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ARTICLE 1 MISSION, COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

Section 1.1. MISSION

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

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

- For which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS (Domain Name System) including, with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registrars and registries, policies in the areas described in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2; and
- That are developed through a bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names systems.
The issues, policies, procedures, and principles addressed in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2 with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registrars and registries shall be deemed to be within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) the foregoing prohibitions are not intended to limit ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s authority or ability to
adopt or implement policies or procedures that take into account the
use of domain names as natural-language identifiers;

(ii) Notwithstanding any provision of the Bylaws to the contrary, the
terms and conditions of the documents listed in subsections (A)
through (C) below, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned
Names and Numbers)'s performance of its obligations or duties
thereunder, may not be challenged by any party in any proceeding
against, or process involving, ICANN (Internet Corporation for
Assigned Names and Numbers) (including a request for
reconsideration or an independent review process pursuant to Article
4) on the basis that such terms and conditions conflict with, or are in
violation of, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
Numbers)'s Mission or otherwise exceed the scope of ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s authority or powers
pursuant to these Bylaws ("Bylaws") or ICANN (Internet Corporation
for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation
("Articles of Incorporation"): (A) (1) all registry agreements and registrar accreditation
agreements between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned
Names and Numbers) and registry operators or registrars in
force on 1 October 2016 \[^1\], including, in each case, any terms or
conditions therein that are not contained in the underlying form
of registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement;
(2) any registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement
not encompassed by (1) above to the extent its terms do not
vary materially from the form of registry agreement or registrar
accreditation agreement that existed on 1 October 2016;

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

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

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

Section 1.2. COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

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

(a) COMMITMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) CORE VALUES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE 2 POWERS

Section 2.1. GENERAL POWERS

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

Section 2.2. RESTRICTIONS

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

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

ARTICLE 3 TRANSPARENCY

Section 3.1. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT

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

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

Section 3.2. WEBSITE

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

Section 3.3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Section 3.4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS

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

Section 3.5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS

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

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

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

Section 3.6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3.7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS

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

ARTICLE 4 ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 4.1. PURPOSE

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

Section 4.2. RECONSIDERATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests;

(ii) Summarily dismiss insufficient or frivolous Reconsideration Requests;

(iii) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests for urgent consideration;

(iv) Conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4.3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS FOR COVERED ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(iii) "Disputes" are defined as:

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

(1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(iii) Claims relating to Internet numbering resources, and

(iv) Claims relating to protocol parameters.

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

(e) Cooperative Engagement Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(v) For avoidance of doubt, IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Section 4.3(a)(iv) above, shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract.

(j) Standing Panel

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(k) IRP Panel

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

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

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

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

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

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

(m) IRP Provider

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

(n) Rules of Procedure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(D) Availability and limitations on discovery methods;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(q) Conflicts of Interest

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

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

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

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

(r) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall bear all the administrative costs of maintaining the IRP mechanism, including
compensation of Standing Panel members. Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.3(e)(ii), each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts. Nevertheless, except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP Panel may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party's Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.

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

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

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

(v) Subject to this Section 4.3, all IRP decisions shall be written and made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the Dispute was resolved in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4.5. ANNUAL REVIEW

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

Section 4.6. SPECIFIC REVIEWS

(a) Review Teams and Reports

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(vi) Confidential Disclosure to Review Teams

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Accountability and Transparency Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(C) maintaining clear and globally interoperable security processes for those portions of the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN
(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) coordinates.

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

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

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

(d) Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review

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

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

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

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

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

(e) Registration Directory Service Review

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4.7. COMMUNITY MEDIATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE 5 OMBUDSMAN

Section 5.1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

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

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

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

Section 5.2. CHARTER

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

Section 5.3. OPERATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE 6 EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

Section 6.1. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

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

(b) This Article 6 shall constitute the articles of association of the EC (Empowered Community) and shall be considered the formational "governing document" (as defined in Section 18008 of the CCC) of the EC (Empowered Community), and the terms contained herein and in these Bylaws relating to the EC (Empowered Community) shall be the EC (Empowered Community)'s "governing principles" (as defined in Section 18010 of the CCC), which may only be amended as set forth in Section 25.2. Where necessary for purposes of interpretation of these Bylaws, an "associate" shall be deemed to be a "member" of the EC (Empowered Community) as defined in Section 18015 of the CCC. Any change in the number and/or identity of Decisional Participants for any reason (including the resignation of any Decisional Participant or the addition of new Decisional Participants as a result of the creation of additional Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees)), and any corresponding changes in the voting thresholds for exercise of the EC (Empowered Community)'s rights described in Annex D of these Bylaws, will only be effective following the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and
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ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Section 1. MISSION

The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):

1. Coordinates the allocation and assignment of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet, which are
   a. Domain names (forming a system referred to as "DNS (Domain Name System)");
   b. Internet protocol ("IP (Internet Protocol or Intellectual Property)") addresses and autonomous system ("AS (Autonomous System ("AS") Numbers)") numbers; and
   c. Protocol (Protocol) port and parameter numbers.

2. Coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS (Domain Name System) root name server system.

3. Coordinates policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions.

Section 2. CORE 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

2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.

3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties.

4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.

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'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. With respect to any matters that would fall within the provisions of Article III, Section 6, the Board may act only by a majority vote of all members of the Board. In all other matters, except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws or by law, the Board may act by majority vote of those present at any annual, regular, or special meeting of the Board. Any references in these Bylaws to a vote of the Board shall mean the vote of only those members present at the meeting where a quorum is present unless otherwise specifically provided in these Bylaws by reference to "all of the members of the Board."

Section 2. RESTRICTIONS

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

Section 2. WEBSITE

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall maintain a publicly-accessible Internet World Wide Web site (the "Website"), which may include, among other things, (i) a calendar of scheduled meetings of the Board, Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees); (ii) a docket of all pending policy development matters, including their schedule and current status; (iii) specific meeting notices and agendas as described below; (iv) information on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s budget, annual audit, financial contributors and the amount of their contributions, and related matters; (v) information about the availability of accountability mechanisms, including reconsideration, independent review, and Ombudsman activities, as well as information about the outcome of specific requests and complaints invoking these mechanisms; (vi) announcements about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) activities of interest to significant segments of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community; (vii) comments received from the community on policies being developed and other matters; (viii) information about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s physical meetings and public forums; and (ix) other information of interest to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community.

Section 3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
There shall be a staff position designated as Manager of Public Participation, or such other title as shall be determined by the President, that shall be responsible, under the direction of the President, for coordinating the various aspects of public participation in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), including the Website and various other means of communicating with and receiving input from the general community of Internet users.

Section 4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS

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

Section 5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS

1. All minutes of meetings of the Board and Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) (and any councils thereof) shall be approved promptly by the originating body and provided to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary for posting on the Website.

2. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the second business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office), any resolutions passed by the Board of Directors at that meeting shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any actions relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)), matters that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the preliminary report made publicly available. The Secretary shall send notice to the Board of Directors and the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) (as set forth in Articles VIII - X of these Bylaws) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) (as set forth in Article XI
of these Bylaws) informing them that the resolutions have been posted.

3. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the seventh business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office), any actions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in a preliminary report on the Website, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in Section 5.2 above. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant preliminary report the reason for such nondisclosure.

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

Section 6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

1. With respect to any policies that are being considered by the Board for adoption that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, including the imposition of any fees or charges, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall:
   a. provide public notice on the Website explaining what policies are being considered for adoption and why, at least twenty-one days (and if practical, earlier) prior to any action by the Board;
b. provide a reasonable opportunity for parties to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, to see the comments of others, and to reply to those comments, prior to any action by the Board; and

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

2. Where both practically feasible and consistent with the relevant policy development process, an in-person public forum shall also be held for discussion of any proposed policies as described in Section 6(1)(b) of this Article, prior to any final Board action.

3. After taking action on any policy subject to this Section, the Board shall publish in the meeting minutes the reasons for any action taken, the vote of each Director voting on the action, and the separate statement of any Director desiring publication of such a statement.

Section 7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS

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

ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 1. PURPOSE

In carrying out its mission as set out in these Bylaws, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 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. The provisions of this Article, creating processes for reconsideration and independent review of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) actions and periodic review of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s structure and procedures, are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these
Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article III and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws

Section 2. RECONSIDERATION

1. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may request review or reconsideration of that action by the Board.

2. Any person or entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that he, she, or it have been adversely affected by:
   a. one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy(ies); or
   b. one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 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 (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board that are taken as a result of the Board's reliance on false or inaccurate material information.

3. The Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The Board Governance Committee shall have the authority to:
   a. evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;
   b. summarily dismiss insufficient requests;
   c. evaluate requests for urgent consideration;
   d. conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;
e. request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;

f. make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the Board of Directors; and

g. make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary

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

5. All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted to an e-mail address designated by the Board Governance Committee within fifteen days after:

   a. for requests challenging Board actions, the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale. In that instance, the request must be submitted within 15 days from the initial posting of the rationale; or

   b. for requests challenging staff actions, the date on which the party submitting the request became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged staff action; or

   c. for requests challenging either Board or staff inaction, the date on which the affected person reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

6. To properly initiate a Reconsideration process, all requestors must review and follow the Reconsideration Request form posted on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
website. at
http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration
(/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration). Requestors must also
acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the
form when filing.

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

8. The Board Governance Committee shall have authority to consider
Reconsideration Requests from different parties in the same
proceeding so long as: (i) the requests involve the same general
action or inaction; and (ii) the parties submitting Reconsideration
Requests are similarly affected by such action or inaction. In addition,
consolidated filings may be appropriate if the alleged causal
connection and the resulting harm is the same for all of the requestors.
Every requestor must be able to demonstrate that it has been
materially harmed and adversely impacted by the action or inaction
giving rise to the request.

9. The Board Governance Committee shall review each Reconsideration
Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The
Board Governance Committee may summarily dismiss a
Reconsideration Request if: (i) the requestor fails to meet the
requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; (ii) it is frivolous,
querulous or vexatious; or (iii) the requestor had notice and
opportunity to, but did not, participate in the public comment period
relating to the contested action, if applicable. The Board Governance
Committee's summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall
be posted on the Website.

10. For all Reconsideration Requests that are not summarily dismissed,
the Board Governance Committee shall promptly proceed to review
and consideration.

11. The Board Governance Committee may ask the ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff for its views on
the matter, which comments shall be made publicly available on the
Website.
12. The Board Governance Committee may request additional information or clarifications from the requestor, and may elect to conduct a meeting with the requestor by telephone, email or, if acceptable to the party requesting reconsideration, in person. A requestor may ask for an opportunity to be heard; the Board Governance Committee's decision on any such request is final. To the extent any information gathered in such a meeting is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation.

13. The Board Governance Committee may also request information relevant to the request from third parties. To the extent any information gathered is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation. Any information collected from third parties shall be provided to the requestor.

14. The Board Governance Committee shall act on a Reconsideration Request on the basis of the public written record, including information submitted by the party seeking reconsideration or review, by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, and by any third party.

15. For all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction, the Board Governance Committee shall be delegated the authority by the Board of Directors to make a final determination and recommendation on the matter. Board consideration of the recommendation is not required. As the Board Governance Committee deems necessary, it may make recommendation to the Board for consideration and action. The Board Governance Committee's determination on staff action or inaction shall be posted on the Website. The Board Governance Committee's determination is final and establishes precedential value.

16. The Board Governance Committee shall make a final determination or a recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within thirty days following its receipt of the request, unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final determination or recommendation. The final recommendation shall be posted on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s website.
17. The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee. The final decision of the Board shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the recommendation of the Board Governance Committee within 60 days of receipt of the Reconsideration Request or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s website. The Board's decision on the recommendation is final.

18. If the requestor believes that the Board action or inaction posed for Reconsideration is so urgent that the timing requirements of the Reconsideration process are too long, the requestor may apply to the Board Governance Committee for urgent consideration. Any request for urgent consideration must be made within two business days (calculated at ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s headquarters in Los Angeles, California) of the posting of the resolution at issue. A request for urgent consideration must include a discussion of why the matter is urgent for reconsideration and must demonstrate a likelihood of success with the Reconsideration Request.

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

20. The Board Governance Committee shall submit a report to the Board on an annual basis containing at least the following information for the preceding calendar year:
   a. the number and general nature of Reconsideration Requests received, including an identification if the requests were acted upon, summarily dismissed, or remain pending;
b. for any Reconsideration Requests that remained pending at the end of the calendar year, the average length of time for which such Reconsideration Requests have been pending, and a description of the reasons for any request pending for more than ninety (90) days;

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

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

Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS

1. In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 2 of this Article, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 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.

2. 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 causally connected to the Board's alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board's action.

3. A request for independent review must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting (and the accompanying Board Briefing Materials, if available) that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation. Consolidated requests may be appropriate when the causal
connection between the circumstances of the requests and the harm is the same for each of the requesting parties.

4. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel"), which shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the 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?

5. Requests for independent review shall not exceed 25 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font) of argument. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s response shall not exceed that same length. Parties may submit documentary evidence supporting their positions without limitation. In the event that parties submit expert evidence, such evidence must be provided in writing and there will be a right of reply to the expert evidence.

6. There shall be an omnibus standing panel of between six and nine members with a variety of expertise, including jurisprudence, judicial experience, alternative dispute resolution and knowledge of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission and work from which each specific IRP Panel shall be selected. The panelists shall serve for terms that are staggered to allow for continued review of the size of the panel and the range of expertise. A Chair of the standing panel shall be appointed for a term not to exceed three years. Individuals holding an official position or office within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) structure are not eligible to serve on the standing panel. In the event that an omnibus standing panel: (i) is not in place when an IRP Panel must be convened for a given proceeding, the IRP proceeding will be considered by a one- or three-member panel comprised in accordance
with the rules of the IRP Provider; or (ii) is in place but does not have the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular proceeding, the IRP Provider shall identify one or more panelists, as required, from outside the omnibus standing panel to augment the panel members for that proceeding.

7. All IRP proceedings shall be administered by an international dispute resolution provider appointed from time to time by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) ("the IRP Provider"). The membership of the standing panel shall be coordinated by the IRP Provider subject to approval by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

8. Subject to the approval of the Board, the IRP Provider shall establish operating rules and procedures, which shall implement and be consistent with this Section 3.

9. Either party may request that the IRP be considered by a one- or three-member panel; the Chair of the standing panel shall make the final determination of the size of each IRP panel, taking into account the wishes of the parties and the complexity of the issues presented.

10. The IRP Provider shall determine a procedure for assigning members from the standing panel to individual IRP panels.

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:
   a. summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious;
   b. request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), or from other parties;
   c. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and
   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;
   e. consolidate requests for independent review if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar; and
   f. determine the timing for each proceeding.
12. In order to keep the costs and burdens of independent review as low as possible, the IRP Panel should conduct its proceedings by email and otherwise via the Internet to the maximum extent feasible. Where necessary, the IRP Panel may hold meetings by telephone. 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.

13. All panel members shall adhere to conflicts-of-interest policy stated in the IRP Provider's operating rules and procedures, as approved by the Board.

14. Prior to initiating a request for independent review, the complainant is urged to enter into a period of cooperative engagement with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. The cooperative engagement process is published on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).org and is incorporated into this Section 3 of the Bylaws.

15. Upon the filing of a request for an independent review, the parties are urged to participate in a conciliation period for the purpose of narrowing the issues that are stated within the request for independent review. A conciliator will be appointed from the members of the omnibus standing panel by the Chair of that panel. The conciliator shall not be eligible to serve as one of the panelists presiding over that particular IRP. The Chair of the standing panel may deem conciliation unnecessary if cooperative engagement sufficiently narrowed the issues remaining in the independent review.

16. Cooperative engagement and conciliation are both voluntary. However, if the party requesting the independent review does not participate in good faith in the cooperative engagement and the conciliation processes, if applicable, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the request for independent review, the IRP Panel must award to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in the proceeding, including legal fees.
17. All matters discussed during the cooperative engagement and conciliation phases are to remain confidential and not subject to discovery or as evidence for any purpose within the IRP, and are without prejudice to either party.

18. The IRP Panel should strive to issue its written declaration no later than six months after the filing of the request for independent review. The IRP Panel shall make its declaration based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its declaration shall specifically designate the prevailing party. The party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the IRP Provider, but in an extraordinary case the IRP Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest. Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses.

19. The IRP operating procedures, and all petitions, claims, and declarations, shall be posted on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s website when they become available.

20. The IRP Panel may, in its discretion, grant a party's request to keep certain information confidential, such as trade secrets.

21. Where feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board's next meeting. The declarations of the IRP Panel, and the Board's subsequent action on those declarations, are final and have precedential value.

Section 4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE V: OMBUDSMAN

Section 1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

1. There shall be an Office of Ombudsman, to be managed by an Ombudsman and to include such staff support as the Board determines is appropriate and feasible. The Ombudsman shall be a full-time position, with salary and benefits appropriate to the function, as determined by the Board.

2. The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Board for an initial term of two years, subject to renewal by the Board.

