connection with the instant Request.

On 5 February 2014, the BGC issued a determination on Request 13-22. With respect to the first claim in Request 13-22 that the Expert was not qualified, the BGC found it was not supported and should be rejected. The BGC noted that there is no support in the Guidebook or otherwise for the Requester’s view that the Expert should have superior knowledge of the community reflected in the contested applications, or that the Expert lacked the training to address the issues raised in the Requester’s objections.” *(See [http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/13-22/determination-dotmusic-05feb14-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/13-22/determination-dotmusic-05feb14-en.pdf).)* With respect to the second claim in Request 13-22 that the Panel should have been advised on the relevance and impact of the GAC’s advice relating to exclusive access registries, the BGC determined that the Requester did not demonstrate any policy or
process that supports reconsideration based on ICANN’s alleged failure to advise the ICC and the Panel on GAC advice. (Id.)

With respect to the third claim in Request 13-22, the BGC determined that “the Requester has not identified any established policy or process that required ICANN to implement an appeal mechanism (upon request or otherwise).” (See id.)

On 18 February 2014, the Panel rendered its Expert Determinations on each of the Requester’s Community Objections in favor of the applicants, thereby dismissing the Requester’s Community Objections and finding applicants to be the prevailing parties. (Request, Annex A.) Based on the submissions and evidence provided by the parties, the Panel determined that the Requester did not have standing to object, and even if the standing requirements had been met, the Requester also failed on the merits. (Determination, Pgs. 9-12.)

On 4 March 2014, the Requester filed Request 14-8.

B. The Requester’s Claims.

The Requester seeks reconsideration on the following grounds:

First, the Requester claims that ICANN failed to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that appropriately qualified expert candidates are selected and trained to decide community objections. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 1.)

Second, the Requester claims that ICANN failed to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that experts are free from potential conflicts of interest. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 1.)

Third, the Requester claims that ICANN failed to recognize the relevance and impact that the “exceptional” GAC advice purportedly has on the community objection process and

---

8 The Panel rendered eight nearly identical Determinations on the Requester’s Community Objections. For ease of reference, all citations to “Determination” are made to the Expert Determination on the Requester’s Objection to the .MUSIC application of Charleston Road Registry Inc. (EXP/462/ICANN/79).
community applicants, and failed to advise the ICC and the Panel about GAC advice and subsequent actions (responses to GAC advice, Board resolutions, material changes to “applicant positions,” and revisions to the registry agreement) that addressed GAC advice relating to exclusive access registries. (Request, Section 3, Pgs. 1-2.)

Fourth, the Requester claims that ICANN failed to provide an appropriate appeal process for community objections and denied parties a procedure to protect their fundamental rights and legitimate interests. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 2.)

Finally, the Requester raises additional points regarding alleged ICANN actions and inactions relating the New gTLD Program. (Request, Section 3, Pgs. 2-3.)

C. Relief Requested.

The Requester asks that ICANN: (i) reimburse (or order the ICC to reimburse) all of Requester’s expenses (including attorney fees, administrative expenses and Expert fees associated with its Objections); (ii) allow new community objections to be filed against the challenged applications and appoint an appropriate expert to decide the objections (noted as an expert in music/intellectual property/competition regulation); (iii) determine that public statements concerning an applicant’s intent to substantially amend its application be deemed “material and inconsistent” with positions taken in the applicant’s community objection response and an admission of the applicant’s “harmful policies,” resulting in a ruling in favor of the objector; and (iv) allow for a reconsideration of the Determinations by an appropriate and qualified expert that has been instructed on GAC advice and changes made by the applicants. (Request, Section 9, Pg. 23.)

III. Issues.

In view of the claims set forth in Request 14-8, the issues for reconsideration are:
A. Whether ICANN staff’s alleged failure to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that appropriately qualified experts are selected and trained to decide community objections supports reconsideration;

B. Whether ICANN staff’s alleged failure to properly supervise the ICC to ensure that experts are free of potential conflicts of interest supports reconsideration;

C. Whether ICANN staff’s alleged failure to advise the ICC and the Panel on GAC Advice supports reconsideration;

D. Whether ICANN staff’s alleged failure to provide an appeal mechanism for community objections supports reconsideration; and

E. Whether Requester’s additional points support a claim for reconsideration.

IV. The Relevant Standards for Evaluating Reconsideration Requests.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with specified criteria.9 (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.) Dismissal of a request for reconsideration of staff action or inaction is appropriate if the BGC10 concludes, or if the Board or the NGPC agrees to the extent that the BGC deems that further consideration is necessary, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the reconsideration criteria set forth in the Bylaws. ICANN has previously determined that the reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges to expert determinations rendered by panels formed by third party dispute resolution service providers in the New gTLD Program, such as the ICC, if the claim is that the Panel failed to follow established policies or processes in reaching

---

9 Article IV, Section 2.2 of ICANN’s Bylaws states in relevant part that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration 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.

10 Board Governance Committee.
the expert determination, or that staff failed to follow its policies or processes in accepting that determination. In the context of the New gTLD Program, the reconsideration process does not call for the BGC to perform a substantive review of expert determinations. Rather, the BGC’s review is limited to whether the Panel violated any established policy or process.

V. Analysis and Rationale.

A. The Alleged Failure Of ICANN To Properly Supervise The ICC To Ensure That Appropriately Qualified Experts Are Selected And Trained To Decide Community Objections Does Not Support Reconsideration.

The Requester claims that the appointed Panel “while a noted and highly respected expert, [] is not an expert on music,” and was therefore not qualified to hear the Requester’s Objections. (Request, Section 6, Pg. 4.) The Requester challenges ICANN’s purported failure to supervise the ICC to ensure appropriately qualified experts are selected and trained to decide community objections. Specifically, the Requester claims that it relied upon § 3.4.4 of the Guidebook, which provides that the “panel will consist of appropriately qualified experts appointed to each proceeding by the designated DRSP,” and that ICANN’s failure to appoint and train a music expert constituted a violation of the Guidebook. (Request, Section 6, Pgs. 4-5 (emphasis added).)

ICANN previously addressed this issue with the Requester in connection with Request 13-22. In June 2013, within days of the expert being appointed in connection with the Requester’s community objections to Amazon’s .MUSIC, .SONG, and .TUNES applications, the Requester sent an email to ICANN raising concerns that “the ICC has not identified expert Panelists that have expertise in music – the relevant subject matter of interest for the communities.” (Request, Section 8, Pg. 20.) ICANN responded to the Requester’s email by

12 “DRSP” refers to dispute resolution service provider.
referencing § 3.4.4 of the Guidebook and stating that “ICANN has confidence that the ICC has followed the requirements as expressed by the [Guidebook] and has appointed experienced jurists with appropriate qualifications in mediation/arbitration to preside over objection proceedings.” (Id. (emphasis added).) After the expert rejected the Requester’s community objections to Amazon’s applications, the Requester filed Request 13-22 and again raised this issue. Ultimately, in evaluating Request 13-22, the BGC concluded that “[t]here is no support in the Guidebook or otherwise for the Requester’s view that the Expert should have superior knowledge of the community reflected in the contested applications…” (See http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/13-22/determination-dotmusic-05feb14-en.pdf.) Nonetheless, the Requester contends here that “the Expert had limited on [sic] functions of the substantial clearly delineated community invoked and was ill-prepared to understand and address these unique issues by applying correct standards for standing.” (Request, Section 6, Pg. 4.) There is, however, no support for the Requester’s contention.