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

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

Section 2. CHARTER

The charter of the Ombudsman shall be to act as a neutral dispute resolution practitioner for those matters for which the provisions of the Reconsideration Policy set forth in Section 2 of Article IV or the Independent Review Policy set forth in Section 3 of Article IV have not been invoked. The principal function of the Ombudsman shall be to provide an independent internal evaluation of complaints by members of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community who believe that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, Board or an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) constituent body has treated them unfairly. The Ombudsman shall serve as an objective advocate for fairness, and shall seek to evaluate and where possible resolve complaints about unfair or inappropriate treatment by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, the Board, or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) constituent bodies, clarifying the issues and using conflict resolution tools such as negotiation, facilitation, and "shuttle diplomacy" to achieve these results.

Section 3. OPERATIONS

The Office of Ombudsman shall:

1. facilitate the fair, impartial, and timely resolution of problems and complaints that affected members of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community (excluding employees and vendors/suppliers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) may have with specific actions or failures to act by the Board or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff which have not otherwise become the subject of either the Reconsideration or Independent Review Policies;
2. exercise discretion to accept or decline to act on a complaint or question, including by the development of procedures to dispose of complaints that are insufficiently concrete, substantive, or related to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s interactions with the community so as to be inappropriate subject matters for the Ombudsman to act on. In addition, and without limiting the foregoing, the Ombudsman shall have no authority to act in any way with respect to internal administrative matters, personnel matters, issues relating to membership on the Board, or issues related to vendor/supplier relations;

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

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

5. maintain neutrality and independence, and have no bias or personal stake in an outcome; and

6. comply with all ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) conflicts-of-interest and confidentiality policies.

Section 4. INTERACTION WITH ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) AND OUTSIDE ENTITIES

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5. ANNUAL REPORT

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

ARTICLE VI: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD
Dear Mike,

The ICANN Office of the Ombudsman is an informal accountability mechanism mandated by the ICANN By-laws; alongside two other formal accountability mechanisms: Reconsideration and Independent Review.

https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en

As the Office of the Ombudsman is an informal accountability mechanism, as stipulated in the Bylaws 5.3 (a), I do not investigate complaints that are simultaneously being addressed by one of the other formal accountability mechanisms, or, as a standard of practice, issues that are under litigation or pending litigation.

As such, considering that I have not received a formal complaint regarding this issue, I will decline involvement for the time being. If you wish to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me independent of this exchange.

Best regards, Herb

Herb Waye
ICANN Ombudsman

https://www.icann.org/ombudsman
https://www.facebook.com/ICANNOmbudsman
Twitter: @IcannOmbudsman

ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:


Community Anti-Harassment Policy


Confidentiality

All matters brought before the Ombudsman shall be treated as confidential. The Ombudsman shall also take all reasonable steps necessary to preserve the privacy of, and to avoid harm to, those parties not involved in the complaint being investigated by the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall only make inquiries about, or advise staff or Board members of the existence and identity of, a complainant in order to further the resolution of the complaint. The Ombudsman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to ensure that if staff and Board members are made aware of the existence and identity of a complainant, they agree to maintain the confidential nature of such information, except as necessary to further the resolution of a complaint.
From: Mike Rodenbaugh <mike@rodenbaugh.com>
Date: Thursday, January 30, 2020 at 3:59 PM
To: "LeVee, Jeffrey A." <jlevee@jonesday.com>
Cc: "Podmaniczky McGonigle, Sarah" <smcgonigle@jonesday.com>, Marie Richmond <marie@rodenbaugh.com>, ombudsman <ombudsman@icann.org>, Tom Simotas
Subject: [Ext] Re: .HOTEL

Jeff,

My letter had a lot of pointed questions for ICANN. The first time the purported "standard practice" was mentioned was yesterday. We have asked for the basis for your statement that it is a "standard practice", and we believe the Ombudsman must look at this issue as ICANN Legal (or at least ICANN's outside counsel) appears to be making up policy that does not exist.

We also have a request pending to ICDR re its clear conflict of interest in adjudicating my clients' Request for Interim Measures, which the Ombudsman must also consider from ICANN's perspective. It makes no sense to file a brief with an administrator that has such a conflict of interest.

ICANN has no right to change the status quo as to the Contention Set, while this IRP is pending. You know that, from past binding precedents. So why are you threatening not only my clients, but all of the .HOTEL applicants (though they do not even know it), with such a draconian step when ICANN has already lost this battle at least twice?

Why do we not have reasoned dialogue, rather than threats? Please confirm that ICDR will set the briefing schedule re Interim Measures, if both it and ICANN concludes it has no conflict of interest.

Thank you,
Mike

Mike Rodenbaugh
RODENAUGH LAW
tel/fax: +1.415.738.8087
http://rodenbaugh.law [rodenbaugh.law]

On Thu, Jan 30, 2020 at 9:56 AM LeVee, Jeffrey A. <jlevee@jonesday.com> wrote:

Mike,

ICANN acknowledges receipt of your letter, dated 29 January 2020, which mostly just repeats statements you have made previously. As we have repeatedly told you, ICANN's standard practice is NOT to continue the "hold" on contracting and delegation while an IRP is pending, unless an emergency panelist has so ordered. Accordingly, ICANN will lift the hold on the .HOTEL contention set if your clients do not serve a request for interim relief today.

Thanks,
Sarah, please see Claimants’ response to Jeff’s letter.

Thanks,

Mike

Mike Rodenbaugh
RODENBAUGH LAW
tel/fax:  +1.415.738.8087

http://rodenbaugh.law [rodenbaugh.law]

On Tue, Jan 14, 2020 at 1:26 PM Podmaniczky McGonigle, Sarah <smcgonigle@jonesday.com> wrote:

Mike,

Please see the attached letter from Jeff.

Thanks,
Also noting, Jeff, that per your letter of Dec. 30 you would give your team 30 days to respond to our Interim Request, while you give us just 17 days to prepare it. Does that sound reasonable to you?

Mike Rodenbaugh

RODENBAUGH LAW

tel/fax: +1.415.738.8087

http://rodenbaugh.law [rodenbaugh.law]

On Thu, Jan 9, 2020 at 11:24 AM Mike Rodenbaugh <mike@rodenbaugh.com> wrote:

Jeff,

It is unreasonable for ICANN to impose a unilateral, 17-day deadline on my clients to make this filing. No such deadline exists in the Rules or otherwise. ICANN itself caused several years of delay as to the .Hotel applications, so certainly cannot claim any urgency now. Please explain any and all bases for purporting to require me and my clients to act so quickly as to such a critical matter.

Meanwhile, it would be outrageous for ICANN to change the status of the pending application that is the subject of this IRP, while this IRP is pending. ICANN has already lost that argument at least three times in prior IRPs (.Africa, .GCC, .registry), which are binding precedent per the Bylaws.
So how can ICANN possibly justify such a decision now? Was that a decision of the ICANN Board, or Staff? When was that decision made and how was it communicated to the community and to my clients, with what explanation as to the decision? We note that your email notice dated January 7 contains four sentences, with no explanation or analysis of the decision to ignore previous IRP precedents and move forward with a TLD delegation while that TLD is subject of an IRP.

Please advise further, soonest. Meanwhile we refuse to accept ICANN’s purported deadline, but are willing to discuss with you a further briefing schedule that is mutually acceptable to both parties.

Thanks,
Mike

Mike Rodenbaugh
RODENBAUGH LAW
tel/fax: +1.415.738.8087

http://rodenbaugh.law [rodenbaugh.law]

On Tue, Jan 7, 2020 at 1:39 PM LeVee, Jeffrey A. <jlevee@jonesday.com> wrote:

Dear Mike:

As you undoubtedly know, during the CEP on .HOTEL, the contention set remained on hold. Now that the CEP has ended, and as I confirmed in my letter to Tom Simotas dated 30 December 2019, ICANN’s normal process is to remove the “on hold” status and, in this instance, ICANN would proceed to contracting and then delegation. This email hereby provides notice that, in the event Claimants do not seek interim measures of protection on this issue on or before 24 January 2020, the .HOTEL contention set will be taken off “on hold” status. In the event Claimants do seek interim measures of protection on this issue by 24 January 2020, the status of the .HOTEL contention set will remain “on hold” until the parties receive a decision from the IRP Panel (or Emergency Panelist) regarding Claimants’ request for interim relief.

Jeff LeVee
R-4
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These interim procedures (Interim Supplementary Procedures) supplement the International Centre for Dispute Resolution’s international arbitration rules in accordance with the independent review process set forth in Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws. These procedures apply to all independent review process proceedings filed after 1 May 2018.

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

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

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

1. Definitions

In these Interim Supplementary Procedures:

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

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

DISPUTES are defined as:

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

1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

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

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

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

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

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

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

IANA refers to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Scope

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

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

3. Composition of Independent Review Panel

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

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

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

5. **Conduct of the Independent Review**

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

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

5A. **Nature of IRP Proceedings**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

5B. Translation

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Written Statements

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

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

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

7. Consolidation, Intervention and Participation as an Amicus

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

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

Consolidation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. Summary Dismissal

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

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

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

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

(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;
(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and
(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief.

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

11. Standard of Review

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

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

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

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

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

12. IRP PANEL Decisions

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

13. Form and Effect of an IRP PANEL DECISION

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

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

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

14. Appeal of IRP PANEL Decisions

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

15. Costs

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

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

On 13 June 2012, ICANN published all applied-for strings. View high-level program statistics as applications move through the evaluation process.

PROGRAM STATISTICS

Current Statistics *(Updated monthly)*

Application Statistics: Overview (as of 31 December 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applications Submitted</th>
<th>1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed New gTLD Program <em>(en/program-status/delegated-strings)</em></td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gTLD Delegated** - introduced into Internet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Withdrawn</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications that Will Not Proceed/Not Approved</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Proceeding through New gTLD Program*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contention Resolution

| Total Contention Sets | 234 |

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. [Learn more.](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/statistics)

This site uses cookies to deliver an efficient user experience and to help us see how the site is used. [Learn more.](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/statistics)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executed Registry Agreements (completed contracting)</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Agreements with Specification 13</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Agreements with Code of Conduct Exemption</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Contracting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Delegation Testing (PDT)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed PDT</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown: Delegation Statistics**

| Delegated gTLDs ([en/program-status/delegated-strings](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/delegated-strings)) (Introduced into Internet) | 1235  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Subcategories of Delegated gTLDs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gTLD Startup Statistics (as of 6 January 2020)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Claims                                           |       |
| Completed                                       | 696   |

**A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:**

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. [Learn more.](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/statistics)

This site uses cookies to deliver an efficient user experience and to help us see how the site is used. [Learn more.](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/statistics)
New gTLD Application Submission Statistics

The statistics in this section were calculated based on applications received by the 29 March 2012 deadline.

Application Breakdown by: Region | Type | String Similarity

Application Breakdown by Region
Statistics as of 13 June 2012

1930 total number of applications received

911 North America
675 Europe
24 South America
17 Africa
303 Asia Pacific

Application Breakdown by Type
Statistics as of 13 June 2012

Application Totals

- Community: 84
- Geographic: 66
- Internationalized Domain Names: 116

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more.

This site uses cookies to deliver an efficient user experience and to help us see how the site is used. Learn more. ✗ OK
Application Breakdown by String Similarity
Statistics as of 26 February 2013

Approximate Number of Unique Applied-for Strings: 1,400

- Contention Sets
  - Exact Match: 230
    (two or more applications for a string with same characters)
  - Confusingly Similar: 2
    - .hotels & .hoteis
    - .unicorn & .unicom
- Applications in a Contention Set: 751

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:
We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more.

This site uses cookies to deliver an efficient user experience and to help us see how the site is used. Learn more.
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New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN’s agenda since its creation. The new gTLD program will open up the top level of the Internet’s namespace to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS.

Currently the namespace consists of 22 gTLDs and over 250 ccTLDs operating on various models. Each of the gTLDs has a designated “registry operator” and, in most cases, a Registry Agreement between the operator (or sponsor) and ICANN. The registry operator is responsible for the technical operation of the TLD, including all of the names registered in that TLD. The gTLDs are served by over 900 registrars, who interact with registrants to perform domain name registration and other related services. The new gTLD program will create a means for prospective registry operators to apply for new gTLDs, and create new options for consumers in the market. When the program launches its first application round, ICANN expects a diverse set of applications for new gTLDs, including IDNs, creating significant potential for new uses and benefit to Internet users across the globe.

The program has its origins in carefully deliberated policy development work by the ICANN community. In October 2007, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)—one of the groups that coordinate global Internet policy at ICANN—formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations. Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups—governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community—were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward. The culmination of this policy development process was a decision by the ICANN Board of Directors to adopt the community-developed policy in June 2008. A thorough brief to the policy process and outcomes can be found at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds.

ICANN’s work next focused on implementation: creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval. This implementation work is reflected in the drafts of the applicant guidebook that were released for public comment, and in the explanatory papers giving insight into rationale behind some of the conclusions reached on specific topics. Meaningful community input has led to revisions of the draft applicant guidebook. In parallel, ICANN has established the resources needed to successfully launch and operate the program. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board of Directors in June 2011 to launch the New gTLD Program.

For current information, timelines and activities related to the New gTLD Program, please go to http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm.
Module 1

Introduction to the gTLD Application Process

This module gives applicants an overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domain, and includes instructions on how to complete and submit an application, the supporting documentation an applicant must submit with an application, the fees required, and when and how to submit them.

This module also describes the conditions associated with particular types of applications, and the stages of the application life cycle.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to read and become familiar with the contents of this entire module, as well as the others, before starting the application process to make sure they understand what is required of them and what they can expect at each stage of the application evaluation process.

For the complete set of the supporting documentation and more about the origins, history and details of the policy development background to the New gTLD Program, please see http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/.

This Applicant Guidebook is the implementation of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs, and has been revised extensively via public comment and consultation over a two-year period.

1.1 Application Life Cycle and Timelines

This section provides a description of the stages that an application passes through once it is submitted. Some stages will occur for all applications submitted; others will only occur in specific circumstances. Applicants should be aware of the stages and steps involved in processing applications received.

1.1.1 Application Submission Dates

The user registration and application submission periods open at 00:01 UTC 12 January 2012.

The user registration period closes at 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012. New users to TAS will not be accepted beyond this
time. Users already registered will be able to complete the application submission process.

Applicants should be aware that, due to required processing steps (i.e., online user registration, application submission, fee submission, and fee reconciliation) and security measures built into the online application system, it might take substantial time to perform all of the necessary steps to submit a complete application. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to submit their completed applications and fees as soon as practicable after the Application Submission Period opens. Waiting until the end of this period to begin the process may not provide sufficient time to submit a complete application before the period closes. Accordingly, new user registrations will not be accepted after the date indicated above.

The application submission period closes at 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012.

To receive consideration, all applications must be submitted electronically through the online application system by the close of the application submission period.

An application will not be considered, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, if:

- It is received after the close of the application submission period.
- The application form is incomplete (either the questions have not been fully answered or required supporting documents are missing). Applicants will not ordinarily be permitted to supplement their applications after submission.
- The evaluation fee has not been paid by the deadline. Refer to Section 1.5 for fee information.

ICANN has gone to significant lengths to ensure that the online application system will be available for the duration of the application submission period. In the event that the system is not available, ICANN will provide alternative instructions for submitting applications on its website.

1.1.2 Application Processing Stages

This subsection provides an overview of the stages involved in processing an application submitted to ICANN. Figure 1-1 provides a simplified depiction of the process. The shortest and most straightforward path is marked with bold lines, while certain stages that may or may not be
applicable in any given case are also shown. A brief description of each stage follows.

![Diagram of gTLD Application Process]

Figure 1-1 – Once submitted to ICANN, applications will pass through multiple stages of processing.

1.1.2.1 Application Submission Period

At the time the application submission period opens, those wishing to submit new gTLD applications can become registered users of the TLD Application System (TAS).

After completing the user registration, applicants will supply a deposit for each requested application slot (see section 1.4), after which they will receive access to the full application form. To complete the application, users will answer a series of questions to provide general information, demonstrate financial capability, and demonstrate technical and operational capability. The supporting documents listed in subsection 1.2.2 of this module must also be submitted through the online application system as instructed in the relevant questions.

Applicants must also submit their evaluation fees during this period. Refer to Section 1.5 of this module for additional information about fees and payments.

Each application slot is for one gTLD. An applicant may submit as many applications as desired; however, there is no means to apply for more than one gTLD in a single application.
Following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will provide applicants with periodic status updates on the progress of their applications.

1.1.2.2 Administrative Completeness Check

Immediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness. This check ensures that:

- All mandatory questions are answered;
- Required supporting documents are provided in the proper format(s); and
- The evaluation fees have been received.

ICANN will post the public portions of all applications considered complete and ready for evaluation within two weeks of the close of the application submission period. Certain questions relate to internal processes or information: applicant responses to these questions will not be posted. Each question is labeled in the application form as to whether the information will be posted. See posting designations for the full set of questions in the attachment to Module 2.

The administrative completeness check isexpected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 8 weeks, subject to extension depending on volume. In the event that all applications cannot be processed within this period, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.3 Comment Period

Public comment mechanisms are part of ICANN’s policy development, implementation, and operational processes. As a private-public partnership, ICANN is dedicated to: preserving the operational security and stability of the Internet, promoting competition, achieving broad representation of global Internet communities, and developing policy appropriate to its mission through bottom-up, consensus-based processes. This necessarily involves the participation of many stakeholder groups in a public discussion.

ICANN will open a comment period (the Application Comment period) at the time applications are publicly posted on ICANN’s website (refer to subsection 1.1.2.2). This period will allow time for the community to review and submit comments on posted application materials.
The comment forum will require commenters to associate comments with specific applications and the relevant panel. Application comments received within a 60-day period from the posting of the application materials will be available to the evaluation panels performing the Initial Evaluation reviews. This period is subject to extension, should the volume of applications or other circumstances require. To be considered by evaluators, comments must be received in the designated comment forum within the stated time period.

Evaluators will perform due diligence on the application comments (i.e., determine their relevance to the evaluation, verify the accuracy of claims, analyze meaningfulness of references cited) and take the information provided in these comments into consideration. In cases where consideration of the comments has impacted the scoring of the application, the evaluators will seek clarification from the applicant. Statements concerning consideration of application comments that have impacted the evaluation decision will be reflected in the evaluators’ summary reports, which will be published at the end of Extended Evaluation.

Comments received after the 60-day period will be stored and available (along with comments received during the comment period) for other considerations, such as the dispute resolution process, as described below.

In the new gTLD application process, all applicants should be aware that comment fora are a mechanism for the public to bring relevant information and issues to the attention of those charged with handling new gTLD applications. Anyone may submit a comment in a public comment forum.

**Comments and the Formal Objection Process:** A distinction should be made between application comments, which may be relevant to ICANN’s task of determining whether applications meet the established criteria, and formal objections that concern matters outside those evaluation criteria. The formal objection process was created to allow a full and fair consideration of objections based on certain limited grounds outside ICANN’s evaluation of applications on their merits (see subsection 3.2).

Public comments will not be considered as formal objections. Comments on matters associated with formal objections will not be considered by panels during Initial Evaluation. These comments will be available to and may
be subsequently considered by an expert panel during a dispute resolution proceeding (see subsection 1.1.2.9). However, in general, application comments have a very limited role in the dispute resolution process.

**String Contention:** Comments designated for the Community Priority Panel, as relevant to the criteria in Module 4, may be taken into account during a Community Priority Evaluation.

**Government Notifications:** Governments may provide a notification using the application comment forum to communicate concerns relating to national laws. However, a government’s notification of concern will not in itself be deemed to be a formal objection. A notification by a government does not constitute grounds for rejection of a gTLD application. A government may elect to use this comment mechanism to provide such a notification, in addition to or as an alternative to the GAC Early Warning procedure described in subsection 1.1.2.4 below.

Governments may also communicate directly to applicants using the contact information posted in the application, e.g., to send a notification that an applied-for gTLD string might be contrary to a national law, and to try to address any concerns with the applicant.

**General Comments:** A general public comment forum will remain open through all stages of the evaluation process, to provide a means for the public to bring forward any other relevant information or issues.

### 1.1.2.4 GAC Early Warning

Concurrent with the 60-day comment period, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) may issue a GAC Early Warning notice concerning an application. This provides the applicant with an indication that the application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more governments.

The GAC Early Warning is a notice only. It is not a formal objection, nor does it directly lead to a process that can result in rejection of the application. However, a GAC Early Warning should be taken seriously as it raises the likelihood that the application could be the subject of GAC Advice on New gTLDs (see subsection 1.1.2.7) or of a formal objection (see subsection 1.1.2.6) at a later stage in the process.
A GAC Early Warning typically results from a notice to the GAC by one or more governments that an application might be problematic, e.g., potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities. A GAC Early Warning may be issued for any reason. The GAC may then send that notice to the Board – constituting the GAC Early Warning. ICANN will notify applicants of GAC Early Warnings as soon as practicable after receipt from the GAC. The GAC Early Warning notice may include a nominated point of contact for further information.

GAC consensus is not required for a GAC Early Warning to be issued. Minimally, the GAC Early Warning must be provided in writing to the ICANN Board, and be clearly labeled as a GAC Early Warning. This may take the form of an email from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board. For GAC Early Warnings to be most effective, they should include the reason for the warning and identify the objecting countries.

Upon receipt of a GAC Early Warning, the applicant may elect to withdraw the application for a partial refund (see subsection 1.5.1), or may elect to continue with the application (this may include meeting with representatives from the relevant government(s) to try to address the concern). To qualify for the refund described in subsection 1.5.1, the applicant must provide notification to ICANN of its election to withdraw the application within 21 calendar days of the date of GAC Early Warning delivery to the applicant.

To reduce the possibility of a GAC Early Warning, all applicants are encouraged to identify potential sensitivities in advance of application submission, and to work with the relevant parties (including governments) beforehand to mitigate concerns related to the application.

1.1.2.5 Initial Evaluation

Initial Evaluation will begin immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation. At the beginning of this period, background screening on the applying entity and the individuals named in the application will be conducted. Applications

---

1 While definitive guidance has not been issued, the GAC has indicated that strings that could raise sensitivities include those that "purport to represent or that embody a particular group of people or interests based on historical, cultural, or social components of identity, such as nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, belief, culture or particular social origin or group, political opinion, membership of a national minority, disability, age, and/or a language or linguistic group (non-exhaustive)" and "those strings that refer to particular sectors, such as those subject to national regulation (such as .bank, .pharmacy) or those that describe or are targeted to a population or industry that is vulnerable to online fraud or abuse."
must pass this step in conjunction with the Initial Evaluation reviews.

There are two main elements of the Initial Evaluation:

1. **String reviews** (concerning the applied-for gTLD string). String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS, including problems caused by similarity to existing TLDs or reserved names.

2. **Applicant reviews** (concerning the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services). Applicant reviews include a determination of whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capabilities to operate a registry.

By the conclusion of the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will post notice of all Initial Evaluation results. Depending on the volume of applications received, such notices may be posted in batches over the course of the Initial Evaluation period.

The Initial Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months. If the volume of applications received significantly exceeds 500, applications will be processed in batches and the 5-month timeline will not be met. The first batch will be limited to 500 applications and subsequent batches will be limited to 400 to account for capacity limitations due to managing extended evaluation, string contention, and other processes associated with each previous batch.

If batching is required, a secondary time-stamp process will be employed to establish the batches. (Batching priority will not be given to an application based on the time at which the application was submitted to ICANN, nor will batching priority be established based on a random selection method.)

The secondary time-stamp process will require applicants to obtain a time-stamp through a designated process which will occur after the close of the application submission period. The secondary time stamp process will occur, if required, according to the details to be published on ICANN’s website. (Upon the Board’s approval of a final designation of the operational details of the “secondary timestamp” batching process, the final plan will be added as a process within the Applicant Guidebook.)
If batching is required, the String Similarity review will be completed on all applications prior to the establishment of evaluation priority batches. For applications identified as part of a contention set, the entire contention set will be kept together in the same batch.

If batches are established, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

Note that the processing constraints will limit delegation rates to a steady state even in the event of an extremely high volume of applications. The annual delegation rate will not exceed 1,000 per year in any case, no matter how many applications are received.\(^2\)

### 1.1.2.6 Objection Filing

Formal objections to applications can be filed on any of four enumerated grounds, by parties with standing to object. The objection filing period will open after ICANN posts the list of complete applications as described in subsection 1.1.2.2, and will last for approximately 7 months.

Objectors must file such formal objections directly with dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs), not with ICANN. The objection filing period will close following the end of the Initial Evaluation period (refer to subsection 1.1.2.5), with a two-week window of time between the posting of the Initial Evaluation results and the close of the objection filing period. Objections that have been filed during the objection filing period will be addressed in the dispute resolution stage, which is outlined in subsection 1.1.2.9 and discussed in detail in Module 3.

All applicants should be aware that third parties have the opportunity to file objections to any application during the objection filing period. Applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection will have an opportunity to file a response according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules and procedures. An applicant wishing to file a formal objection to another application that has been submitted would do so within the objection filing period, following the objection filing procedures in Module 3.

Applicants are encouraged to identify possible regional, cultural, property interests, or other sensitivities regarding TLD strings and their uses before applying and where

---

possible, consult with interested parties to mitigate any concerns in advance.

1.1.2.7 Receipt of GAC Advice on New gTLDs

The GAC may provide public policy advice directly to the ICANN Board on any application. The procedure for GAC Advice on New gTLDs described in Module 3 indicates that, to be considered by the Board during the evaluation process, the GAC Advice on New gTLDs must be submitted by the close of the objection filing period. A GAC Early Warning is not a prerequisite to use of the GAC Advice process.

If the Board receives GAC Advice on New gTLDs stating that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed, this will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved. If the Board does not act in accordance with this type of advice, it must provide rationale for doing so.

See Module 3 for additional detail on the procedures concerning GAC Advice on New gTLDs.

1.1.2.8 Extended Evaluation

Extended Evaluation is available only to certain applicants that do not pass Initial Evaluation.

Applicants failing certain elements of the Initial Evaluation can request an Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not pass Initial Evaluation and does not expressly request an Extended Evaluation, the application will proceed no further. The Extended Evaluation period allows for an additional exchange of information between the applicant and evaluators to clarify information contained in the application. The reviews performed in Extended Evaluation do not introduce additional evaluation criteria.

An application may be required to enter an Extended Evaluation if one or more proposed registry services raise technical issues that might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. The Extended Evaluation period provides a time frame for these issues to be investigated. Applicants will be informed if such a review is required by the end of the Initial Evaluation period.

Evaluators and any applicable experts consulted will communicate the conclusions resulting from the additional review by the end of the Extended Evaluation period.
At the conclusion of the Extended Evaluation period, ICANN will post summary reports, by panel, from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.

If an application passes the Extended Evaluation, it can then proceed to the next relevant stage. If the application does not pass the Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further.

The Extended Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months, though this timeframe could be increased based on volume. In this event, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.9 Dispute Resolution

Dispute resolution applies only to applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection.

Where formal objections are filed and filing fees paid during the objection filing period, independent dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs) will initiate and conclude proceedings based on the objections received. The formal objection procedure exists to provide a path for those who wish to object to an application that has been submitted to ICANN. Dispute resolution service providers serve as the fora to adjudicate the proceedings based on the subject matter and the needed expertise. Consolidation of objections filed will occur where appropriate, at the discretion of the DRSP.

As a result of a dispute resolution proceeding, either the applicant will prevail (in which case the application can proceed to the next relevant stage), or the objector will prevail (in which case either the application will proceed no further or the application will be bound to a contention resolution procedure). In the event of multiple objections, an applicant must prevail in all dispute resolution proceedings concerning the application to proceed to the next relevant stage. Applicants will be notified by the DRSP(s) of the results of dispute resolution proceedings.

Dispute resolution proceedings, where applicable, are expected to be completed for all applications within approximately a 5-month time frame. In the event that volume is such that this timeframe cannot be accommodated, ICANN will work with the dispute resolution service providers to create processing procedures and post updated timeline information.
1.1.2.10 String Contention

String contention applies only when there is more than one qualified application for the same or similar gTLD strings.

String contention refers to the scenario in which there is more than one qualified application for the identical gTLD string or for similar gTLD strings. In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

Applicants are encouraged to resolve string contention cases among themselves prior to the string contention resolution stage. In the absence of resolution by the contending applicants, string contention cases are resolved either through a community priority evaluation (if a community-based applicant elects it) or through an auction.

In the event of contention between applied-for gTLD strings that represent geographic names, the parties may be required to follow a different process to resolve the contention. See subsection 2.2.1.4 of Module 2 for more information.

Groups of applied-for strings that are either identical or similar are called contention sets. All applicants should be aware that if an application is identified as being part of a contention set, string contention resolution procedures will not begin until all applications in the contention set have completed all aspects of evaluation, including dispute resolution, if applicable.

To illustrate, as shown in Figure 1-2, Applicants A, B, and C all apply for .EXAMPLE and are identified as a contention set. Applicants A and C pass Initial Evaluation, but Applicant B does not. Applicant B requests Extended Evaluation. A third party files an objection to Applicant C’s application, and Applicant C enters the dispute resolution process. Applicant A must wait to see whether Applicants B and C successfully complete the Extended Evaluation and dispute resolution phases, respectively, before it can proceed to the string contention resolution stage. In this example, Applicant B passes the Extended Evaluation, but Applicant C does not prevail in the dispute resolution proceeding. String contention resolution then proceeds between Applicants A and B.
Figure 1-2 – All applications in a contention set must complete all previous evaluation and dispute resolution stages before string contention resolution can begin.

Applicants prevailing in a string contention resolution procedure will proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLDs.

String contention resolution for a contention set is estimated to take from 2.5 to 6 months to complete. The time required will vary per case because some contention cases may be resolved in either a community priority evaluation or an auction, while others may require both processes.

1.1.2.11 Transition to Delegation

Applicants successfully completing all the relevant stages outlined in this subsection 1.1.2 are required to carry out a series of concluding steps before delegation of the applied-for gTLD into the root zone. These steps include execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and completion of a pre-delegation technical test to validate information provided in the application.

Following execution of a registry agreement, the prospective registry operator must complete technical set-up and show satisfactory performance on a set of technical tests before delegation of the gTLD into the root zone may be initiated. If the pre-delegation testing requirements are not satisfied so that the gTLD can be delegated into the root zone within the time frame specified in the registry agreement, ICANN may in its sole and absolute discretion elect to terminate the registry agreement.
Once all of these steps have been successfully completed, the applicant is eligible for delegation of its applied-for gTLD into the DNS root zone.

It is expected that the transition to delegation steps can be completed in approximately 2 months, though this could take more time depending on the applicant’s level of preparedness for the pre-delegation testing and the volume of applications undergoing these steps concurrently.

### 1.1.3 Lifecycle Timelines

Based on the estimates for each stage described in this section, the lifecycle for a straightforward application could be approximately 9 months, as follows:

```
2 Months
  Administrative Check

5 Months
  Initial Evaluation

2 Months
  Transition to Delegation
```

Figure 1-3 – A straightforward application could have an approximate 9-month lifecycle.

The lifecycle for a highly complex application could be much longer, such as 20 months in the example below:
1.1.4 Posting Periods

The results of application reviews will be made available to the public at various stages in the process, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Posting Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Public portions of all applications (posted within 2 weeks of the start of the Administrative Completeness Check).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Results of Administrative Completeness Check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Early Warning Period</td>
<td>GAC Early Warnings received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>Status updates for applications withdrawn or ineligible for further review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contention sets resulting from String Similarity review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Period | Posting Content
--- | ---
End of Initial Evaluation | Application status updates with all Initial Evaluation results.
GAC Advice on New gTLDs | GAC Advice received.
End of Extended Evaluation | Application status updates with all Extended Evaluation results.
 | Evaluation summary reports from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.
During Objection Filing/Dispute Resolution | Information on filed objections and status updates available via Dispute Resolution Service Provider websites.
 | Notice of all objections posted by ICANN after close of objection filing period.
During Contention Resolution (Community Priority Evaluation) | Results of each Community Priority Evaluation posted as completed.
During Contention Resolution (Auction) | Results from each auction posted as completed.
Transition to Delegation | Registry Agreements posted when executed.
 | Pre-delegation testing status updated.

#### 1.1.5 Sample Application Scenarios

The following scenarios briefly show a variety of ways in which an application may proceed through the evaluation process. The table that follows exemplifies various processes and outcomes. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of possibilities. There are other possible combinations of paths an application could follow.

Estimated time frames for each scenario are also included, based on current knowledge. Actual time frames may vary depending on several factors, including the total number...
of applications received by ICANN during the application submission period. It should be emphasized that most applications are expected to pass through the process in the shortest period of time, i.e., they will not go through extended evaluation, dispute resolution, or string contention resolution processes. Although most of the scenarios below are for processes extending beyond nine months, it is expected that most applications will complete the process within the nine-month timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Number</th>
<th>Initial Evaluation</th>
<th>Extended Evaluation</th>
<th>Objection(s) Filed</th>
<th>String Contention</th>
<th>Approved for Delegation Steps</th>
<th>Estimated Elapsed Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.5 – 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objector prevails</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5 – 20 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.5 – 18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 1 - Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention** – In the most straightforward case, the application passes Initial Evaluation and there is no need for an Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD. Most applications are expected to complete the process within this timeframe.

**Scenario 2 - Extended Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. As with Scenario 1, no objections are filed.
during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 3 – Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, Contention** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the application prevails in the contention resolution, so the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 4 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Win Objection, No Contention** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing (refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures). The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. The applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 5 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Lose Objection** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection period, multiple objections are filed by one or more objectors with standing for one or more of the four enumerated objection grounds. Each objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel. In this case, the panels find in favor of the applicant for most of the objections, but one finds in favor of the objector. As one of the objections has been upheld, the application does not proceed.

**Scenario 6 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Applicant Withdraws** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant decides to withdraw the application rather than continuing with Extended Evaluation. The application does not proceed.

**Scenario 7 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Fail Extended Evaluation** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant requests Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. However, the
Scenario 8 – Extended Evaluation, Win Objection, Pass Contention – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the applicant prevails over other applications in the contention resolution procedure, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement, and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

Scenario 9 – Extended Evaluation, Objection, Fail Contention – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, another applicant prevails in the contention resolution procedure, and the application does not proceed.

Transition to Delegation – After an application has successfully completed Initial Evaluation, and other stages as applicable, the applicant is required to complete a set of steps leading to delegation of the gTLD, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN, and completion of pre-delegation testing. Refer to Module 5 for a description of the steps required in this stage.