As the BGC previously found, the Guidebook does not define “expert” as a person with superior knowledge of the community reflected in the application in community objection proceedings, and the Requester’s attempt to impute such a definition into the Guidebook is not supported. (See http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/13-22/determination-dotmusic-05feb14-en.pdf; Guidebook, § 3.4.4.) There is likewise no support for the Requester’s claims that the Panelist lacked training or was somehow “ill-equipped to address the unique issues” raised in the Objections. Moreover, the standards for evaluating the merits of a community objection are set out in the Guidebook, and by filing an application for a new gTLD, each applicant agrees to accept the applicability of the gTLD dispute resolution
process. (Guidebook, §§ 3.5.4 & 3.3.2; Procedure, Art. 1(d.).)

Finally, the Requester’s claim that the Panelist was “unqualified” is just another approach Requester is using to challenge the ultimate outcome of Requester’s Community Objections. (See Request, Section 6, Pgs. 4-6 (arguing that the Panelist’s findings and rationale regarding standing were incorrect given his alleged lack of experience in the music industry).) Yet, as noted above, the Reconsideration Process does not call for the BGC to perform a substantive review of expert determinations. The BGC is not to evaluate the Panelist’s conclusions that the Requester lacked standing to bring its Community Objections. Rather, the BGC’s review is limited to whether the Panelist violated any established policy or process. The Requester has not alleged that the Panelist acted in contravention of an established policy or procedure and instead alleges only that the Panelist reached the wrong conclusion because he was somehow unqualified, or lacked the necessary training, to reach this conclusion. For the reasons provided above, ICANN complied with established policies and procedures for supervising the ICC to ensure that appropriately qualified experts are selected and trained to decide community objections against sufficiently transparent and predictable criteria.

**B. The Alleged Failure Of ICANN To Supervise The Panelist To Ensure No Potential Conflicts Of Interest Existed Does Not Support Reconsideration.**

The Requester claims that ICANN failed to properly supervise the Panel to ensure that potential conflicts of interest were not present. (Request, Section 6, Pg. 5.) The Requester further claims that the Expert had a “potential appearance of bias” because he “worked for Samsung,” which is a “strategic business partner” of Google, one of the applicants for .MUSIC. (Id.) Requester has not provided any support for this contention.

The Guidebook clearly states that all Experts “shall be impartial and independent of the parties.” (Guidebook, Attachment to Module 3, Article 13(c.).) The Guidebook further requires
that the “applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the manner by which each Expert shall confirm and
maintain their impartiality and independence.” (Id.)

The DRSP at issue here, the ICC, has impartiality rules in place, as required by the
Guidebook. In particular, Article 7 of the ICC’s Rules of Expertise, requires all potential experts
to “sign a statement of independence and disclose in writing . . . any facts or circumstances
which might be of such a nature as to call into question the expert’s independence in the eyes of
the parties.” (http://www.iccwbo.org/products-and-services/arbitration-and-adr/expertise/icc-
rules-for-expertise/#article_2.) From there, the ICC’s rules give the parties an opportunity to
comment on, or object to, the selected expert based on potential conflicts of interest. (Id.)

Here, as the Requester acknowledges, the Panelist signed a statement of independence in
compliance with Article 7 of the ICC’s Rules of Expertise. (Request, Section 8, Pg. 22-23.) The
Requester has not provided any evidence that it subsequently commented on or otherwise
objected to the appointed Expert based on any alleged potential conflict of interest. Thus, all
evidence indicates that ICANN, the ICC and the Expert followed the established policies and
procedures regarding selection and impartiality of the Expert.

Additionally, there is no evidence suggesting that the Expert “works” for Samsung, as
Requester claims. Rather, Requester’s own documentation indicates that the Expert was retained
by Samsung as an expert in an International Trade Commission investigation involving Samsung
and Ericsson Inc. relating to electronic devices. (Request, Annex K.) The fact that Samsung and
Google may have an agreement relating to the licensing of patents – which was entered into on
January 26, 2014, six months after this matter was assigned to the Expert and a mere three-weeks
before the Expert Determinations were issued (see Request, FN 13) – simply fails to suggest that
the Expert had a bias in favor of Google or against Requester. The Requester filed Community
Objections against strings sought by seven applicants, and Google\textsuperscript{13} was just one of these seven applicants, yet the result in each of the Community Objections was the same.

C. The Alleged Failure Of ICANN To Advise The ICC And The Panel On GAC Advice Does Not Support Reconsideration.

The Requester claims that ICANN failed “to ensure that the ICC and Experts were appropriately advised on the relevancy of GAC Advice/Resolutions and new AGB material changes in contracting,” by not communicating to the Expert information about the GAC’s Beijing Communiqué, which related to exclusive access registries. (Request, Section 6, Pg. 6.) Here, too, Requester has failed to identify a ground for reconsideration.

As an initial matter, the Guidebook provides that the “receipt of GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (\textit{i.e.}, an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process).” (Guidebook, § 3.1.) Thus, ICANN’s receipt of GAC advice in the Beijing Communiqué should not impact or toll the processing of any objections, including Requester’s Community Objections.

In addition, the Requester originally asked ICANN to instruct the ICC to \textit{not} consider these materials:

\begin{quote}
We respectfully request that ICANN appropriately instruct the ICC that all applications evaluated by Objection panelists be judged solely on their own merit (within the four-corners of the Applications) without considering new material changes made by ICANN in response to GAC advice (or newly created self-serving statements by Applicants).
\end{quote}

(Requester’s 12 July 2013 Letter to ICANN (emphasis in original).) In response, ICANN advised Requester that ICANN “does not dictate or limit the scope of the documentation that the

\textsuperscript{13} Charleston Road Registry Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Google. (See https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadapplication/528?t:ac=528.)

13
Panel may request or evaluate”; thus, it is up to the Panel whether to consider the impact of recent GAC advice in reaching its determination. (ICANN’s 14 August 2013 Letter to Requester.) ICANN’s response is consistent with the Procedure, which makes clear that, in addition to applying the standards that have been defined by the Guidebook, 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.” (Procedure, Art. 20(b).)

More importantly, in each of the Requester’s Community Objections, the Requester was given permission from the Panelist to file new information relating to the GAC’s Beijing Communiqué. (Determination, Pg. 2, ¶¶ 5-6.) And it is clear that the Expert Panel considered the Requester’s supplemental information in reaching its Determination. (Id., Pgs. 6-7, ¶¶ 17-21.) Thus, there is no support for the Requester’s claim that the Panel was not advised about the Beijing Communiqué when the Panel rendered its Determination.