1.1.6 Subsequent Application Rounds

ICANN’s goal is to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible. The exact timing will be based on experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed. The goal is for the next application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round.
ICANN has committed to reviewing the effects of the New gTLD Program on the operations of the root zone system after the first application round, and will defer the delegations in a second application round until it is determined that the delegations resulting from the first round did not jeopardize root zone system security or stability.

It is the policy of ICANN that there be subsequent application rounds, and that a systemized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term.

1.2 Information for All Applicants

1.2.1 Eligibility

Established corporations, organizations, or institutions in good standing may apply for a new gTLD. Applications from individuals or sole proprietorships will not be considered. Applications from or on behalf of yet-to-be-formed legal entities, or applications presupposing the future formation of a legal entity (for example, a pending Joint Venture) will not be considered.

ICANN has designed the New gTLD Program with multiple stakeholder protection mechanisms. Background screening, features of the gTLD Registry Agreement, data and financial escrow mechanisms are all intended to provide registrant and user protections.

The application form requires applicants to provide information on the legal establishment of the applying entity, as well as the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity. The names and positions of individuals included in the application will be published as part of the application; other information collected about the individuals will not be published.

Background screening at both the entity level and the individual level will be conducted for all applications to confirm eligibility. This inquiry is conducted on the basis of the information provided in questions 1-11 of the application form. ICANN may take into account information received from any source if it is relevant to the criteria in this section. If requested by ICANN, all applicants will be required to obtain and deliver to ICANN and ICANN's background screening vendor any consents or agreements of the entities and/or individuals named in questions 1-11 of the application form necessary to conduct background screening activities.
ICANN will perform background screening in only two areas: (1) General business diligence and criminal history; and (2) History of cybersquatting behavior. The criteria used for criminal history are aligned with the “crimes of trust” standard sometimes used in the banking and finance industry.

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, applications from any entity with or including any individual with convictions or decisions of the types listed in (a) – (m) below will be automatically disqualified from the program.

a. within the past ten years, has been convicted of any crime related to financial or corporate governance activities, or has been judged by a court to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or has been the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN deems as the substantive equivalent of any of these;

b. within the past ten years, has been disciplined by any government or industry regulatory body for conduct involving dishonesty or misuse of the funds of others;

c. within the past ten years has been convicted of any willful tax-related fraud or willful evasion of tax liabilities;

d. within the past ten years has been convicted of perjury, forswearing, failing to cooperate with a law enforcement investigation, or making false statements to a law enforcement agency or representative;

e. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;

f. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;

g. has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the
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elderly, or individuals with disabilities;

h. has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;

i. has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);

j. has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes above (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) - (i) above);

k. has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents), within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) - (i) above);

l. is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time the application is considered;

m. has been involved in a pattern of adverse, final decisions indicating that the applicant


5 It is recognized that not all countries have signed on to the UN conventions referenced above. These conventions are being used solely for identification of a list of crimes for which background screening will be performed. It is not necessarily required that an applicant would have been convicted pursuant to the UN convention but merely convicted of a crime listed under these conventions, to trigger these criteria.
or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name hijacking under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or other equivalent legislation. Three or more such decisions with one occurring in the last four years will generally be considered to constitute a pattern.

n. fails to provide ICANN with the identifying information necessary to confirm identity at the time of application or to resolve questions of identity during the background screening process;

o. fails to provide a good faith effort to disclose all relevant information relating to items (a) – (m).

Background screening is in place to protect the public interest in the allocation of critical Internet resources, and ICANN reserves the right to deny an otherwise qualified application based on any information identified during the background screening process. For example, a final and legally binding decision obtained by a national law enforcement or consumer protection authority finding that the applicant was engaged in fraudulent and deceptive commercial practices as defined in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Protecting Consumers from Fraudulent and Deceptive Commercial Practices Across Borders may cause an application to be rejected. ICANN may also contact the applicant with additional questions based on information obtained in the background screening process.

All applicants are required to provide complete and detailed explanations regarding any of the above events as part of the application. Background screening information will not be made publicly available by ICANN.

**Registrar Cross-Ownership** -- ICANN-accredited registrars are eligible to apply for a gTLD. However, all gTLD registries

---

6 [http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3746,en_2649_34267_2515000_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3746,en_2649_34267_2515000_1_1_1_1,00.html)
are required to abide by a Code of Conduct addressing, inter alia, non-discriminatory access for all authorized registrars. ICANN reserves the right to refer any application to the appropriate competition authority relative to any cross-ownership issues.

Legal Compliance -- ICANN must comply with all U.S. laws, rules, and regulations. One such set of regulations is the economic and trade sanctions program administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. These sanctions have been imposed on certain countries, as well as individuals and entities that appear on OFAC's List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (the SDN List). ICANN is prohibited from providing most goods or services to residents of sanctioned countries or their governmental entities or to SDNs without an applicable U.S. government authorization or exemption. ICANN generally will not seek a license to provide goods or services to an individual or entity on the SDN List. In the past, when ICANN has been requested to provide services to individuals or entities that are not SDNs, but are residents of sanctioned countries, ICANN has sought and been granted licenses as required. In any given case, however, OFAC could decide not to issue a requested license.

1.2.2 Required Documents

All applicants should be prepared to submit the following documents, which are required to accompany each application:

1. **Proof of legal establishment** - Documentation of the applicant’s establishment as a specific type of entity in accordance with the applicable laws of its jurisdiction.

2. **Financial statements** - Applicants must provide audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant. In some cases, unaudited financial statements may be provided.

As indicated in the relevant questions, supporting documentation should be submitted in the original language. English translations are not required.

All documents must be valid at the time of submission. Refer to the Evaluation Criteria, attached to Module 2, for additional details on the requirements for these documents.
Some types of supporting documentation are required only in certain cases:

1. **Community endorsement** - If an applicant has designated its application as community-based (see section 1.2.3), it will be asked to submit a written endorsement of its application by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named. An applicant may submit written endorsements from multiple institutions. If applicable, this will be submitted in the section of the application concerning the community-based designation.

   At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement of support for the application, and supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement.

   Written endorsements from individuals need not be submitted with the application, but may be submitted in the application comment forum.

2. **Government support or non-objection** - If an applicant has applied for a gTLD string that is a geographic name (as defined in this Guidebook), the applicant is required to submit documentation of support for or non-objection to its application from the relevant governments or public authorities. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.4 for more information on the requirements for geographic names. If applicable, this will be submitted in the geographic names section of the application.

3. **Documentation of third-party funding commitments** - If an applicant lists funding from third parties in its application, it must provide evidence of commitment by the party committing the funds. If applicable, this will be submitted in the financial section of the application.

1.2.3 Community-Based Designation

All applicants are required to designate whether their application is **community-based**.

1.2.3.1 Definitions

For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, a **community-based gTLD** is a gTLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community. Designation or non-
designation of an application as community-based is entirely at the discretion of the applicant. Any applicant may designate its application as community-based; however, each applicant making this designation is asked to substantiate its status as representative of the community it names in the application by submission of written endorsements in support of the application. Additional information may be requested in the event of a community priority evaluation (refer to section 4.2 of Module 4). An applicant for a community-based gTLD is expected to:

1. Demonstrate an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community.
2. Have applied for a gTLD string strongly and specifically related to the community named in the application.
3. Have proposed dedicated registration and use policies for registrants in its proposed gTLD, including appropriate security verification procedures, commensurate with the community-based purpose it has named.
4. Have its application endorsed in writing by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named.

For purposes of differentiation, an application that has not been designated as community-based will be referred to hereinafter in this document as a standard application. A standard gTLD can be used for any purpose consistent with the requirements of the application and evaluation criteria, and with the registry agreement. A standard applicant may or may not have a formal relationship with an exclusive registrant or user population. It may or may not employ eligibility or use restrictions. Standard simply means here that the applicant has not designated the application as community-based.

1.2.3.2 Implications of Application Designation

Applicants should understand how their designation as community-based or standard will affect application processing at particular stages, and, if the application is successful, execution of the registry agreement and subsequent obligations as a gTLD registry operator, as described in the following paragraphs.

Objection / Dispute Resolution – All applicants should understand that a formal objection may be filed against any application on community grounds, even if the applicant has not designated itself as community-based or
declared the gTLD to be aimed at a particular community. Refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures.

**String Contention** – Resolution of string contention may include one or more components, depending on the composition of the contention set and the elections made by community-based applicants.

- **A settlement between the parties** can occur at any time after contention is identified. The parties will be encouraged to meet with an objective to settle the contention. Applicants in contention always have the opportunity to resolve the contention voluntarily, resulting in the withdrawal of one or more applications, before reaching the contention resolution stage.

- **A community priority evaluation** will take place only if a community-based applicant in a contention set elects this option. All community-based applicants in a contention set will be offered this option in the event that there is contention remaining after the applications have successfully completed all previous evaluation stages.

- **An auction** will result for cases of contention not resolved by community priority evaluation or agreement between the parties. Auction occurs as a contention resolution means of last resort. If a community priority evaluation occurs but does not produce a clear winner, an auction will take place to resolve the contention.

Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for detailed discussions of contention resolution procedures.

**Contract Execution and Post-Delegation** – A community-based applicant will be subject to certain post-delegation contractual obligations to operate the gTLD in a manner consistent with the restrictions associated with its community-based designation. Material changes to the contract, including changes to the community-based nature of the gTLD and any associated provisions, may only be made with ICANN’s approval. The determination of whether to approve changes requested by the applicant will be at ICANN’s discretion. Proposed criteria for approving such changes are the subject of policy discussions.

Community-based applications are intended to be a narrow category, for applications where there are
unambiguous associations among the applicant, the
community served, and the applied-for gTLD string.
Evaluation of an applicant’s designation as community-
based will occur only in the event of a contention situation
that results in a community priority evaluation. However,
any applicant designating its application as community-
based will, if the application is approved, be bound by the
registry agreement to implement the community-based
restrictions it has specified in the application. This is true
even if there are no contending applicants.

1.2.3.3 Changes to Application Designation
An applicant may not change its designation as standard
or community-based once it has submitted a gTLD
application for processing.

1.2.4 Notice concerning Technical Acceptance Issues
with New gTLDs
All applicants should be aware that approval of an
application and entry into a registry agreement with
ICANN do not guarantee that a new gTLD will immediately
function throughout the Internet. Past experience indicates
that network operators may not immediately fully support
new top-level domains, even when these domains have
been delegated in the DNS root zone, since third-party
software modification may be required and may not
happen immediately.

Similarly, software applications sometimes attempt to
validate domain names and may not recognize new or
unknown top-level domains. ICANN has no authority or
ability to require that software accept new top-level
domains, although it does prominently publicize which top-
level domains are valid and has developed a basic tool to
assist application providers in the use of current root-zone
data.

ICANN encourages applicants to familiarize themselves
with these issues and account for them in their startup and
launch plans. Successful applicants may find themselves
expend considerable efforts working with providers to
achieve acceptance of their new top-level domains.

Applicants should review
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/TLD-acceptance/ for
background. IDN applicants should also review the
material concerning experiences with IDN test strings in the
root zone (see http://idn.icann.org/).
1.2.5 Notice concerning TLD Delegations

ICANN is only able to create TLDs as delegations in the DNS root zone, expressed using NS records with any corresponding DS records and glue records. There is no policy enabling ICANN to place TLDs as other DNS record types (such as A, MX, or DNAME records) in the root zone.

1.2.6 Terms and Conditions

All applicants must agree to a standard set of Terms and Conditions for the application process. The Terms and Conditions are available in Module 6 of this guidebook.

1.2.7 Notice of Changes to Information

If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms. This includes applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.

ICANN reserves the right to require a re-evaluation of the application in the event of a material change. This could involve additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round.

Failure to notify ICANN of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.

1.2.8 Voluntary Designation for High Security Zones


The Final Report may be used to inform further work. ICANN will support independent efforts toward developing voluntary high-security TLD designations, which may be available to gTLD applicants wishing to pursue such designations.

1.2.9 Security and Stability

Root Zone Stability: There has been significant study, analysis, and consultation in preparation for launch of the
New gTLD Program, indicating that the addition of gTLDs to the root zone will not negatively impact the security or stability of the DNS.

It is estimated that 200-300 TLDs will be delegated annually, and determined that in no case will more than 1000 new gTLDs be added to the root zone in a year. The delegation rate analysis, consultations with the technical community, and anticipated normal operational upgrade cycles all lead to the conclusion that the new gTLD delegations will have no significant impact on the stability of the root system. Modeling and reporting will continue during, and after, the first application round so that root-scaling discussions can continue and the delegation rates can be managed as the program goes forward.

All applicants should be aware that delegation of any new gTLDs is conditional on the continued absence of significant negative impact on the security or stability of the DNS and the root zone system (including the process for delegating TLDs in the root zone). In the event that there is a reported impact in this regard and processing of applications is delayed, the applicants will be notified in an orderly and timely manner.

1.2.10 Resources for Applicant Assistance

A variety of support resources are available to gTLD applicants. Financial assistance will be available to a limited number of eligible applicants. To request financial assistance, applicants must submit a separate financial assistance application in addition to the gTLD application form.

To be eligible for consideration, all financial assistance applications must be received by 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012. Financial assistance applications will be evaluated and scored against pre-established criteria.

In addition, ICANN maintains a webpage as an informational resource for applicants seeking assistance, and organizations offering support.

See http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/candidate-support for details on these resources.

1.2.11 Updates to the Applicant Guidebook

As approved by the ICANN Board of Directors, this Guidebook forms the basis of the New gTLD Program. ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and
changes to the Applicant Guidebook at any time, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process. Any such updates or revisions will be posted on ICANN’s website.

1.3 Information for Internationalized Domain Name Applicants

Some applied-for gTLD strings are expected to be Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). IDNs are domain names including characters used in the local representation of languages not written with the basic Latin alphabet (a - z), European-Arabic digits (0 - 9), and the hyphen (-). As described below, IDNs require the insertion of A-labels into the DNS root zone.

1.3.1 IDN-Specific Requirements

An applicant for an IDN string must provide information indicating compliance with the IDNA protocol and other technical requirements. The IDNA protocol and its documentation can be found at [http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm](http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm).

Applicants must provide applied-for gTLD strings in the form of both a **U-label** (the IDN TLD in local characters) and an **A-label**.

An A-label is the ASCII form of an IDN label. Every IDN A-label begins with the IDNA ACE prefix, “xn--”, followed by a string that is a valid output of the Punycode algorithm, making a maximum of 63 total ASCII characters in length. The prefix and string together must conform to all requirements for a label that can be stored in the DNS including conformance to the LDH (host name) rule described in RFC 1034, RFC 1123, and elsewhere.

A U-label is the Unicode form of an IDN label, which a user expects to see displayed in applications.

For example, using the current IDN test string in Cyrillic script, the U-label is «испытание» and the A-label is «xn--80akhbyknj4f». An A-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from a U-label and a U-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from an A-label.

Applicants for IDN gTLDs will also be required to provide the following at the time of the application:
1. Meaning or restatement of string in English. The applicant will provide a short description of what the string would mean or represent in English.

2. Language of label (ISO 639-1). The applicant will specify the language of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of languages, and in English.

3. Script of label (ISO 15924). The applicant will specify the script of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of scripts, and in English.

4. Unicode code points. The applicant will list all the code points contained in the U-label according to its Unicode form.

5. Applicants must further demonstrate that they have made reasonable efforts to ensure that the encoded IDN string does not cause any rendering or operational problems. For example, problems have been identified in strings with characters of mixed right-to-left and left-to-right directionality when numerals are adjacent to the path separator (i.e., the dot). If an applicant is applying for a string with known issues, it should document steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in applications. While it is not possible to ensure that all rendering problems are avoided, it is important that as many as possible are identified early and that the potential registry operator is aware of these issues. Applicants can become familiar with these issues by understanding the IDNA protocol (see http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfc6122.htm), and by active participation in the IDN wiki (see http://idn.icann.org/) where some rendering problems are demonstrated.

6. [Optional] - Representation of label in phonetic alphabet. The applicant may choose to provide its applied-for gTLD string notated according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/). Note that this information will not be evaluated or scored. The information, if provided, will be used as a guide to ICANN in responding to inquiries or speaking of the application in public presentations.

---

7 See examples at http://stupid.domain.name/node/683
1.3.2 IDN Tables

An IDN table provides the list of characters eligible for registration in domain names according to the registry’s policy. It identifies any multiple characters that are considered equivalent for domain name registration purposes (“variant characters”). Variant characters occur where two or more characters can be used interchangeably.

Examples of IDN tables can be found in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) IDN Repository at http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string (the “top level tables”). IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second or lower levels.

Each applicant is responsible for developing its IDN Tables, including specification of any variant characters. Tables must comply with ICANN’s IDN Guidelines and any updates thereto, including:

- Complying with IDN technical standards.
- Employing an inclusion-based approach (i.e., code points not explicitly permitted by the registry are prohibited).
- Defining variant characters.
- Excluding code points not permissible under the guidelines, e.g., line-drawing symbols, pictographic dingbats, structural punctuation marks.
- Developing tables and registration policies in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to address common issues.
- Depositing IDN tables with the IANA Repository for IDN Practices (once the TLD is delegated).

An applicant’s IDN tables should help guard against user confusion in the deployment of IDN gTLDs. Applicants are strongly urged to consider specific linguistic and writing system issues that may cause problems when characters are used in domain names, as part of their work of defining variant characters.

---

8 See http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm
To avoid user confusion due to differing practices across TLD registries, it is recommended that applicants cooperate with TLD operators that offer domain name registration with the same or visually similar characters.

As an example, languages or scripts are often shared across geographic boundaries. In some cases, this can cause confusion among the users of the corresponding language or script communities. Visual confusion can also exist in some instances between different scripts (for example, Greek, Cyrillic and Latin).

Applicants will be asked to describe the process used in developing the IDN tables submitted. ICANN may compare an applicant’s IDN table with IDN tables for the same languages or scripts that already exist in the IANA repository or have been otherwise submitted to ICANN. If there are inconsistencies that have not been explained in the application, ICANN may ask the applicant to detail the rationale for differences. For applicants that wish to conduct and review such comparisons prior to submitting a table to ICANN, a table comparison tool will be available. ICANN will accept the applicant’s IDN tables based on the factors above.

Once the applied-for string has been delegated as a TLD in the root zone, the applicant is required to submit IDN tables for lodging in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices. For additional information, see existing tables at http://iana.org/domains/idn-tables/, and submission guidelines at http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

### 1.3.3 IDN Variant TLDs

A variant TLD string results from the substitution of one or more characters in the applied-for gTLD string with variant characters based on the applicant’s top level tables.

Each application contains one applied-for gTLD string. The applicant may also declare any variant strings for the TLD in its application. However, no variant gTLD strings will be delegated through the New gTLD Program until variant management solutions are developed and implemented.\(^9\) Declaring variant strings is informative only and will not imply any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

---

\(^9\) The ICANN Board directed that work be pursued on variant management in its resolution on 25 Sep 2010, [http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25sep10-en.htm#2.5](http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25sep10-en.htm#2.5).
When a variant delegation process is established, applicants may be required to submit additional information such as implementation details for the variant TLD management mechanism, and may need to participate in a subsequent evaluation process, which could contain additional fees and review steps.

The following scenarios are possible during the gTLD evaluation process:

a. Applicant declares variant strings to the applied-for gTLD string in its application. If the application is successful, the applied-for gTLD string will be delegated to the applicant. The declared variant strings are noted for future reference. These declared variant strings will not be delegated to the applicant along with the applied-for gTLD string, nor will the applicant have any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

Variant strings listed in successful gTLD applications will be tagged to the specific application and added to a “Declared Variants List” that will be available on ICANN’s website. A list of pending (i.e., declared) variant strings from the IDN ccTLD Fast Track is available at [http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/string-evaluation-completion-en.htm](http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/string-evaluation-completion-en.htm).

ICANN may perform independent analysis on the declared variant strings, and will not necessarily include all strings listed by the applicant on the Declared Variants List.

b. Multiple applicants apply for strings that are identified by ICANN as variants of one another. These applications will be placed in a contention set and will follow the contention resolution procedures in Module 4.

c. Applicant submits an application for a gTLD string and does not indicate variants to the applied-for gTLD string. ICANN will not identify variant strings unless scenario (b) above occurs.

Each variant string declared in the application must also conform to the string requirements in section 2.2.1.3.2.

Variant strings declared in the application will be reviewed for consistency with the top-level tables submitted in the application. Should any declared variant strings not be
based on use of variant characters according to the submitted top-level tables, the applicant will be notified and the declared string will no longer be considered part of the application.

Declaration of variant strings in an application does not provide the applicant any right or reservation to a particular string. Variant strings on the Declared Variants List may be subject to subsequent additional review per a process and criteria to be defined.

It should be noted that while variants for second and lower-level registrations are defined freely by the local communities without any ICANN validation, there may be specific rules and validation criteria specified for variant strings to be allowed at the top level. It is expected that the variant information provided by applicants in the first application round will contribute to a better understanding of the issues and assist in determining appropriate review steps and fee levels going forward.

### 1.4 Submitting an Application

Applicants may complete the application form and submit supporting documents using ICANN’s TLD Application System (TAS). To access the system, each applicant must first register as a TAS user.

As TAS users, applicants will be able to provide responses in open text boxes and submit required supporting documents as attachments. Restrictions on the size of attachments as well as the file formats are included in the instructions on the TAS site.

Except where expressly provided within the question, all application materials must be submitted in English.

ICANN will not accept application forms or supporting materials submitted through other means than TAS (that is, hard copy, fax, email), unless such submission is in accordance with specific instructions from ICANN to applicants.

#### 1.4.1 Accessing the TLD Application System

The TAS site will be accessible from the New gTLD webpage (http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtd-program.htm), and will be highlighted in communications regarding the opening of the application submission period. Users of TAS will be expected to agree to a standard set of terms of use.
including user rights, obligations, and restrictions in relation to the use of the system.

1.4.1.1 User Registration

TAS user registration (creating a TAS user profile) requires submission of preliminary information, which will be used to validate the identity of the parties involved in the application. An overview of the information collected in the user registration process is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full legal name of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal business address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fax number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Website or URL, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secondary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proof of legal establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Trading, subsidiary, or joint venture information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applicant background: previous convictions, cybersquatting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deposit payment confirmation and payer information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subset of identifying information will be collected from the entity performing the user registration, in addition to the applicant information listed above. The registered user could be, for example, an agent, representative, or
employee who would be completing the application on behalf of the applicant.

The registration process will require the user to request the desired number of application slots. For example, a user intending to submit five gTLD applications would complete five application slot requests, and the system would assign the user a unique ID number for each of the five applications.

Users will also be required to submit a deposit of USD 5,000 per application slot. This deposit amount will be credited against the evaluation fee for each application. The deposit requirement is in place to help reduce the risk of frivolous access to the online application system.

After completing the registration, TAS users will receive access enabling them to enter the rest of the application information into the system. Application slots will be populated with the registration information provided by the applicant, which may not ordinarily be changed once slots have been assigned.

No new user registrations will be accepted after 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012.

ICANN will take commercially reasonable steps to protect all applicant data submitted from unauthorized access, but cannot warrant against the malicious acts of third parties who may, through system corruption or other means, gain unauthorized access to such data.

1.4.1.2 Application Form

Having obtained the requested application slots, the applicant will complete the remaining application questions. An overview of the areas and questions contained in the form is shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Application and String Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Payment confirmation for remaining evaluation fee amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Applied-for gTLD string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IDN string information, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IDN tables, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mitigation of IDN operational or rendering problems, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Representation of string in International Phonetic Alphabet (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission/purpose of the TLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>If community based, describe elements of community and proposed policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Is the application for a geographic name? If geographic, documents of support required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Measures for protection of geographic names at second level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Registry Services: name and full description of all registry services to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical and Operational Questions (External)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shared registration system (SRS) performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Registration life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Abuse prevention &amp; mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rights protection mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(a)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical and Operational Questions (Internal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(b)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical overview of proposed registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Database capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Geographic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DNS service compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>IPv6 reachability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Data backup policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Escrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Registry continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Registry transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Failover testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Monitoring and fault escalation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DNSSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>IDNs (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Financial Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Projections template: costs and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Costs: setup and operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Funding and revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Contingency planning: barriers, funds, volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Continuity: continued operations instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2 Customer Service during the Application Process

Assistance will be available to applicants throughout the application process via the Applicant Service Center (ASC). The ASC will be staffed with customer service agents...
to answer questions relating to the New gTLD Program, the
application process, and TAS.

1.4.3 Backup Application Process

If the online application system is not available, ICANN will
provide alternative instructions for submitting applications.

1.5 Fees and Payments

This section describes the fees to be paid by the applicant.
Payment instructions are also included here.

1.5.1 gTLD Evaluation Fee

The gTLD evaluation fee is required from all applicants. This
fee is in the amount of USD 185,000. The evaluation fee is
payable in the form of a 5,000 deposit submitted at the
time the user requests an application slot within TAS, and a
payment of the remaining 180,000 submitted with the full
application. ICANN will not begin its evaluation of an
application unless it has received the full gTLD evaluation
fee by 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012.

The gTLD evaluation fee is set to recover costs associated
with the new gTLD program. The fee is set to ensure that
the program is fully funded and revenue neutral and is not
subsidized by existing contributions from ICANN funding
sources, including generic TLD registries and registrars,
cctLD contributions and RIR contributions.

The gTLD evaluation fee covers all required reviews in Initial
Evaluation and, in most cases, any required reviews in
Extended Evaluation. If an extended Registry Services
review takes place, an additional fee will be incurred for
this review (see section 1.5.2). There is no additional fee to
the applicant for Extended Evaluation for geographic
names, technical and operational, or financial reviews.

Refunds -- In certain cases, refunds of a portion of the
evaluation fee may be available for applications that are
withdrawn before the evaluation process is complete. An
applicant may request a refund at any time until it has
executed a registry agreement with ICANN. The amount of
the refund will depend on the point in the process at which
the withdrawal is requested, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refund Available to Applicant</th>
<th>Percentage of Evaluation Fee</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 21 calendar days of a GAC Early</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>USD 148,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refund Available to Applicant | Percentage of Evaluation Fee | Amount of Refund
--- | --- | ---
Warning | 70% | USD 130,000
After posting of applications until posting of Initial Evaluation results | 35% | USD 65,000
After the applicant has completed Dispute Resolution, Extended Evaluation, or String Contention Resolution(s) | 20% | USD 37,000
After the applicant has entered into a registry agreement with ICANN | None | 

Thus, any applicant that has not been successful is eligible for at least a 20% refund of the evaluation fee if it withdraws its application.

An applicant that wishes to withdraw an application must initiate the process through TAS. Withdrawal of an application is final and irrevocable. Refunds will only be issued to the organization that submitted the original payment. All refunds are paid by wire transfer. Any bank transfer or transaction fees incurred by ICANN, or any unpaid evaluation fees, will be deducted from the amount paid. Any refund paid will be in full satisfaction of ICANN’s obligations to the applicant. The applicant will have no entitlement to any additional amounts, including for interest or currency exchange rate changes.

**Note on 2000 proof-of-concept round applicants:**
Participants in ICANN’s proof-of-concept application process in 2000 may be eligible for a credit toward the evaluation fee. The credit is in the amount of USD 86,000 and is subject to:
• submission of documentary proof by the applicant that it is the same entity, a successor in interest to the same entity, or an affiliate of the same entity that applied previously;

• a confirmation that the applicant was not awarded any TLD string pursuant to the 2000 proof-of-concept application round and that the applicant has no legal claims arising from the 2000 proof-of-concept process; and

• submission of an application, which may be modified from the application originally submitted in 2000, for the same TLD string that such entity applied for in the 2000 proof-of-concept application round.

Each participant in the 2000 proof-of-concept application process is eligible for at most one credit. A maximum of one credit may be claimed for any new gTLD application submitted according to the process in this guidebook. Eligibility for this credit is determined by ICANN.

### 1.5.2 Fees Required in Some Cases

Applicants may be required to pay additional fees in certain cases where specialized process steps are applicable. Those possible additional fees\(^\text{10}\) include:

- **Registry Services Review Fee** - If applicable, this fee is payable for additional costs incurred in referring an application to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. The fee for a three-member RSTEP review team is anticipated to be USD 50,000. In some cases, five-member panels might be required, or there might be increased scrutiny at a greater cost. The amount of the fee will cover the cost of the RSTEP review. In the event that reviews of proposed registry services can be consolidated across multiple applications or applicants, ICANN will apportion the fees in an equitable manner. In every case, the applicant will be advised of the cost before initiation of the review. Refer to subsection 2.2.3 of Module 2 on Registry Services review.

---

\(^{10}\) The estimated fee amounts provided in this section 1.5.2 will be updated upon engagement of panel service providers and establishment of fees.
• **Dispute Resolution Filing Fee** - This amount must accompany any filing of a formal objection and any response that an applicant files to an objection. This fee is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with the provider's payment instructions. ICANN estimates that filing fees could range from approximately USD 1,000 to USD 5,000 (or more) per party per proceeding. Refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amount. Refer to Module 3 for dispute resolution procedures.

• **Advance Payment of Costs** - In the event of a formal objection, this amount is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with that provider's procedures and schedule of costs. Ordinarily, both parties in the dispute resolution proceeding will be required to submit an advance payment of costs in an estimated amount to cover the entire cost of the proceeding. This may be either an hourly fee based on the estimated number of hours the panelists will spend on the case (including review of submissions, facilitation of a hearing, if allowed, and preparation of a decision), or a fixed amount. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the advance payment will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider's rules.

The prevailing party in a dispute resolution proceeding will have its advance payment refunded, while the non-prevailing party will not receive a refund and thus will bear the cost of the proceeding. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the refund of fees will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules.

ICANN estimates that adjudication fees for a proceeding involving a fixed amount could range from USD 2,000 to USD 8,000 (or more) per proceeding. ICANN further estimates that an hourly rate based proceeding with a one-member panel could range from USD 32,000 to USD 56,000 (or more) and with a three-member panel it could range from USD 70,000 to USD 122,000 (or more). These estimates may be lower if the panel does not call for written submissions beyond the objection and response, and does not allow a hearing. Please
refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amounts or fee structures.

- **Community Priority Evaluation Fee** – In the event that the applicant participates in a community priority evaluation, this fee is payable as a deposit in an amount to cover the cost of the panel’s review of that application (currently estimated at USD 10,000). The deposit is payable to the provider appointed to handle community priority evaluations. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. Refer to Section 4.2 of Module 4 for circumstances in which a community priority evaluation may take place. An applicant who scores at or above the threshold for the community priority evaluation will have its deposit refunded.

ICANN will notify the applicants of due dates for payment in respect of additional fees (if applicable). This list does not include fees (annual registry fees) that will be payable to ICANN following execution of a registry agreement.

### 1.5.3 Payment Methods

Payments to ICANN should be submitted by wire transfer. Instructions for making a payment by wire transfer will be available in TAS.\(^{11}\)

Payments to Dispute Resolution Service Providers should be submitted in accordance with the provider’s instructions.

### 1.5.4 Requesting a Remittance Form

The TAS interface allows applicants to request issuance of a remittance form for any of the fees payable to ICANN. This service is for the convenience of applicants that require an invoice to process payments.

### 1.6 Questions about this Applicant Guidebook

For assistance and questions an applicant may have in the process of completing the application form, applicants should use the customer support resources available via the ASC. Applicants who are unsure of the information being sought in a question or the parameters for acceptable documentation are encouraged to communicate these questions through the appropriate...

---

\(^{11}\) Wire transfer is the preferred method of payment as it offers a globally accessible and dependable means for international transfer of funds. This enables ICANN to receive the fee and begin processing applications as quickly as possible.
support channels before the application is submitted. This helps avoid the need for exchanges with evaluators to clarify information, which extends the timeframe associated with processing the application.

Currently, questions may be submitted via <newgtld@icann.org>. To provide all applicants equitable access to information, ICANN will make all questions and answers publicly available.

All requests to ICANN for information about the process or issues surrounding preparation of an application must be submitted to the ASC. ICANN will not grant requests from applicants for personal or telephone consultations regarding the preparation of an application. Applicants that contact ICANN for clarification about aspects of the application will be referred to the ASC.

Answers to inquiries will only provide clarification about the application forms and procedures. ICANN will not provide consulting, financial, or legal advice.
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Module 2
Evaluation Procedures

This module describes the evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation. All applicants will undergo an Initial Evaluation and those that do not pass all elements may request Extended Evaluation.

The first, required evaluation is the Initial Evaluation, during which ICANN assesses an applied-for gTLD string, an applicant's qualifications, and its proposed registry services.

The following assessments are performed in the Initial Evaluation:

- String Reviews
  - String similarity
  - Reserved names
  - DNS stability
  - Geographic names
- Applicant Reviews
  - Demonstration of technical and operational capability
  - Demonstration of financial capability
  - Registry services reviews for DNS stability issues

An application must pass all these reviews to pass the Initial Evaluation. Failure to pass any one of these reviews will result in a failure to pass the Initial Evaluation.

Extended Evaluation may be applicable in cases in which an applicant does not pass the Initial Evaluation. See Section 2.3 below.

2.1 Background Screening

Background screening will be conducted in two areas:
(a) General business diligence and criminal history; and
(b) History of cybersquatting behavior.
The application must pass both background screening areas to be eligible to proceed. Background screening results are evaluated according to the criteria described in section 1.2.1. Due to the potential sensitive nature of the material, applicant background screening reports will not be published.

The following sections describe the process ICANN will use to perform background screening.

### 2.1.1 General business diligence and criminal history

Applying entities that are publicly traded corporations listed and in good standing on any of the world’s largest 25 stock exchanges (as listed by the World Federation of Exchanges) will be deemed to have passed the general business diligence and criminal history screening. The largest 25 will be based on the domestic market capitalization reported at the end of the most recent calendar year prior to launching each round.¹

Before an entity is listed on an exchange, it must undergo significant due diligence including an investigation by the exchange, regulators, and investment banks. As a publicly listed corporation, an entity is subject to ongoing scrutiny from shareholders, analysts, regulators, and exchanges. All exchanges require monitoring and disclosure of material information about directors, officers, and other key personnel, including criminal behavior. In totality, these requirements meet or exceed the screening ICANN will perform.