D. The Alleged Failure To Provide An Appeal Mechanism For Community Objections Does Not Support Reconsideration.

With respect to Requester’s claims that the lack of an appeal mechanism is grounds for reconsideration of the Expert Determinations in Requester’s Community Objections, there is no support for the Requester’s contentions.14 Specifically, the Requester contends that the “failure

---

14 In Section 3 of the Request, the Requester complains of a lack of an appeal process for community objections. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 2 (“Point 3”).) But in Section 6 of the Request, where Requester purports to support this claim, the Requester spends almost eleven pages arguing that the Panelist incorrectly determined that the Requester did not have standing. (Request, Section 3, Pgs. 7-18.) But, as set forth above, the Reconsideration Process does not call for the BGC to perform a substantive review of expert determinations. Put another way, it is not for the BGC to evaluate the Panelist’s conclusions that the Requester lacked standing to bring its Community Objections. Rather, the BGC’s review is limited to whether the Panelist violated any established policy or process. The Panelist’s thorough analysis and its reliance of Module 3 of the Guidebook, as set forth in Annex A of the Determination, indicate that the Panelist acted in accordance with established ICANN policy or procedure in reaching its Determination.
of the Board to address a chorus of voices that called for an appeal mechanism to allow appropriate review of cases has prejudiced Objector’s ability to protect their members’ fundamental and legitimate rights.” (Request, Section 8, Pgs. 18-19.) The Guidebook, and its many versions and revisions, is based on years of open and frank discussion, debate and deliberation with the Internet community. The standards for evaluating the merits of a community objection have been debated and have been well known for years. The Guidebook provides that “applicant[s] may utilize any accountability mechanism set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws for purposes of challenging any final decision made by ICANN with respect to that application.” (Guidebook, Module 6, ¶ 6.) These mechanisms include the Reconsideration Process, the Independent Review Process, and the Ombudsman. (Bylaws, Art. IV & V.) The Requester has not identified any established policy or process that required ICANN to implement any additional appeal mechanism (upon request or otherwise) than those mechanisms already provided for under the Guidebook and in ICANN’s Bylaws. The Requester’s belief that the dispute resolution procedures should have included an appeal mechanism does not constitute a policy or process violation that supports reconsideration.

Furthermore, the Requester’s claim in this regard has already been rejected by the BGC in connection with Request 13-22. There, the BGC stated: “The Requester has not identified any established policy or process that required ICANN to implement any additional appeal mechanism (upon request or otherwise) than those mechanisms already provided for under the Guidebook and in ICANN’s Bylaws.”

(continued…)
E. The Requester’s Additional Points Do Not Support Reconsideration.

Section 3 of the Request sets out various points that the Requester claims support reconsideration. (Request, Section 3, Pgs. 2-3.) Specifically, Requester states that ICANN is “giving preferential treatment of .brand Applicants and all Applicants without Safeguards in their current Applications,” by permitting these applicants to alter their applications in the form of Public Interest Commitments (“PICs”) and changes to Specification 13. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 2.) In addition, Requester states that ICANN is “giving preferential treatment to the String Confusion Objection process” by introducing a process to address perceived inconsistent string confusion determinations relating to .CAR/.CARS and .COM/.CAM, but not doing the same for perceived inconsistent Community Objections determinations. (Id.) Finally, Requester asserts that ICANN “did not verify whether some Applications had exclusive access language” in response to the GAC Category 2 Advice in the Beijing Communiqué. (Id. at Pgs. 2-3.) None of these points support reconsideration.

As an initial matter, it is difficult to understand the arguments raised by the Requester because, other than a brief introduction in Section 3, Requester does not substantively address these arguments anywhere else in its Request. In addition, the Requester makes no effort to explain how these points are relevant to the Request or the Requester’s Community Objections, how these alleged inactions materially and adversely affect the Requester or precisely what is being challenged. Most importantly, the Request does not identify any ICANN policy or procedure that has been violated by these alleged actions and inactions. As such, Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration on these the additional points.
VI. Decision

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denies Reconsideration Request 14-8. If the Requester believes that it has somehow been treated unfairly in the process, the Requester is free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

In accordance with Article IV, Section 2.15 of the Bylaws, the BGC’s determination on Request 14-8 shall be final and does not require Board consideration. The Bylaws provides that the BGC is authorized to make a final determination on all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction. (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.15.) The BGC has the discretion, but is not required, to recommend the matter to the Board for consideration and action, as the BGC deems necessary. (See id.) As discussed above, Request 14-8 seeks reconsideration of an action or inaction taken by staff. After consideration of this particular Request, the BGC concludes that its determination on this matter is sufficient and that no further consideration by the Board is warranted.
The Requester seeks reconsideration of the 23 October 2013 Expert Determination in favor of SportAccord’s community objection to the Requester’s application for the .SPORTS gTLD.

I. Brief Summary

Both the Requester dot Sport Limited (“Requester” or “dot Sport”) and SportAccord applied for the .SPORTS string, and are in the same contention set. SportAccord won its Community Objection against the Requester’s application. The Requester claims that the Panel failed to apply the requisite ICANN standards, processes and policies in reaching the Determination by: (a) creating a new standard for determining the likelihood of material detriment; (b) failing to apply the existing standard for cause of the material detriment to a community; and (c) creating a new standard for examining the alleged material detriment. The Requester also claims that the Expert violated established policy or process by failing to disclose material information relevant to his appointment in. As a result, the Requester asks ICANN to reject the Expert Determination, and send the .SPORT matter back to a new panel that the ICC must show has been given substantial training in the Guidebook processes and standards. In the alternative, the Requester asks that ICANN request a formal accounting of the Expert’s current or prospective links with SportAccord or any of its member federation, and that the ICC demonstrate that the Expert was given reasonable training in the Guidebook processes and standards.
With respect to the first claim, the Requester failed to demonstrate that the Panel applied the wrong standard and there is no indication that: (a) the Panel created a new standard for determining the likelihood of material detriment; (b) the Panel ignored the causation requirement for evaluating the likelihood of material detriment; and (c) the Panel created a new test for examining material detriment.

With respect to the second claim, the Requester provides no evidence demonstrating that the Expert failed to follow the applicable ICC procedures for independence and impartiality. Rather, the Requester is challenging the merits of the Expert’s disclosure. Such challenges should be brought to the ICC under the ICC Rules of Expertise, not through the Reconsideration process.

Therefore, it the BGC is recommending that Request 13-16 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Background Facts.

The Requester and SportAccord applied for the .SPORTS string, and are in the same contention set.

On 13 March 2013, SportAccord filed a Community Objection with the ICC\(^1\) to the Requester’s application asserting that 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.” (Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), § 3.2.1; New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”), Art. 2(e).)

On 21 May 2013, the Requester filed a response to SportAccord’s Objection.

---

\(^1\) International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.
On 29 July 2013, the ICC appointed Professor Dr. Guido Santiago Tawil as the expert (“Expert” or “Panel”) to consider SportAccord’s Objection and notified the parties of the appointment. The ICC provided the parties with the Expert’s curriculum vitae as well as his Declaration of Acceptance and Availability, Statement of Impartiality and Independence.

On 23 October 2013, the Panel rendered an “Expert Determination” in favor of SportAccord. The Panel determined that SportAccord had standing to object as an “established institution which has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community.” (Determination, Pg. 12, ¶ 82.) Based on the submissions and evidence provided by the parties, the Panel determined that SportAccord established that there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the Requester’s application for the .SPORTS string may be targeted. The Panel deemed SportAccord to be the prevailing party and the Requester to be the losing party. (Determination, Pg. 24, ¶ 164.)

On 8 November 2013, the Requester filed Request 13-16, seeking reconsideration of the Expert Determination.

B. Requester’s Claims.

Requester seeks reconsideration on the following grounds:

First, the Requester claims that the Panel failed to apply the requisite ICANN standards, processes and policies in reaching the Determination. Specifically, the Requester contends the Panel:

- Created a new standard for determining the likelihood of material detriment;
- Failed to apply the existing standard for cause of the material detriment to a community; and
- Created a new standard for examining the alleged material detriment.
The Requester further asserts that the Panel’s alleged failure to apply the proper standard is evidence that the Expert was not qualified to render a determination on SportAccord’s objection, and thus, the ICC’s failure to appoint an appropriately qualified expert demonstrates a process violation sufficient to void the Expert Determination.

Second, the Requester alleges that the Expert failed to disclose material information about his interest in sporting arbitration and the organized sporting industry (of which SportAccord is a part), as well as his co-chairing of a panel entitled “The quest for optimizing the dispute resolution process in major sport-hosting events,” which the Requester suggests gives rise to doubts as to the Expert’s impartiality and independence. The Requester claims that the Expert’s failure to disclose these interests constitutes a breach of the relevant dispute resolution procedures as well as a breach of the ICANN policy on transparency as set out in Article 3, Section 1 of the Bylaws, which states that ICANN shall operate “in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.”

III. Issues.

As noted above, the Requester asks ICANN to consider: (i) whether the Panel failed to follow the requisite ICANN standards, processes and policies in rendering the Expert Determination; and (ii) whether the Expert failed to disclose material information relevant to his appointment which should invalidate the Expert Determination.

In view of the claims set forth in Request 13-16, the issues for reconsideration are:

A. Whether the Panel applied the wrong standard in contravention of established ICANN policy or process by:

1. Creating a new standard for determining the likelihood of material detriment in the Determination;
2. Failing to apply the existing standard for cause of the likelihood of material detriment to a community; and

3. Creating a new standard for examining the alleged material detriment.

B. Whether the Expert failed to disclose material information relevant to his appointment in violation of established policy or process.

IV. The Relevant Standards for Evaluating Reconsideration Requests and Community Objections.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with the specified criteria.² (See Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.) Dismissal of a request for reconsideration relating to staff action or inaction is appropriate if the BGC³ concludes, and the Board or the NGPC⁴ agrees to the extent that the BGC deems that further consideration by the Board or NGPC is necessary, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the reconsideration criteria set forth in the Bylaws. ICANN has previously determined that the reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges to expert determinations rendered by panels formed by third party dispute resolution service providers, such as the ICC, where it can be stated that the Panel failed to follow the established policies or

² Article IV, Section 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.

³ Board Governance Committee.
⁴ New gTLD Program Committee.
processes in reaching the expert determination, or that staff failed to follow its policies or processes in accepting that determination.\textsuperscript{5}

In the context of the New gTLD Program, the reconsideration process does not call for the BGC to perform a substantive review of expert determinations. Accordingly, here the BGC is not to evaluate the Panel’s conclusion that there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the Requester’s application for .SPORTS may be targeted. Rather, the BGC’s review is limited to whether the Panel violated any established policy or process, which the Requester suggests was accomplished when the Panel “derogated substantially” from the applicable standard for evaluating community objections. (Request, Section 8.)

The standards for evaluating community objections include a four-part test to help an expert panel 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.

Section 3.5.4 also includes a list of factors that could be used to evaluate each of the four criteria. (See id.) The factors relevant to Requester’s claims are discussed below.

V. Analysis and Rationale.


The Requester contends that the Panel applied the wrong standard in evaluating SportAccord’s community objection to Requester’s application for .SPORTS. Specifically, the Requester claims that the Panel: (i) created a new standard for determining the “likelihood of material detriment”; (ii) failed to apply the existing standard for cause of the likelihood of material detriment to a community; and (iii) created a new test for examining the alleged material detriment. (Request, Section 10b(iv)(a)-(d).)

1. The Panel did not Create a New Standard for Determining the Likelihood of Material Detriment.

The Requester claims that the Panel erroneously interpreted the standard for assessing the “likelihood of material detriment” as requiring a “potential” harm, which is a lesser standard than the “probability” of harm that is purportedly required in the Guidebook. (Request, Section 10(b)(iv)(a).) The Requester’s conclusions in this respect are not supported.

As noted above, to prevail on a community objection, the objector must, among other things, establish 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.” (Guidebook, Section 3.5.4.) The Guidebook includes a list of factors that could be used by a panel in making this determination. The factors include but are not limited to the following:
• 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.

(Guidebook, Section 3.5.4.)

Here, the Panel correctly referenced the above standard (Determination, Pgs. 22-23; ¶¶ 153-154) and noted:

Therefore, the standard that the Appointed Expert should apply to this issue is the “chance” that detriment will occur, which differs from the standard of “actual damage” invariably applied in litigation or arbitration. In other words, the standard of a “likelihood of material detriment” is, in the Appointed Expert’s opinion, equivalent to future “possible” damage.

(Determination, Pg. 23, ¶ 156.)

The Requester has failed to establish how the Panel’s interpretation of “likelihood” is a violation or contradiction of the Guidebook. Contrary to the Requester’s assertion, the Guidebook does not specifically define “likelihood of material detriment” but provides a set of factors that can be used to make a determination, and the Requester’s interpretation of the meaning of “likelihood” is not supported by the Guidebook. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the Panel’s agreement with Requester that many detriments alleged by SportAccord were “purely
hypothetical” (such as the risk of cybersquatting, ambush marketing, or the misuse of sport themes for purposes foreign to sport values), the Panel concluded that there was a “strong likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of the Sport Community if the application … is allowed to proceed.” (Determination, Pg. 24, ¶ 163 (emphasis added).) The Panel determined that SportAccord “proved several links between potential detriments” that the community may suffer and the operation of the .SPORTS string by Requester (such as the sense of official sanction or the disruption of some community efforts.) (Determination, Pg. 23, ¶¶ 157-58.) The Requester’s argument therefore does not support reconsideration because the Requester has failed to demonstrate how the Panel’s actions contradict any established policy or process.