For applicants not listed on one of these exchanges, ICANN will submit identifying information for the entity, officers, directors, and major shareholders to an international background screening service. The service provider(s) will use the criteria listed in section 1.2.1 and return results that match these criteria. Only publicly available information will be used in this inquiry.

ICANN is in discussions with INTERPOL to identify ways in which both organizations can collaborate in background screenings of individuals, entities and their identity documents consistent with both organizations’ rules and regulations. Note that the applicant is expected to disclose potential problems in meeting the criteria in the application, and provide any clarification or explanation at the time of application submission. Results returned from

the background screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those cases will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

### 2.1.2 History of cybersquatting

ICANN will screen applicants against UDRP cases and legal databases as financially feasible for data that may indicate a pattern of cybersquatting behavior pursuant to the criteria listed in section 1.2.1.

The applicant is required to make specific declarations regarding these activities in the application. Results returned during the screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those instances will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

### 2.2 Initial Evaluation

The Initial Evaluation consists of two types of review. Each type is composed of several elements.

**String review:** The first review focuses on the applied-for gTLD string to test:

- Whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion;
- Whether the applied-for gTLD string might adversely affect DNS security or stability; and
- Whether evidence of requisite government approval is provided in the case of certain geographic names.

**Applicant review:** The second review focuses on the applicant to test:

- Whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capability to operate a registry; and
- Whether the registry services offered by the applicant might adversely affect DNS security or stability.
2.2.1 String Reviews

In the Initial Evaluation, ICANN reviews every applied-for gTLD string. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

This review involves a preliminary comparison of each applied-for gTLD string against existing TLDs, Reserved Names (see subsection 2.2.1.2), and other applied-for strings. The objective of this review is to prevent user confusion and loss of confidence in the DNS resulting from delegation of many similar strings.

Note: In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

The visual similarity check that occurs during Initial Evaluation is intended to augment the objection and dispute resolution process (see Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures) that addresses all types of similarity.

This similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel.

2.2.1.1.1 Reviews Performed

The String Similarity Panel’s task is to identify visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.

The panel performs this task of assessing similarities that would lead to user confusion in four sets of circumstances, when comparing:

- Applied-for gTLD strings against existing TLDs and reserved names;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against other applied-for gTLD strings;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against strings requested as IDN ccTLDs; and
- Applied-for 2-character IDN gTLD strings against:
  - Every other single character;
  - Any other 2-character ASCII string (to protect possible future ccTLD delegations).
Similarity to Existing TLDs or Reserved Names - This review involves cross-checking between each applied-for string and the lists of existing TLD strings and Reserved Names to determine whether two strings are so similar to one another that they create a probability of user confusion.

In the simple case in which an applied-for gTLD string is identical to an existing TLD or reserved name, the online application system will not allow the application to be submitted.

Testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. For example, protocols treat equivalent labels as alternative forms of the same label, just as “foo” and “Foo” are treated as alternative forms of the same label (RFC 3490).

All TLDs currently in the root zone can be found at http://iana.org/domains/root/db/.

IDN tables that have been submitted to ICANN are available at http://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables/.

Similarity to Other Applied-for gTLD Strings (String Contention Sets) - All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed against one another to identify any similar strings. In performing this review, the String Similarity Panel will create contention sets that may be used in later stages of evaluation.

A contention set contains at least two applied-for strings identical or similar to one another. Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for more information on contention sets and contention resolution.

ICANN will notify applicants who are part of a contention set as soon as the String Similarity review is completed. (This provides a longer period for contending applicants to reach their own resolution before reaching the contention resolution stage.) These contention sets will also be published on ICANN’s website.

Similarity to TLD strings requested as IDN ccTLDs -- Applied-for gTLD strings will also be reviewed for similarity to TLD strings requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process (see http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/). Should a conflict with a prospective fast-track IDN ccTLD be identified, ICANN will take the following approach to resolving the conflict.
If one of the applications has completed its respective process before the other is lodged, that TLD will be delegated. A gTLD application that has successfully completed all relevant evaluation stages, including dispute resolution and string contention, if applicable, and is eligible for entry into a registry agreement will be considered complete, and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed IDN ccTLD request. Similarly, an IDN ccTLD request that has completed evaluation (i.e., is validated) will be considered complete and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed gTLD application.

In the case where neither application has completed its respective process, where the gTLD application does not have the required approval from the relevant government or public authority, a validated request for an IDN ccTLD will prevail and the gTLD application will not be approved. The term “validated” is defined in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process Implementation, which can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn.

In the case where a gTLD applicant has obtained the support or non-objection of the relevant government or public authority, but is eliminated due to contention with a string requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process, a full refund of the evaluation fee is available to the applicant if the gTLD application was submitted prior to the publication of the ccTLD request.

**Review of 2-character IDN strings** — In addition to the above reviews, an applied-for gTLD string that is a 2-character IDN string is reviewed by the String Similarity Panel for visual similarity to:

a) Any one-character label (in any script), and

b) Any possible two-character ASCII combination.

An applied-for gTLD string that is found to be too similar to a) or b) above will not pass this review.

**2.2.1.1.2 Review Methodology**

The String Similarity Panel is informed in part by an algorithmic score for the visual similarity between each applied-for string and each of other existing and applied-for TLDs and reserved names. The score will provide one objective measure for consideration by the panel, as part of the process of identifying strings likely to result in user confusion. In general, applicants should expect that a higher visual similarity score suggests a higher probability
that the application will not pass the String Similarity review. However, it should be noted that the score is only indicative and that the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the Panel’s judgment.

The algorithm, user guidelines, and additional background information are available to applicants for testing and informational purposes. Applicants will have the ability to test their strings and obtain algorithmic results through the application system prior to submission of an application.

The algorithm supports the common characters in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek, Japanese, Korean, and Latin scripts. It can also compare strings in different scripts to each other.

The panel will also take into account variant characters, as defined in any relevant language table, in its determinations. For example, strings that are not visually similar but are determined to be variant TLD strings based on an IDN table would be placed in a contention set. Variant TLD strings that are listed as part of the application will also be subject to the string similarity analysis.

The panel will examine all the algorithm data and perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion. In cases of strings in scripts not yet supported by the algorithm, the panel’s assessment process is entirely manual.

The panel will use a common standard to test for whether string confusion exists, as follows:

**Standard for String Confusion** - String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For the likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

An application that fails the String Similarity review due to similarity to an existing TLD will not pass the Initial Evaluation,

---


3 In the case where an applicant has listed Declared Variants in its application (see subsection 1.3.3), the panel will perform an analysis of the listed strings to confirm that the strings are variants according to the applicant’s IDN table. This analysis may include comparison of applicant IDN tables with other existing tables for the same language or script, and forwarding any questions to the applicant.
and no further reviews will be available. Where an application does not pass the String Similarity review, the applicant will be notified as soon as the review is completed.

An application for a string that is found too similar to another applied-for gTLD string will be placed in a contention set.

An application that passes the String Similarity review is still subject to objection by an existing TLD operator or by another gTLD applicant in the current application round. That process requires that a string confusion objection be filed by an objector having the standing to make such an objection. Such category of objection is not limited to visual similarity. Rather, confusion based on any type of similarity (including visual, aural, or similarity of meaning) may be claimed by an objector. Refer to Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures, for more information about the objection process.

An applicant may file a formal objection against another gTLD application on string confusion grounds. Such an objection may, if successful, change the configuration of the preliminary contention sets in that the two applied-for gTLD strings will be considered in direct contention with one another (see Module 4, String Contention Procedures). The objection process will not result in removal of an application from a contention set.

### 2.2.1.2 Reserved Names and Other Unavailable Strings

Certain names are not available as gTLD strings, as detailed in this section.

#### 2.2.1.2.1 Reserved Names

All applied-for gTLD strings are compared with the list of top-level Reserved Names to ensure that the applied-for gTLD string does not appear on that list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-Level Reserved Names List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRINIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an applicant enters a Reserved Name as its applied-for gTLD string, the application system will recognize the Reserved Name and will not allow the application to be submitted.

In addition, applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed during the String Similarity review to determine whether they are similar to a Reserved Name. An application for a gTLD string that is identified as too similar to a Reserved Name will not pass this review.

### 2.2.1.2.2 Declared Variants

Names appearing on the Declared Variants List (see section 1.3.3) will be posted on ICANN’s website and will be treated essentially the same as Reserved Names, until such time as variant management solutions are developed and variant TLDs are delegated. That is, an application for a gTLD string that is identical or similar to a string on the Declared Variants List will not pass this review.

### 2.2.1.2.3 Strings Ineligible for Delegation

The following names are prohibited from delegation as gTLDs in the initial application round. Future application rounds may differ according to consideration of further policy advice.

These names are not being placed on the Top-Level Reserved Names List, and thus are not part of the string similarity review conducted for names on that list. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.1: where applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed for similarity to existing TLDs and reserved names, the strings listed in this section are not reserved names and accordingly are not incorporated into this review.

Applications for names appearing on the list included in this section will not be approved.
### 2.2.1.3 DNS Stability Review

This review determines whether an applied-for gTLD string might cause instability to the DNS. In all cases, this will involve a review for conformance with technical and other requirements for gTLD strings (labels). In some exceptional cases, an extended review may be necessary to investigate possible technical stability problems with the applied-for gTLD string.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Olympic Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLYMPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLYMPIADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIMPIADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>奥林匹克</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>奥林匹亞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>올림픽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>奥林匹亚</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REDCROSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDLIONANDSUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROIXROUGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROISSANT-ROUGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>インドヨドロデ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTALROJO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Красный Кристалл</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قرينة تمردء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>红新月</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: All applicants should recognize issues surrounding invalid TLD queries at the root level of the DNS.

Any new TLD registry operator may experience unanticipated queries, and some TLDs may experience a non-trivial load of unanticipated queries. For more information, see the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)'s report on this topic at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac045.pdf. Some publicly available statistics are also available at http://stats.l.root-servers.org/.

ICANN will take steps to alert applicants of the issues raised in SAC045, and encourage the applicant to prepare to minimize the possibility of operational difficulties that would pose a stability or availability problem for its registrants and users. However, this notice is merely an advisory to applicants and is not part of the evaluation, unless the string raises significant security or stability issues as described in the following section.

2.2.1.3.1 DNS Stability: String Review Procedure

New gTLD labels must not adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. During the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will conduct a preliminary review on the set of applied-for gTLD strings to:

- ensure that applied-for gTLD strings comply with the requirements provided in section 2.2.1.3.2, and
- determine whether any strings raise significant security or stability issues that may require further review.

There is a very low probability that extended analysis will be necessary for a string that fully complies with the string requirements in subsection 2.2.1.3.2 of this module. However, the string review process provides an additional safeguard if unanticipated security or stability issues arise concerning an applied-for gTLD string.

In such a case, the DNS Stability Panel will perform an extended review of the applied-for gTLD string during the Initial Evaluation period. The panel will determine whether the string fails to comply with relevant standards or creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, and will report on its findings.

If the panel determines that the string complies with relevant standards and does not create the conditions
2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements

ICANN will review each applied-for gTLD string to ensure that it complies with the requirements outlined in the following paragraphs.

If an applied-for gTLD string is found to violate any of these rules, the application will not pass the DNS Stability review. No further reviews are available.

Part I -- Technical Requirements for all Labels (Strings) - The technical requirements for top-level domain labels follow.

1.1 The ASCII label (i.e., the label as transmitted on the wire) must be valid as specified in technical standards Domain Names: Implementation and Specification (RFC 1035), and Clarifications to the DNS Specification (RFC 2181) and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

   1.1.1 The label must have no more than 63 characters.

   1.1.2 Upper and lower case characters are treated as identical.

1.2 The ASCII label must be a valid host name, as specified in the technical standards DOD Internet Host Table Specification (RFC 952), Requirements for Internet Hosts — Application and Support (RFC 1123), and Application Techniques for Checking and Transformation of Names (RFC 3696), Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA) (RFCs 5890-5894), and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

   1.2.1 The ASCII label must consist entirely of letters (alphabetic characters a-z), or
1.2.2 The label must be a valid IDNA A-label (further restricted as described in Part II below).

**Part II -- Requirements for Internationalized Domain Names**

- These requirements apply only to prospective top-level domains that contain non-ASCII characters. Applicants for these internationalized top-level domain labels are expected to be familiar with the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) IDNA standards, Unicode standards, and the terminology associated with Internationalized Domain Names.

2.1 The label must be an A-label as defined in IDNA, converted from (and convertible to) a U-label that is consistent with the definition in IDNA, and further restricted by the following, non-exhaustive, list of limitations:

2.1.1 Must be a valid A-label according to IDNA.

2.1.2 The derived property value of all codepoints used in the U-label, as defined by IDNA, must be PVALID or CONTEXT (accompanied by unambiguous contextual rules).\(^4\)

2.1.3 The general category of all codepoints, as defined by IDNA, must be one of (Ll, Lo, Lm, Mn, Mc).

2.1.4 The U-label must be fully compliant with Normalization Form C, as described in Unicode Standard Annex #15: Unicode Normalization Forms. See also examples in [http://unicode.org/faq/normalization.html](http://unicode.org/faq/normalization.html).

2.1.5 The U-label must consist entirely of characters with the same directional property, or fulfill the requirements of the Bidi rule per RFC 5893.

2.2 The label must meet the relevant criteria of the ICANN Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalised Domain Names. See [http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation](http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation).

---

\(^4\) It is expected that conversion tools for IDNA will be available before the Application Submission period begins, and that labels will be checked for validity under IDNA. In this case, labels valid under the previous version of the protocol (IDNA2003) but not under IDNA will not meet this element of the requirements. Labels that are valid under both versions of the protocol will meet this element of the requirements. Labels valid under IDNA but not under IDNA2003 may meet the requirements; however, applicants are strongly advised to note that the duration of the transition period between the two protocols cannot presently be estimated nor guaranteed in any specific timeframe. The development of support for IDNA in the broader software applications environment will occur gradually. During that time, TLD labels that are valid under IDNA, but not under IDNA2003, will have limited functionality.
2.2.1 All code points in a single label must be taken from the same script as determined by the Unicode Standard Annex #24: Unicode Script Property (See http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr24/).

2.2.2 Exceptions to 2.2.1 are permissible for languages with established orthographies and conventions that require the commingled use of multiple scripts. However, even with this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed to co-exist in a single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding policy and character table are clearly defined.

Part III - Policy Requirements for Generic Top-Level Domains – These requirements apply to all prospective top-level domain strings applied for as gTLDs.

3.1 Applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two-character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard.

3.2 Applied-for gTLD strings in IDN scripts must be composed of two or more visually distinct characters in the script, as appropriate. Note, however, that a two-character IDN string will not be approved if:

3.2.1 It is visually similar to any one-character label (in any script); or

3.2.2 It is visually similar to any possible two-character ASCII combination.

See the String Similarity review in subsection 2.2.1.1 for additional information on this requirement.

Note that the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG) has made recommendations that this section be revised to allow for single-character IDN gTLD labels. See the JIG Final Report at http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/jig-final-report-30mar11-en.pdf. Implementation models for these recommendations are being developed for community discussion.
2.2.1.4 Geographic Names Review

Applications for gTLD strings must ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the interests of governments or public authorities in geographic names. The requirements and procedure ICANN will follow in the evaluation process are described in the following paragraphs. Applicants should review these requirements even if they do not believe their intended gTLD string is a geographic name. All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed according to the requirements in this section, regardless of whether the application indicates it is for a geographic name.

2.2.1.4.1 Treatment of Country or Territory Names

Applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved, as they are not available under the New gTLD Program in this application round. A string shall be considered to be a country or territory name if:

i. it is an alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

ii. it is a long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the long-form name in any language.

iii. it is a short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the short-form name in any language.

iv. it is the short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as “exceptionally reserved” by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency.

v. it is a separable component of a country name designated on the “Separable Country Names List,” or is a translation of a name appearing on the list, in any language. See the Annex at the end of this module.

vi. it is a permutation or transposition of any of the names included in items (i) through (v). Permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and addition or...
removal of grammatical articles like “the.” A transposition is considered a change in the sequence of the long or short–form name, for example, “RepublicCzech” or “IslandsCayman.”

vii. it is a name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.

2.2.1.4.2 Geographic Names Requiring Government Support

The following types of applied-for strings are considered geographic names and must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities:

1. An application for any string that is a representation, in any language, of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

2. An application for a city name, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name.

City names present challenges because city names may also be generic terms or brand names, and in many cases city names are not unique. Unlike other types of geographic names, there are no established lists that can be used as objective references in the evaluation process. Thus, city names are not universally protected. However, the process does provide a means for cities and applicants to work together where desired.

An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements (i.e., will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities) if:

(a) It is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name; and
(b) The applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents.\(^7\)

3. An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard.

4. An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region\(^8\) or appearing on the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” list.\(^9\)

In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region.

Where the 60% rule is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” takes precedence.

An applied-for gTLD string that falls into any of 1 through 4 listed above is considered to represent a geographic name. In the event of any doubt, it is in the applicant’s interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support or non-objection prior to submission of the application, in order to preclude possible objections and pre-address any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements.

Strings that include but do not match a geographic name (as defined in this section) will not be considered geographic names as defined by section 2.2.1.4.2, and therefore will not require documentation of government support in the evaluation process.