2. **The Panel did not Fail to Apply the Existing Standard for Cause of the Likelihood of Material Detriment to a Community.**

The Requester alleges that the Panel ignored the requirement that the objector prove that the application “specifically created” or is the “cause” of the likelihood of material detriment. The Requester claims that the Panel “did not identify a single objectionable or lacking aspect in the application that creates a likelihood of material detriment.” (Request, Section 10b(iv)(b).) Requester’s arguments here are likewise unsupported.

Based on the Expert Determination, it appears that the Panel’s analysis of the detriment element centered on whether the Requester’s application for the .SPORTS string was likely to cause a material detriment – i.e., whether the Requester’s operation of the .SPORTS gTLD was likely to create the detriment alleged by SportAccord. (Determination, Pgs. 20-24, ¶¶ 137-163.) More specifically, SportAccord asserted that the Requester’s application for .SPORTS lacked accountability to the sport community and that such an application would generate numerous detriments to the interests of the community. (Determination, Pgs. 20-21, ¶¶ 137-145.) The
Requester challenged SportAccord’s assertions by claiming, among other things, that any alleged detriments were hypothetical and would not result from the Requester’s operation of the .SPORTS string. (Determination, Pgs. 21-22, ¶¶ 146-151.) As explained above, the Expert agreed with the Requester that many detriments alleged by SportAccord were purely hypothetical, but concluded that SportAccord was able to prove that Requester’s operation of the .SPORTS string was linked to potential detriments that the sport community may suffer. (Determination, Pg. 23, ¶¶ 157-58.) Thus, there is no support for the Requester’s claim that the Panel ignored the causation requirement for evaluating the likelihood of material detriment.

3. The Panel did not Create a New Test for Examining the Alleged Material Detriment.

The Requester asserts that the Panel created a new test for examining the alleged material detriment. To support this assertion, the Requester claims that the Panel applied the wrong test by considering both the Requester’s intent to act in accordance with the interests of the sport community and the economic damage that SportAccord (as opposed to the sport community) may suffer if the Requester’s application is allowed to proceed. (Request, Section 10b(iv)(c)-(d).) The Requester claims that SportAccord was never required to prove intention to cause material detriment; rather, it was required to prove that the application was likely to cause material detriment.

Turning first to the Requester’s claim that the Panel erred by considering the Requester’s intent to act in accordance with the interests of the sport community, “[e]vidence that the applicant is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the community” is one of the expressed factors set forth in the Guidebook that a panel may consider in evaluating detriment. (Guidebook, Section 3.5.4.) The Panel was therefore correct in addressing this factor.
With respect to the Requester’s claim that the Panel improperly considered the economic damage to SportAccord (as opposed to the Sport Community), there is no support for this assertion. In setting forth the parties’ positions on detriment, the Panel noted that SportAccord “focuses on the actual and certain damages that the Sport Community would suffer [if .SPORT] is operated by a registry without appropriate community-based accountability.” (Determination, Pg. 21, ¶ 144 (emphasis added).) It is clear from SportAccord’s focus on the alleged damages to the sport community and the Panel’s evaluation of the alleged damages as presented that the Panel was referencing the community represented by SportAccord (and not SportAccord itself) in the Expert Determination. Based on the parties’ submissions, the Panel concluded:

Regarding the economic damage that SportAccord may suffer, the Appointed Expert is of the view that although the figures and calculations on negative externalities provided by the Objector may have been exaggerated, the risk of economic damages which would be inflicted to Objector due to the operation of the gTLD by an unaccountable registry shows a reasonable level of certainty and could not be avoided if the application is allowed to proceed.

Therefore, the Appointed Expert is not in a position to accept Applicant’s argument that Objector’s alleged detriment only relies on the fact that Applicant would be delegated [.SPORT] instead of Objector.

(Determination, Pg. 24, ¶¶ 160-161 (footnote omitted.) One of the factors that a panel may consider in evaluating detriment is the “nature and extent of concrete or economic damage to the community represented by the objector ….” (Guidebook, Section 3.5.4.) As such, the Panel’s evaluation does not appear inconsistent with the standards set forth in the Guidebook.

Because there is no support for the Requester’s claim that the Panel applied the wrong standard in evaluating SportAccord’s community objection, there is also no support for the Requester’s contention that the Expert Determination should be voided due to the ICC’s alleged failure to appoint an appropriately qualified expert.
B. The Expert’s Purported Failure To Disclose A Possible Conflict Of Interest Does Not Support Reconsideration.

The Requester also claims that the Expert Determination should be void because the Expert failed to disclose information about his purported “interest in sporting arbitration and his presence at [a sporting event] conference” in February 2011. (Request, Section 8.) In particular, Requester relies on the Expert’s alleged participation as co-chair of a panel at the conference entitled “The quest for optimizing the dispute resolution process in major sport-hosting events.” (Request, Section 8.) The Requester contends that the Expert’s participation at the conference reflects his “recent[] focus on the prospect of creating business opportunities by close connections with … the organized sporting industry (of which SportAccord is a part)” and constitutes a conflict of interest that should have been disclosed prior to accepting the appointment. (Request, Section 8.) The Requester asks that ICANN request a formal account from the Expert of whether he has any links, including current or prospective links, with the objector or any of its member federations.

Section 3.4.4 of the Guidebook provides that the ICC will “follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an expert for lack of independence.” (Guidebook, Section 3.4.4.) The ICC Rules of Expertise\(^6\) would therefore govern any challenges to the independence of experts appointed to evaluate community objections. Requester provides no evidence demonstrating that the Expert failed to follow the applicable ICC procedures for independence and impartiality prior to his appointment. Article 7(4) of the ICC Rules for Expertise and Article 3(3) of its Appendix I provide that “a prospective expert shall sign a statement of independence and disclose in writing to the Centre [ICC] any

facts or circumstances which might be of such nature as to call into question the expert’s independence in the eyes of the parties.” (Request, Section 8; ICC Expertise Rules, Art. 7(4) & Appendix I.) The Panelist submitted his *curriculum vitae* as well as his Declaration of Acceptance and Availability, Statement of Impartiality and Independence. (Determination, Pg. 4.) Requester seeks to challenge the merits of said disclosure. However, from the Request, it does not appear that the Requester has sought to challenge the Expert’s independence under the ICC Rules of Expertise. Although the alleged conflict of interest was discovered after the Expert rendered a determination, the ICC Rules of Expertise would still govern any issues relating to the independence of experts. The reconsideration process is for the consideration of policy- or process-related complaints. Without the Requester attempting to challenge the Expert through the established process set forth in the Guidebook and the ICC Rules of Expertise, there can be no policy or process violation to support reconsideration – *i.e.*, reconsideration is not the appropriate mechanism to raise the issue for the first time.\(^7\)

VI. Decision.

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denies dot Sport Limited’s Request for Reconsideration. As there is no indication that Panel violated any policy or process in reaching the determination sustaining SportAccord’s community objection, this Request should not proceed. If the Requester believes that it has somehow been treated unfairly in the process, the Requester is free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

\(^7\) Notably, the Requester demonstrated familiarity with the ICC Rules of Expertise by successfully challenging and replacing the first expert appointed to the matter. (Request, Section 8.)
In accordance with Article IV, Section 2.15 of the Bylaws, the BGC’s determination on Request 13-16 shall be final and does not require Board consideration. Article IV, Section 2, Paragraph 16 of the Bylaws provides that the BGC is delegated with authority by the Board to make a final determination and recommendation for all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction and that the BGC’s determination on such matters is final and establishes precedential value. (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.15.) The BGC has the discretion, but is not required, to recommend the matter to the Board for consideration and action, as the BGC deems necessary. (See id.) As discussed above, Request 13-16 seeks reconsideration of action or inaction taken by staff. After consideration of this particular Reconsideration Request, the BGC concludes that its determination on this matter is sufficient and that no further consideration by the Board is warranted.
ERRATA SHEET

The Recommendation of ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“BGC”) on Reconsideration Request 13-16, which was published on 8 January 2014, is a true record of the BGC’s Recommendation, with the following exceptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} full para.</td>
<td>Each reference to “.SPORTS” should read “.SPORT”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 28 July 2014
Annex 19
Response to Documentary Information Disclosure Policy Request

To: Mike Rodenbaugh

Date: 10 October 2015

Re: Request No. 20150910-1

Thank you for your Request for Information dated 10 September 2015 (Request), which was submitted through the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN’s) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), on behalf of Asia Green IT System Ltd. (AGIT). For reference, a copy of your Request is attached to the email forwarding this Response.

Items Requested

Your Request seeks disclosure of the following documents:

1. All correspondence between any representative of ICANN on the one hand, and on the other hand any purported representative of the OIC, GCC, Lebanon, Indonesia or any other objector to AGIT’s applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM.

2. All records of the NGPC meeting with GAC members in Durban relating to these applications, referenced in the February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT.

3. All documents considered by the Board in coming to its February 5, 2014 resolution and February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT.

4. All documents considered by the Board Governance Committee (BGC) and New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) in rejecting AGIT's Request for Reconsideration of that resolution.

5. All documents regarding any effort by ICANN to facilitate resolution of the purported "conflicts" referenced in the February 7 letter.

6. Provide an entirely unredacted version of both the .AFRICA IRP decision and all documents submitted to and/or considered by the IRP panel in reaching that decision.

Response

All but one of your Request seeks documents related to AGIT’s applications for .HALAL and .ISLAM. In its Beijing Communiqué, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advised the ICANN Board:

[w]ith regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook:…The GAC recognizes that religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have
raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.

(Beijing Communiqué, § IV.1.a.i.ii.1, https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf.) Prior to the issuance of the Beijing Communiqué, the applications received GAC Early Warning notices from two GAC members: (i) the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”) (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-AE-23450.pdf; https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-AE-60793.pdf); and (ii) India (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-IN-23459.pdf; https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-IN-60793.pdf.) Both members expressed serious concerns regarding the AGIT’s Applications, including a perceived lack of community involvement in, and support for, the AGIT’s Applications. (See id.)

On 4 June 2013, the NGPC adopted the NGPC Scorecard (“4 June 2013 Resolution”) setting forth the NGPC’s response to the GAC Advice found in the Beijing Communiqué (“NGPC Scorecard”). (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-04jun13-en.htm#1.a.; http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-04jun13-en.pdf.) With respect to the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings, the NGPC Scorecard stated in pertinent part:

The NGPC accepts [the GAC] advice. The AGB provides that if "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.” Pursuant to Section 3.1ii of the [Guidebook], the NGPC stands ready to enter into dialogue with the GAC on this matter. We look forward to liaising with the GAC as to how such dialogue should be conducted.

(NGPC Scorecard, Pg. 3.) The NGPC Scorecard further noted the Community Objections filed against the AGIT’s Applications and indicated that “these applications cannot move to the contracting phase until the objections are resolved.” (Id.)

Module 3.1 of the AGB states that GAC Advice may take several forms. Part II of the Module 3.1 states:

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.

Pursuant to Module 3.1, part II, the ICANN New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the .HALAL and .ISLAM applications. (See Annex 1 to NGPC Resolution 2014.02.05.NG01 at https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf.)

On 25 July 2013, the Ministry of Communications for the State of Kuwait sent a letter to ICANN expressing its support for UAE’s Community Objections and identifying concerns that the AGIT did not receive the support of the community, the AGIT’s Applications are not in the best interest of the Islamic community, and the strings “should be managed and operated by the community itself through a neutral body that truly represents the Islamic community such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/al-qattan-to-icann-icc-25jul13-en.pdf)

On 4 September 2013, in a letter to the NGPC Chairman, the Republic of Lebanon expressed general support for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings, but stated that it strongly believes “the management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral non-governmental multi-stakeholder group representing, at least, the larger Muslim community.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/hoballah-to-chalaby-et-al-04sep13-en.pdf)

On 4 November 2013, the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”) submitted a letter to the GAC Chair, stating that, as the “second largest intergovernmental organization with 57 Member States spread across four continents” and the “sole official representative of 1.6 million Muslims,” the Member States of the OIC officially opposed the use of the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings “by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people”. (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-11nov13-en.pdf)

On 11 November 2013, having received a copy of the OIC’s 4 November 2013 letter, the ICANN Board Chairman sent a letter to the GAC Chair, noting that the NGPC has not taken any final action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL applications while they were subject to formal objections. The letter further stated that since the objection proceedings have concluded, the NGPC will wait for any additional GAC input regarding the strings and stands ready to discuss the applications if additional dialog would be helpful. (See https://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-11nov13-en.)

On 21 November 2013, the GAC issued its Buenos Aires Communiqué, which stated the following with respect to the AGIT’s Applications:

GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in early December.
The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair’s correspondence in similar terms.

(Buenos Aires Communiqué, Pg. 4, available at https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aires_GAC_Communiqu_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905332&api=v2.)

On 29 November 2013, the GAC Chair responded to the ICANN Board Chairman’s 11 November 2013 correspondence, confirming that the GAC has concluded its discussion on the AGIT’s Applications and stating that “no further GAC input on this matter can be expected.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/dryden-to-crocker-29nov13-en.pdf.)


On 19 December 2013, the Secretary General of the OIC sent a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman, stating that the Foreign Ministers of the 57 Muslim Member States of the OIC have unanimously approved and adopted a resolution officially objecting to the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings and indicating that the resolution “underlines the need for constructive engagement between the ICANN and OIC as well as between ICANN and OIC Member States.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/ihsanoglu-to-crocker-19dec13-en.pdf.)

On 24 December 2013, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology on behalf of the government of Indonesia sent a letter to the NGPC Chairman, stating that Indonesia “strongly objects” to the .ISLAM string and, in principle, “approves” the .HALAL string “provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/iskandar-to-chalaby-24dec13-en.pdf.)

On 30 December 2013, the AGIT submitted a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman challenging the nature and extent of the OIC’s opposition to the AGIT’s Applications, reiterating its proposed policies and procedures for governance of .ISLAM and .HALAL, and requesting to proceed to the contracting phase. (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/abbasnia-to-crocker-30dec13-en.pdf.)