---

\(^7\) City governments with concerns about strings that are duplicates, nicknames or close renderings of a city name should not rely on the evaluation process as the primary means of protecting their interests in a string. Rather, a government may elect to file a formal objection to an application that is opposed by the relevant community, or may submit its own application for the string.


For each application, the Geographic Names Panel will determine which governments are relevant based on the inputs of the applicant, governments, and its own research and analysis. In the event that there is more than one relevant government or public authority for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant must provide documentation of support or non-objection from all the relevant governments or public authorities. It is anticipated that this may apply to the case of a sub-national place name.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to:

- identify whether its applied-for gTLD string falls into any of the above categories; and
- identify and consult with the relevant governments or public authorities; and
- identify which level of government support is required.

Note: the level of government and which administrative agency is responsible for the filing of letters of support or non-objection is a matter for each national administration to determine. Applicants should consult within the relevant jurisdiction to determine the appropriate level of support.

The requirement to include documentation of support for certain applications does not preclude or exempt applications from being the subject of objections on community grounds (refer to subsection 3.1.1 of Module 3), under which applications may be rejected based on objections showing substantial opposition from the targeted community.

2.2.1.4.3 Documentation Requirements

The documentation of support or non-objection should include a signed letter from the relevant government or public authority. Understanding that this will differ across the respective jurisdictions, the letter could be signed by the minister with the portfolio responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister or President of the relevant jurisdiction; or a senior representative of the agency or department responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister. To assist the applicant in determining who the relevant government or public authority may be for a potential geographic name, the applicant may wish to consult with the relevant
Govermental Advisory Committee (GAC) representative.\textsuperscript{10}

The letter must clearly express the government’s or public authority’s support for or non-objection to the applicant’s application and demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding of the string being requested and its intended use.

The letter should also demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding that the string is being sought through the gTLD application process and that the applicant is willing to accept the conditions under which the string will be available, i.e., entry into a registry agreement with ICANN requiring compliance with consensus policies and payment of fees. (See Module 5 for a discussion of the obligations of a gTLD registry operator.)

A sample letter of support is available as an attachment to this module.

Applicants and governments may conduct discussions concerning government support for an application at any time. Applicants are encouraged to begin such discussions at the earliest possible stage, and enable governments to follow the processes that may be necessary to consider, approve, and generate a letter of support or non-objection.

It is important to note that a government or public authority is under no obligation to provide documentation of support or non-objection in response to a request by an applicant.

It is also possible that a government may withdraw its support for an application at a later time, including after the new gTLD has been delegated, if the registry operator has deviated from the conditions of original support or non-objection. Applicants should be aware that ICANN has committed to governments that, in the event of a dispute between a government (or public authority) and a registry operator that submitted documentation of support from that government or public authority, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of the government or public authority that has given support to an application.

\textbf{2.2.1.4.4 Review Procedure for Geographic Names}

A Geographic Names Panel (GNP) will determine whether each applied-for gTLD string represents a geographic

\textsuperscript{10}See \url{https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Members}
name, and verify the relevance and authenticity of the supporting documentation where necessary.

The GNP will review all applications received, not only those where the applicant has noted its applied-for gTLD string as a geographic name. For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a country or territory name (as defined in this module), the application will not pass the Geographic Names review and will be denied. No additional reviews will be available.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is not a geographic name requiring government support (as described in this module), the application will pass the Geographic Names review with no additional steps required.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a geographic name requiring government support, the GNP will confirm that the applicant has provided the required documentation from the relevant governments or public authorities, and that the communication from the government or public authority is legitimate and contains the required content. ICANN may confirm the authenticity of the communication by consulting with the relevant diplomatic authorities or members of ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee for the government or public authority concerned on the competent authority and appropriate point of contact within their administration for communications.

The GNP may communicate with the signing entity of the letter to confirm their intent and their understanding of the terms on which the support for an application is given.

In cases where an applicant has not provided the required documentation, the applicant will be contacted and notified of the requirement, and given a limited time frame to provide the documentation. If the applicant is able to provide the documentation before the close of the Initial Evaluation period, and the documentation is found to meet the requirements, the applicant will pass the Geographic Names review. If not, the applicant will have additional time to obtain the required documentation; however, if the applicant has not produced the required documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of notice), the application will be considered incomplete and will be ineligible for further review. The applicant may reapply in subsequent application rounds, if desired, subject to the fees and requirements of the specific application rounds.
If there is more than one application for a string representing a certain geographic name as described in this section, and the applications have requisite government approvals, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants. If the applicants have not reached a resolution by either the date of the end of the application round (as announced by ICANN), or the date on which ICANN opens a subsequent application round, whichever comes first, the applications will be rejected and applicable refunds will be available to applicants according to the conditions described in section 1.5.

However, in the event that a contention set is composed of multiple applications with documentation of support from the same government or public authority, the applications will proceed through the contention resolution procedures described in Module 4 when requested by the government or public authority providing the documentation.

If an application for a string representing a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographical names, the string contention will be resolved using the string contention procedures described in Module 4.

2.2.2 Applicant Reviews

Concurrent with the applied-for gTLD string reviews described in subsection 2.2.1, ICANN will review the applicant’s technical and operational capability, its financial capability, and its proposed registry services. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 24 – 44 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant’s technical capabilities and its plans for operation of the proposed gTLD.

Applicants are not required to have deployed an actual gTLD registry to pass the Technical/Operational review. It will be necessary, however, for an applicant to demonstrate a clear understanding and accomplishment of some groundwork toward the key technical and operational aspects of a gTLD registry operation. Subsequently, each applicant that passes the technical evaluation and all other steps will be required to complete
a pre-delegation technical test prior to delegation of the new gTLD. Refer to Module 5, Transition to Delegation, for additional information.

2.2.2.2 Financial Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 45-50 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant’s financial capabilities for operation of a gTLD registry and its financial planning in preparation for long-term stability of the new gTLD.

Because different registry types and purposes may justify different responses to individual questions, evaluators will pay particular attention to the consistency of an application across all criteria. For example, an applicant’s scaling plans identifying system hardware to ensure its capacity to operate at a particular volume level should be consistent with its financial plans to secure the necessary equipment. That is, the evaluation criteria scale with the applicant plans to provide flexibility.

2.2.2.3 Evaluation Methodology

Dedicated technical and financial evaluation panels will conduct the technical/operational and financial reviews, according to the established criteria and scoring mechanism included as an attachment to this module. These reviews are conducted on the basis of the information each applicant makes available to ICANN in its response to the questions in the Application Form.

The evaluators may request clarification or additional information during the Initial Evaluation period. For each application, clarifying questions will be consolidated and sent to the applicant from each of the panels. The applicant will thus have an opportunity to clarify or supplement the application in those areas where a request is made by the evaluators. These communications will occur via TAS. Unless otherwise noted, such communications will include a 2-week deadline for the applicant to respond. Any supplemental information provided by the applicant will become part of the application.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that the questions have been fully answered and the required documentation is attached. Evaluators are entitled, but not obliged, to request further information or evidence from an applicant, and are not obliged to take into account any information or evidence that is not made
available in the application and submitted by the due date, unless explicitly requested by the evaluators.

2.2.3 Registry Services Review

Concurrent with the other reviews that occur during the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will review the applicant’s proposed registry services for any possible adverse impact on security or stability. The applicant will be required to provide a list of proposed registry services in its application.

2.2.3.1 Definitions

Registry services are defined as:

1. operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry zone servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the registry agreement;

2. other products or services that the registry operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a consensus policy; and

3. any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator.

Proposed registry services will be examined to determine if they might raise significant stability or security issues. Examples of services proposed by existing registries can be found at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/). In most cases, these proposed services successfully pass this inquiry.

Registry services currently provided by gTLD registries can be found in registry agreement appendices. See [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/agreements.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/agreements.htm).

A full definition of registry services can be found at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html).

For purposes of this review, security and stability are defined as follows:

**Security** – an effect on security by the proposed registry service means (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or
resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.

**Stability** - an effect on stability means that the proposed registry service (1) does not comply with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized, and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs sponsored by the IETF, or (2) creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs and relying on registry operator's delegation information or provisioning services.

### 2.2.3.2 Customary Services

The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator:

- Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers
- Dissemination of TLD zone files
- Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois)
- DNS Security Extensions

The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Any additional registry services that are unique to the proposed gTLD registry should be described in detail. Directions for describing the registry services are provided at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rrs_sample.html](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rrs_sample.html).

### 2.2.3.3 TLD Zone Contents

ICANN receives a number of inquiries about use of various record types in a registry zone, as entities contemplate different business and technical models. Permissible zone contents for a TLD zone are:

- Apex SOA record.
- Apex NS records and in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers.
• NS records and in-bailiwick glue for DNS servers of registered names in the TLD.
• DS records for registered names in the TLD.
• Records associated with signing the TLD zone (i.e., RRSIG, DNSKEY, NSEC, and NSEC3).

An applicant wishing to place any other record types into its TLD zone should describe in detail its proposal in the registry services section of the application. This will be evaluated and could result in an extended evaluation to determine whether the service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability of the DNS. Applicants should be aware that a service based on use of less-common DNS resource records in the TLD zone, even if approved in the registry services review, might not work as intended for all users due to lack of application support.

2.2.3.4 Methodology

Review of the applicant’s proposed registry services will include a preliminary determination of whether any of the proposed registry services could raise significant security or stability issues and require additional consideration.

If the preliminary determination reveals that there may be significant security or stability issues (as defined in subsection 2.2.3.1) surrounding a proposed service, the application will be flagged for an extended review by the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP), see http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rstep.html. This review, if applicable, will occur during the Extended Evaluation period (refer to Section 2.3).

In the event that an application is flagged for extended review of one or more registry services, an additional fee to cover the cost of the extended review will be due from the applicant. Applicants will be advised of any additional fees due, which must be received before the additional review begins.

2.2.4 Applicant’s Withdrawal of an Application

An applicant who does not pass the Initial Evaluation may withdraw its application at this stage and request a partial refund (refer to subsection 1.5 of Module 1).
2.3 **Extended Evaluation**

An applicant may request an Extended Evaluation if the application has failed to pass the Initial Evaluation elements concerning:

- Geographic names (refer to subsection 2.2.1.4). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Demonstration of technical and operational capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.1). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Demonstration of financial capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.2). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Registry services (refer to subsection 2.2.3). Note that this investigation incurs an additional fee (the Registry Services Review Fee) if the applicant wishes to proceed. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 for fee and payment information.

An Extended Evaluation does not imply any change of the evaluation criteria. The same criteria used in the Initial Evaluation will be used to review the application in light of clarifications provided by the applicant.

From the time an applicant receives notice of failure to pass the Initial Evaluation, eligible applicants will have 15 calendar days to submit to ICANN the Notice of Request for Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not explicitly request the Extended Evaluation (and pay an additional fee in the case of a Registry Services inquiry) the application will not proceed.

### 2.3.1 Geographic Names Extended Evaluation

In the case of an application that has been identified as a geographic name requiring government support, but where the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities by the end of the Initial Evaluation period, the applicant has additional time in the Extended Evaluation period to obtain and submit this documentation.

If the applicant submits the documentation to the Geographic Names Panel by the required date, the GNP will perform its review of the documentation as detailed in
section 2.2.1.4. If the applicant has not provided the documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of the notice), the application will not pass the Extended Evaluation, and no further reviews are available.

2.3.2 Technical/Operational or Financial Extended Evaluation

The following applies to an Extended Evaluation of an applicant's technical and operational capability or financial capability, as described in subsection 2.2.2.

An applicant who has requested Extended Evaluation will again access the online application system (TAS) and clarify its answers to those questions or sections on which it received a non-passing score (or, in the case of an application where individual questions were passed but the total score was insufficient to pass Initial Evaluation, those questions or sections on which additional points are possible). The answers should be responsive to the evaluator report that indicates the reasons for failure, or provide any amplification that is not a material change to the application. Applicants may not use the Extended Evaluation period to substitute portions of new information for the information submitted in their original applications, i.e., to materially change the application.

An applicant participating in an Extended Evaluation on the Technical/Operational or Financial reviews will have the option to have its application reviewed by the same evaluation panelists who performed the review during the Initial Evaluation period, or to have a different set of panelists perform the review during Extended Evaluation.

The Extended Evaluation allows an additional exchange of information between the evaluators and the applicant to further clarify information contained in the application. This supplemental information will become part of the application record. Such communications will include a deadline for the applicant to respond.

ICANN will notify applicants at the end of the Extended Evaluation period as to whether they have passed. If an application passes Extended Evaluation, it continues to the next stage in the process. If an application does not pass Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further. No further reviews are available.
2.3.3 Registry Services Extended Evaluation

This section applies to Extended Evaluation of registry services, as described in subsection 2.2.3.

If a proposed registry service has been referred to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review, the RSTEP will form a review team of members with the appropriate qualifications.

The review team will generally consist of three members, depending on the complexity of the registry service proposed. In a 3-member panel, the review could be conducted within 30 to 45 calendar days. In cases where a 5-member panel is needed, this will be identified before the extended evaluation starts. In a 5-member panel, the review could be conducted in 45 calendar days or fewer.

The cost of an RSTEP review will be covered by the applicant through payment of the Registry Services Review Fee. Refer to payment procedures in section 1.5 of Module 1. The RSTEP review will not commence until payment has been received.

If the RSTEP finds that one or more of the applicant’s proposed registry services may be introduced without risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, these services will be included in the applicant’s registry agreement with ICANN. If the RSTEP finds that the proposed service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, the applicant may elect to proceed with its application without the proposed service, or withdraw its application for the gTLD. In this instance, an applicant has 15 calendar days to notify ICANN of its intent to proceed with the application. If an applicant does not explicitly provide such notice within this time frame, the application will proceed no further.

2.4 Parties Involved in Evaluation

A number of independent experts and groups play a part in performing the various reviews in the evaluation process. A brief description of the various panels, their evaluation roles, and the circumstances under which they work is included in this section.
2.4.1 Panels and Roles

The **String Similarity Panel** will assess whether a proposed gTLD string creates a probability of user confusion due to similarity with any reserved name, any existing TLD, any requested IDN ccTLD, or any new gTLD string applied for in the current application round. This occurs during the String Similarity review in Initial Evaluation. The panel may also review IDN tables submitted by applicants as part of its work.

The **DNS Stability Panel** will determine whether a proposed string might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. This occurs during the DNS Stability String review in Initial Evaluation.

The **Geographic Names Panel** will review each application to determine whether the applied-for gTLD represents a geographic name, as defined in this guidebook. In the event that the string is a geographic name requiring government support, the panel will ensure that the required documentation is provided with the application and verify that the documentation is from the relevant governments or public authorities and is authentic.

The **Technical Evaluation Panel** will review the technical components of each application against the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook, along with proposed registry operations, in order to determine whether the applicant is technically and operationally capable of operating a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Technical/Operational reviews in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Financial Evaluation Panel** will review each application against the relevant business, financial and organizational criteria contained in the Applicant Guidebook, to determine whether the applicant is financially capable of maintaining a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Financial review in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP)** will review proposed registry services in the application to determine if they pose a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability. This occurs, if applicable, during the Extended Evaluation period.
Members of all panels are required to abide by the established Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines included in this module.

2.4.2 Panel Selection Process

ICANN has selected qualified third-party providers to perform the various reviews, based on an extensive selection process. In addition to the specific subject matter expertise required for each panel, specified qualifications are required, including:

- The provider must be able to convene - or have the capacity to convene - globally diverse panels and be able to evaluate applications from all regions of the world, including applications for IDN gTLDs.

- The provider should be familiar with the IETF IDNA standards, Unicode standards, relevant RFCs and the terminology associated with IDNs.

- The provider must be able to scale quickly to meet the demands of the evaluation of an unknown number of applications. At present it is not known how many applications will be received, how complex they will be, and whether they will be predominantly for ASCII or non-ASCII gTLDs.

- The provider must be able to evaluate the applications within the required timeframes of Initial and Extended Evaluation.

2.4.3 Code of Conduct Guidelines for Panelists

The purpose of the New gTLD Program ("Program") Code of Conduct ("Code") is to prevent real and apparent conflicts of interest and unethical behavior by any Evaluation Panelist ("Panelist").

Panelists shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well prepared, and impartial professionals throughout the application process. Panelists are expected to comply with equity and high ethical standards while assuring the Internet community, its constituents, and the public of objectivity, integrity, confidentiality, and credibility. Unethical actions, or even the appearance of compromise, are not acceptable. Panelists are expected
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Panelists shall:

- not advance personal agendas or non-ICANN approved agendas in the evaluation of applications;
- examine facts as they exist and not be influenced by past reputation, media accounts, or unverified statements about the applications being evaluated;
- exclude themselves from participating in the evaluation of an application if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to such evaluation; and
- exclude themselves from evaluation activities if they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of applicant or application.

Compensation/Gifts -- Panelists shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the Applicant being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the Applicant. (Gifts of substance would include any gift greater than USD 25 in value).

If the giving of small tokens is important to the Applicant’s culture, Panelists may accept these tokens; however, the total of such tokens must not exceed USD 25 in value. If in doubt, the Panelist should err on the side of caution by declining gifts of any kind.

Conflicts of Interest -- Panelists shall act in accordance with the “New gTLD Program Conflicts of Interest Guidelines” (see subsection 2.4.3.1).