The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community.

On 7 February 2014, Dr. Steve Crocker, Chair of the ICANN Board sent a letter to Mehdi Abbasnia, Chairman and Managing Director of AGIT. The letter acknowledges AGIT’s stated commitment to a multi-stakeholder governance model, but states:

> Despite these commitments, a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings .HALAL and .ISLAM….There seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in your letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.

(See id.)


Item No. 2 seeks the disclosure of all records of the NGPC meeting with GAC members in Durban relating to these applications, referenced in the February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT. All non-privileged documents responsive to this request have been published, including, without limitation, [http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-05feb14-en.pdf).
To the extent there are other documents responsive to this item, they are subject to the following DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure:

- 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.

- 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 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 No. 3 seeks all documents considered by the Board in coming to its February 5, 2014 resolution and February 7, 2014 letter to AGIT. The 5 February 2014 Resolution and Rationale set forth the materials reviewed by the NGPC as part of its deliberations, including, without limitation, the following:

- GAC Beijing Communiqué
  (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Commun ique_Durban_20130718.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1375787122000&api =v2)

- GAC Durban Communiqué
  (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Final_GAC_Commun ique_Durban_20130717.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1374215119858&api =v2)

- GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué
  (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aire s_GAC_Communique_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905 332&api=v2)
• Applicant responses to GAC advice (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/gac-advice/)


(See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a.) The Board briefing materials for the 5 February 2014 meeting have been published at https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-05feb14-en.pdf. To the extent there are other documents responsive to this item, they are subject to the following DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure:

• 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.

• 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 subject to the attorney–client, attorney work product privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/14-7/request-attachment-agit-1-28feb14-en.pdf,
https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/14-7/request-attachment-agit-3-28feb14-en.pdf,
https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/14-7/request-attachment-agit-4-28feb14-en.pdf,
https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/14-7/request-attachment-agit-5-28feb14-en.pdf, and

In addition, the minutes of the BGC 13 March 2014 meeting have been published at

Similarly, the document considered by the NGPC in Resolution 2014.03.22.NG04 adoption the BGC’s Recommendation on Request 14-7 are set forth in the Rationale for Resolution 2014.03.22.NG04, available at https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-03-22-en#1.e. Additionally, the Board briefing materials for the 22 March 2014 NGPC meeting are available at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/2014-2015-01-28-en. Further, the Minutes of the 22 March 2014 NGPC meeting are available at https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/minutes-new-gtld-22mar14-en.htm.

To the extent there are other documents responsive to this item, they are subject to the following DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure:

- 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.

- 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.
Item No. 5 seeks the disclosure of all documents regarding any effort by ICANN to facilitate resolution of the purported "conflicts" referenced in the 7 February letter from Dr. Crocker to AGIT. This request seems to be premised on the mistaken belief that ICANN’s Chairman suggested in his letter that ICANN would facilitate the resolution referenced in the 7 February 2014 letter. He did not. Specifically, the letter states:

There seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in your letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.

To the extent there are any documents responsive to this item, they are subject to the following DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure:

- 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 would be likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.

- 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 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.

With respect to Item No. 6, except for the GAC designated confidential information, ICANN has unredacted the IRP Final Declaration in the DotConnectAfrica Trust IRP, as well as all papers filed by the parties and the hearing transcripts (see [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dca-v-icann-2013-12-11-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dca-v-icann-2013-12-11-en)). With respect to the GAC designated confidential information, such information is subject to the following DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure:

• 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 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.

**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 makes every effort to be as responsive as possible to the entirety of your Request. As part of its accountability and transparency commitments, ICANN continually strives to provide as much information to the community as is reasonable. We encourage you to sign up for an account at MyICANN.org, through which you can receive daily updates regarding postings to the portions of ICANN's website that are of interest because, as we continue to enhance our reporting mechanisms, reports will be posted for public access.

We hope this information is helpful. If you have any further inquiries, please forward them to didp@icann.org.
I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Buenos Aires during the week of 16 November 2013. 56 GAC Members attended the meetings, with one GAC Member participating remotely, and five Observers. The GAC expresses warm thanks to the local host, NIC Argentina, for their support.

At the beginning of its meeting the GAC expressed its sympathy for and solidarity with the people and government of the Philippines following the recent disaster of Typhoon Haiyan.

II. GAC Advice to the Board

1. Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice

The GAC welcomed the response of the Board to the GAC's Beijing Communiqué advice on Category 1 and Category 2 safeguards. The GAC received useful information regarding implementation of the safeguards during its discussions with the New gTLD Program Committee. GAC members asked for clarification of a number of issues and look forward to ICANN's response.

   a. The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted Access' registries, particularly with regard to the need to avoid undue preference and/or undue disadvantage.

       i. The GAC requests

          1. A briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.

          b. The GAC requests a briefing on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).

---

1 To track the history and progress of GAC Advice to the Board, please visit the GAC Advice Online Register available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/GAC+Register+of+Advice
c. The GAC considers that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

d. **The GAC advises the ICANN Board:**
   
i. to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors, therefore ascribing these domains exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. The GAC notes the strong implications for consumer protection and consumer trust, and the need for proper medical ethical standards, demanded by the medical field online to be fully respected.

e. The GAC welcomes the Board’s communication with applicants with regard to open and closed gTLDs, but seeks **written clarification** of how strings are identified as being generic.

2. **GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)**

   a. .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), and .spa
   
   Discussions between interested parties are ongoing so as noted in the Durban Communiqué
   
i. **The GAC advises the ICANN Board:**
      1. Not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached.
      
      a. The application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese – application number 1-1121-22691)
      
      b. The application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese – 1-1121-82863)
      
      c. The applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115)
      
   b. The GAC notes that the application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524) has been withdrawn.

   c. The GAC welcomes the Board’s acceptance of its advice in the Durban Communiqué on the application for .thai.

   d. The GAC sought an update from the Board on the current status of the implementation of the GAC Advice for .amazon.

3. **.wine and .vin**

   The GAC took note of the developments on the two strings .wine and .vin from its previous meetings in Beijing and Durban.

   GAC members have undertaken extensive discussions to examine a diversity of views on these applications, and the protections associated with Geographical Indications (GIs).
GAC considers that appropriate safeguards against possible abuse of these new gTLDs are needed.

Some members are of the view, after prolonged and careful consideration, that the existing safeguards outlined in the GAC’s Beijing Communiqué and implemented by the ICANN Board are appropriate and sufficient to deal with the potential for misuse of the .wine and .vin new gTLDs. These members welcome the Board’s response to these safeguards, which prohibit fraudulent or deceptive use of domain names. They consider that it would be inappropriate and a serious concern if the agreed international settings on GIs were to be redesigned by ICANN. The current protections for geographical indications are the outcome of carefully balanced negotiations. Any changes to those protections are more appropriately negotiated among intellectual property experts in the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization.

Other members consider that delegation of .wine and .vin strings should remain on hold until either sufficient additional safeguards to protect GIs are put into place in these strings to protect the consumers and businesses that rely on such GIs; or common ground has been reached for the worldwide protection of GIs via international fora and wide array of major trade agreements. Given this changing context, they welcome the current face-to-face talks between the applicants for .wine and .vin and wine producers, aiming to protect their assets and consumers’ interests whilst taking into account governments’ public policy concerns.

The Board may wish to seek a clear understanding of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in order to consider the appropriate next steps in the process of delegating the two strings. GAC members may wish to write to the Board to further elaborate their views.

4. Protection of Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs)

a. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:

i. The GAC, together with IGOs, remains committed to continuing the dialogue with NGPC on finalising the modalities for permanent protection of IGO acronyms at the second level, by putting in place a mechanism which would:

1. provide for a permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant and the relevant IGO as to a possible conflict if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of that IGO;

2. allow the IGO a timely opportunity to effectively prevent potential misuse and confusion;

3. allow for a final and binding determination by an independent third party in order to resolve any disagreement between an IGO and a potential registrant; and

4. be at no cost or of a nominal cost only to the IGO.
The GAC looks forward to receiving the alternative NGPC proposal adequately addressing this advice. The initial protections for IGO acronyms should remain in place until the dialogue between the NGPC, the IGOs and the GAC ensuring the implementation of this protection is completed.

5. Special Launch Program for Geographic and Community TLDs

The GAC recognizes the importance of the priority inclusion of government and locally relevant name strings for the successful launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs.

The GAC appreciates that the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) is an important rights protection mechanism applicable across all the new gTLDs and has an invaluable role to fulfill across the new gTLD spectrum as a basic safety net for the protection of trademark rights.

   a. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board:
      i. that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch program for special cases as a matter of urgency.

6. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names

   a. The GAC advises the ICANN Board:
      i. that it is giving further consideration to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words “Red Cross”, “Red Crescent” and related designations at the top and second levels with specific regard to national Red Cross and Red Crescent entities; and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.

7. .islam and .halal

   a. GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair’s correspondence in similar terms.

III. Inter-constituencies Activities

1. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO)

   The GAC met with the GNSO and welcomed preliminary work that has been done to identify improved ways for earlier GAC involvement in policy development processes which have potential public policy aspects. A joint GAC/GNSO working group will be established to develop inter-sessionally more detailed options for implementation.

2. Meeting with the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG)
The GAC met with the EWG and exchanged views on the model proposed by the EWG for next generation directory services. GAC members highlighted a range of issues including the importance of applicable data privacy laws, the balance between public and restricted data elements, and the accreditation process to allow access to restricted data for legitimate purposes. The GAC welcomed the opportunity for continuing engagement with the EWG.

3. **Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organisation (ccNSO)**

The GAC met with the ccNSO and received briefings on ccNSO working groups on the IDN policy development process and the framework of interpretation; and the study group on country names. The GAC committed to continuing engagement with these issues, all of which have public policy implications, and will continue to work closely with the ccNSO.

4. **Meeting with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT 2)**

The GAC is grateful for the work undertaken by the ATRT2 and discussed with review team members their draft recommendations and report, noting that it was valuable to gain an external perspective on the work and operations of the GAC. The GAC has already made progress in relation to early engagement in policy development processes, increased transparency and improved working methods, but acknowledges that there is always more to be done, particularly in outreach. GAC members noted that the GAC provides policy advice, not legal advice. The GAC noted that each member already operates within their own government's code of conduct framework.

5. **Meeting with the Brand Registry Group (BRG)**

The GAC met with the Brand Registry Group to discuss their proposal for a streamlined process under an addendum to the Registry Agreement for the approval of country names and 2-letter and character codes at the second level. The GAC undertook to consider this proposal further and respond to the BRG in due course.

***

The GAC warmly thanks the GNSO, the EWG, the ccNSO, and the ATRT 2, who jointly met with the GAC; as well as all those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with the GAC in Buenos Aires.

**IV. Internal Matters**

1. **New Members and Observers** - The GAC welcomes the Commonwealth of Dominica and Montenegro as members, and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation and the Caribbean Telecommunications Union as observers.

2. **GAC Secretariat** – The independent consultants, Australian Continuous Improvement Group, have begun providing additional secretariat services to the
GAC. A range of measures to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the GAC is being progressively implemented.

3. **GAC Leadership** - The GAC welcomed the re-election of the current Vice Chairs (Australia, Switzerland and Trinidad and Tobago) for a further term. The issue of a possible increase in the number of Vice Chairs to better represent regions and manage workload has been referred to the GAC working group on working methods for consideration and report.

4. **New gTLDs** - At the ICANN meeting in Durban, the GAC formed a working group to begin consideration of potential public policy input for future rounds of new gTLDs. This working group has been focusing on issues associated with the protection of geographic names, the processes associated with identified communities, and developing economy issues and applicant support. The outcomes of the Geographic names working group are expected to be presented to the community by the ICANN 49 Singapore meeting. The GAC looks forward to discussing these issues with the community in future meetings.

5. **Working Methods** – At the ICANN meeting in Durban the GAC formed a working group to consider improvements to the GAC’s working methods. A range of immediate measures has been identified and is being progressively implemented. Other matters will be progressed in coordination with related initiatives including the ATRT 2 process.

6. **High Level Meeting** - A high level meeting of governments will be held in London in June 2014 in conjunction with the ICANN and GAC meetings. The agenda for the meeting should be finalised in Singapore.

V. **Next Meeting**

The GAC will meet during the period of the 49th ICANN meeting in Singapore.
13 January 2014
Mr. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu
Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation

Dear Mr. İhsanoğlu,

Thank you for your letter dated 19 December 2013 regarding the new gTLD applications of .islam and .halal.

We received with great interest the news about the Resolution on preserving gTLDs with Islamic identity that was unanimously adopted by OIC’s 57 Member States in the Fortieth Session of the Council of Foreign Ministers held in Conakry, Republic of Guinea, on 9-11 December 2013. I have forwarded the Resolution to the New gTLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board (NGPC) for their consideration. The time window for formal objections on new gTLD strings has ended, but we will have to wait for the consideration and decision of the NGPC according to their rules and procedures.

On the other hand, I am delighted that one of articles of the Resolution encourages the OIC and its Member States to become more active in ICANN, which we surely welcome and support as ICANN Board and staff. This will build the necessary bridges for engagement and dialogue and foster the cooperation between our two organizations in the future. We were pleased to see the OIC become an observer at ICANN’s Government Advisory Committee (GAC), and look forward to an era of more active participation of OIC’s Member States in the GAC as well as in other ICANN constituencies. The active engagement will enrich constituencies and support ICANN’s constant efforts to become more global and inclusive. In this respect, I would like to propose that the ICANN Regional VP for the Middle East, Baher Esmat, work closely with your team to foster more active engagement with OIC and its Member States, and I count on your support to this effort.

Once again, thank you for your communication and we look forward to working more closely with OIC and its Member States.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Crocker, Chair
ICANN Board of Directors