Confidentiality -- Confidentiality is an integral part of the evaluation process. Panelists must have access to sensitive information in order to conduct evaluations. Panelists must maintain confidentiality of information entrusted to them by ICANN and the Applicant and any other confidential information provided to them from whatever source,
except when disclosure is legally mandated or has been authorized by ICANN. “Confidential information” includes all elements of the Program and information gathered as part of the process – which includes but is not limited to: documents, interviews, discussions, interpretations, and analyses – related to the review of any new gTLD application.

**Affirmation** -- All Panelists shall read this Code prior to commencing evaluation services and shall certify in writing that they have done so and understand the Code.

### 2.4.3.1 Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Panelists

It is recognized that third-party providers may have a large number of employees in several countries serving numerous clients. In fact, it is possible that a number of Panelists may be very well known within the registry / registrar community and have provided professional services to a number of potential applicants.

To safeguard against the potential for inappropriate influence and ensure applications are evaluated in an objective and independent manner, ICANN has established detailed Conflict of Interest guidelines and procedures that will be followed by the Evaluation Panelists. To help ensure that the guidelines are appropriately followed ICANN will:

- Require each Evaluation Panelist (provider and individual) to acknowledge and document understanding of the Conflict of Interest guidelines.
- Require each Evaluation Panelist to disclose all business relationships engaged in at any time during the past six months.
- Where possible, identify and secure primary and backup providers for evaluation panels.
- In conjunction with the Evaluation Panelists, develop and implement a process to identify conflicts and re-assign applications as appropriate to secondary or contingent third party providers to perform the reviews.

**Compliance Period** -- All Evaluation Panelists must comply with the Conflict of Interest guidelines beginning with the opening date of the Application Submission period and ending with the public announcement by ICANN of the
final outcomes of all the applications from the Applicant in question.

**Guidelines** -- The following guidelines are the minimum standards with which all Evaluation Panelists must comply. It is recognized that it is impossible to foresee and cover all circumstances in which a potential conflict of interest might arise. In these cases the Evaluation Panelist should evaluate whether the existing facts and circumstances would lead a reasonable person to conclude that there is an actual conflict of interest.

Evaluation Panelists and Immediate Family Members:

- Must not be under contract, have or be included in a current proposal to provide Professional Services for or on behalf of the Applicant during the Compliance Period.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire any interest in a privately-held Applicant.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire more than 1% of any publicly listed Applicant’s outstanding equity securities or other ownership interests.
- Must not be involved or have an interest in a joint venture, partnership or other business arrangement with the Applicant.
- Must not have been named in a lawsuit with or against the Applicant.
- Must not be a:
  - Director, officer, or employee, or in any capacity equivalent to that of a member of management of the Applicant;
  - Promoter, underwriter, or voting trustee of the Applicant; or
  - Trustee for any pension or profit-sharing trust of the Applicant.

**Definitions**--

Evaluation Panelist: An Evaluation Panelist is any individual associated with the review of an application. This includes
any primary, secondary, and contingent third party Panelists engaged by ICANN to review new gTLD applications.

Immediate Family Member: Immediate Family Member is a spouse, spousal equivalent, or dependent (whether or not related) of an Evaluation Panelist.

Professional Services: include, but are not limited to legal services, financial audit, financial planning / investment, outsourced services, consulting services such as business / management / internal audit, tax, information technology, registry / registrar services.

2.4.3.2 Code of Conduct Violations

Evaluation panelist breaches of the Code of Conduct, whether intentional or not, shall be reviewed by ICANN, which may make recommendations for corrective action, if deemed necessary. Serious breaches of the Code may be cause for dismissal of the person, persons or provider committing the infraction.

In a case where ICANN determines that a Panelist has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the results of that Panelist’s review for all assigned applications will be discarded and the affected applications will undergo a review by new panelists.

Complaints about violations of the Code of Conduct by a Panelist may be brought to the attention of ICANN via the public comment and applicant support mechanisms, throughout the evaluation period. Concerns of applicants regarding panels should be communicated via the defined support channels (see subsection 1.4.2). Concerns of the general public (i.e., non-applicants) can be raised via the public comment forum, as described in Module 1.

2.4.4 Communication Channels

Defined channels for technical support or exchanges of information with ICANN and with evaluation panels are available to applicants during the Initial Evaluation and Extended Evaluation periods. Contacting individual ICANN staff members, Board members, or individuals engaged by ICANN to perform an evaluation role in order to lobby for a particular outcome or to obtain confidential information about applications under review is not appropriate. In the interests of fairness and equivalent treatment for all applicants, any such individual contacts will be referred to the appropriate communication channels.
Application is confirmed as complete and ready for evaluation during Administrative Completeness Check

Background Screening
Third-party provider reviews applicant's background.

Initial Evaluation – String Review

String Similarity
String Similarity Panel reviews applied-for strings to ensure they are not too similar to existing TLDs or Reserved Names.

- Panel compares all applied-for strings and creates contention sets.
- ICANN will seek to publish contention sets prior to publication of full IE results.

DNS Stability
All strings reviewed and in extraordinary cases, DNS Stability Panel may perform extended review for possible technical stability issues.

- Does applicant pass all elements of Initial Evaluation?
  - Yes: Applicant elects to pursue Extended Evaluation?
    - Yes: Extended Evaluation process
    - No: Ineligible for further review
  - No: Does applicant pass all elements of Extended Evaluation?
    - Yes: Applicant continues to subsequent steps.
    - No: Does applicant pass all elements of Extended Evaluation?
Annex: Separable Country Names List

gTLD application restrictions on country or territory names are tied to listing in property fields of the ISO 3166-1 standard. Notionally, the ISO 3166-1 standard has an “English short name” field which is the common name for a country and can be used for such protections; however, in some cases this does not represent the common name. This registry seeks to add additional protected elements which are derived from definitions in the ISO 3166-1 standard. An explanation of the various classes is included below.

Separable Country Names List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>English Short Name</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>Separable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ax</td>
<td>Åland Islands</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Åland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tutuila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swain’s Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cabinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Antigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Barbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Redonda Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lord Howe Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Macquarie Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ashmore Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cartier Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coral Sea Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo</td>
<td>Bolivia, Plurinational State of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bq</td>
<td>Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bonaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sint Eustatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fernando de Noronha Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Martim Vaz Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Trinidad Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>io</td>
<td>British Indian Ocean Territory</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chagos Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Diego Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Negara Brunei Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>São Tiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>São Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ky</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grand Cayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Easter Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Juan Fernández Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sala y Gómez Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Ambrosio Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Félix Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cocos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Keeling Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Malpelo Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Andrés Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Providencia Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anjouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grande Comore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mohéli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ck</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rarotonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coco Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Galápagos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gq</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Annobón Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bioko Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fk</td>
<td>Falkland Islands (Malvinas)</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Falkland Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malvinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Faroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fj</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Viti Levu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf</td>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Austral Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>French Southern Territories</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amsterdam Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mount Athos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gd</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern Grenadine Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>Heard Island and McDonald Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Heard Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>Holy See (Vatican City State)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Holy See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swan Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amindivi Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gilbert Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kp</td>
<td>Korea, Democratic People's Republic of</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kr</td>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mk</td>
<td>Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mh</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jaluit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agalega Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm</td>
<td>Micronesia, Federated States of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caroline Islands (see also pw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chuuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kosrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pohnpei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>Moldova, Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Moldava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Loyalty Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp</td>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>Oman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Musandam Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pw</td>
<td>Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caroline Islands (see also fm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Babelthuap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps</td>
<td>Palestinian Territory, Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bismarck Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Northern Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn</td>
<td>Pitcairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ducie Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Henderson Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oeno Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re</td>
<td>Réunion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bassas da India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Europa Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Glorioso Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Juan de Nova Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tromelin Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kaliningrad Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>Saint Helena, Ascension, and Tristan de Cunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saint Helena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ascension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gough Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kn</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saint Kitts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>Saint Pierre and Miquelon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saint Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Miquelon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vc</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saint Vincent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Northern Grenadine Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bequia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Vincent Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Savai’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Upolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Principe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mahé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aldabra Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amirante Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cosmoledo Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Farquhar Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sb</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Guadalcanal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marion Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>South Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>South Sandwich Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Country Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sj</td>
<td>Svalbard Jan Mayen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw</td>
<td>Taiwan, Province of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tz</td>
<td>Tanzania, United Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tv</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>United States Minor Outlying Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vu</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve</td>
<td>Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vg</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wf</td>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance**

A Separable Country Names Registry will be maintained and published by ICANN Staff.
Each time the ISO 3166-1 standard is updated with a new entry, this registry will be reappraised to identify if the changes to the standard warrant changes to the entries in this registry. Appraisal will be based on the criteria listing in the “Eligibility” section of this document.

Codes reserved by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency do not have any implication on this registry, only entries derived from normally assigned codes appearing in ISO 3166-1 are eligible.

If an ISO code is struck off the ISO 3166-1 standard, any entries in this registry deriving from that code must be struck.

Eligibility

Each record in this registry is derived from the following possible properties:

**Class A:**
The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name is comprised of multiple, separable parts whereby the country is comprised of distinct sub-entities. Each of these separable parts is eligible in its own right for consideration as a country name. For example, “Antigua and Barbuda” is comprised of “Antigua” and “Barbuda.”

**Class B:**
The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name (1) or the ISO 3166-1 English Full Name (2) contains additional language as to the type of country the entity is, which is often not used in common usage when referencing the country. For example, one such short name is “The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela” for a country in common usage referred to as “Venezuela.”

**Macedonia is a separable name in the context of this list; however, due to the ongoing dispute listed in UN documents between the Hellenic Republic (Greece) and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia over the name, no country will be afforded attribution or rights to the name “Macedonia” until the dispute over the name has been resolved. See [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf).**

**Class C:**
The ISO 3166-1 Remarks column containing synonyms of the country name, or sub-national entities, as denoted by “often referred to as,” “includes”, “comprises”, “variant” or “principal islands”.

In the first two cases, the registry listing must be directly derivative from the English Short Name by excising words and articles. These registry listings do not include vernacular or other non-official terms used to denote the country.

Eligibility is calculated in class order. For example, if a term can be derived both from Class A and Class C, it is only listed as Class A.
Attachment to Module 2

Sample Letter of Government Support

[This letter should be provided on official letterhead]

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for [TLD requested]

This letter is to confirm that [government entity] fully supports the application for [TLD] submitted to ICANN by [applicant] in the New gTLD Program. As the [Minister/Secretary/position] I confirm that I have the authority of the [x government/public authority] to be writing to you on this matter. [Explanation of government entity, relevant department, division, office, or agency, and what its functions and responsibilities are]

The gTLD will be used to [explain your understanding of how the name will be used by the applicant. This could include policies developed regarding who can register a name, pricing regime and management structures.] [Government/public authority/department] has worked closely with the applicant in the development of this proposal.

The [x government/public authority] supports this application, and in doing so, understands that in the event that the application is successful, [applicant] will be required to enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN. In doing so, they will be required to pay fees to ICANN and comply with consensus policies developed through the ICANN multi-stakeholder policy processes.

[Government / public authority] further understands that, in the event of a dispute between [government/public authority] and the applicant, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of [government/public authority].

(Optional) This application is being submitted as a community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the application. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

(Optional) I can advise that in the event that this application is successful [government/public authority] will enter into a separate agreement with the applicant. This agreement will outline the conditions under which we support them in the operation of the TLD, and circumstances under which we would withdraw that support. ICANN will not be a party to this agreement, and enforcement of this agreement lies fully with [government/public authority].
[Government / public authority] understands that the Geographic Names Panel engaged by ICANN will, among other things, conduct due diligence on the authenticity of this documentation. I would request that if additional information is required during this process, that [name and contact details] be contacted in the first instance.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Signature from relevant government/public authority
Attachment to Module 2
Evaluation Questions and Criteria

Since ICANN was founded in 1998 as a not-for-profit, multi-stakeholder organization, one of its key mandates has been to promote competition in the domain name market. ICANN’s mission specifically calls for the corporation to maintain and build on processes that will ensure competition and consumer interests - without compromising Internet security and stability. This includes the consideration and implementation of new gTLDs. It is ICANN’s goal to make the criteria and evaluation as objective as possible.

While new gTLDs are viewed by ICANN as important to fostering choice, innovation and competition in domain registration services, the decision to launch these coming new gTLD application rounds followed a detailed and lengthy consultation process with all constituencies of the global Internet community.

Any public or private sector organization can apply to create and operate a new gTLD. However the process is not like simply registering or buying a second-level domain name. Instead, the application process is to evaluate and select candidates capable of running a registry, a business that manages top level domains such as, for example,.COM or .INFO. Any successful applicant will need to meet published operational and technical criteria in order to preserve Internet stability and interoperability.

I. Principles of the Technical and Financial New gTLD Evaluation Criteria

- Principles of conservatism. This is the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new TLDs, including Internationalized Domain Names. Therefore, the criteria in this round require applicants to provide a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the technical requirements to operate a registry and the proposed business model.

- The criteria and evaluation should be as objective as possible.
  - With that goal in mind, an important objective of the new TLD process is to diversify the namespace, with different registry business models and target audiences. In some cases, criteria that are objective, but that ignore the differences in business models and target audiences of new registries, will tend to make the process exclusionary. For example, the business model for a registry targeted to a small community need not possess the same robustness in funding and technical infrastructure as a registry intending to compete with large gTLDs. Therefore purely objective criteria such as a requirement for a certain amount of cash on hand will not provide for the flexibility to consider different business models. The process must provide for an objective evaluation framework, but allow for adaptation according to the differing models applicants will present. Within that framework, applicant responses will be evaluated against the criteria in light of the proposed model.
  - Therefore the criteria should be flexible: able to scale with the overall business approach, providing that the planned approach is consistent and coherent, and can withstand highs and lows.
• Criteria can be **objective in areas of registrant protection**, for example:
  – Providing for funds to continue operations in the event of a registry failure.
  – Adherence to data escrow, registry failover, and continuity planning requirements.

• The evaluation must strike the correct balance between establishing the business and technical competence of the applicant to operate a registry (to serve the interests of registrants), while not asking for the detailed sort of information or making the judgment that a venture capitalist would. ICANN is not seeking to certify business success but instead seeks to encourage innovation while providing certain safeguards for registrants.

• New registries must be added in a way that maintains DNS stability and security. Therefore, ICANN asks several questions so that the applicant can demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements to operate a registry. ICANN will ask the applicant to demonstrate actual operational technical compliance prior to delegation. This is in line with current prerequisites for the delegation of a TLD.

• Registrant protection is emphasized in both the criteria and the scoring. Examples of this include asking the applicant to:
  – Plan for the occurrence of contingencies and registry failure by putting in place financial resources to fund the ongoing resolution of names while a replacement operator is found or extended notice can be given to registrants,
  – Demonstrate a capability to understand and plan for business contingencies to afford some protections through the marketplace,
  – Adhere to DNS stability and security requirements as described in the technical section, and
  – Provide access to the widest variety of services.

II. Aspects of the Questions Asked in the Application and Evaluation Criteria

The technical and financial questions are intended to inform and guide the applicant in aspects of registry start-up and operation. The established registry operator should find the questions straightforward while inexperienced applicants should find them a natural part of planning.

Evaluation and scoring (detailed below) will emphasize:

• How thorough are the answers? Are they well thought through and do they provide a sufficient basis for evaluation?

• Demonstration of the ability to operate and fund the registry on an ongoing basis:
  – Funding sources to support technical operations in a manner that ensures stability and security and supports planned expenses,
  – Resilience and sustainability in the face of ups and downs, anticipation of contingencies,
  – Funding to carry on operations in the event of failure.
• Demonstration that the technical plan will likely deliver on best practices for a registry and identification of aspects that might raise DNS stability and security issues.

• Ensures plan integration, consistency and compatibility (responses to questions are not evaluated individually but in comparison to others):
  ■ Funding adequately covers technical requirements,
  ■ Funding covers costs,
  ■ Risks are identified and addressed, in comparison to other aspects of the plan.

III. Scoring

Evaluation

• The questions, criteria, scoring and evaluation methodology are to be conducted in accordance with the principles described earlier in section I. With that in mind, globally diverse evaluation panelists will staff evaluation panels. The diversity of evaluators and access to experts in all regions of the world will ensure application evaluations take into account cultural, technical and business norms in the regions from which applications originate.

• Evaluation teams will consist of two independent panels. One will evaluate the applications against the financial criteria. The other will evaluate the applications against the technical & operational criteria. Given the requirement that technical and financial planning be well integrated, the panels will work together and coordinate information transfer where necessary. Other relevant experts (e.g., technical, audit, legal, insurance, finance) in pertinent regions will provide advice as required.

• Precautions will be taken to ensure that no member of the Evaluation Teams will have any interest or association that may be viewed as a real or potential conflict of interest with an applicant or application. All members must adhere to the Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines that are found in Module 2.

• Communications between the evaluation teams and the applicants will be through an online interface. During the evaluation, evaluators may pose a set of clarifying questions to an applicant, to which the applicant may respond through the interface.

Confidentiality: ICANN will post applications after the close of the application submission period. The application form notes which parts of the application will be posted.

Scoring

• Responses will be evaluated against each criterion. A score will be assigned according to the scoring schedule linked to each question or set of questions. In several questions, 1 point is the maximum score that may be awarded. In several other questions, 2 points are awarded for a response that exceeds requirements, 1 point is awarded for a response that meets requirements and 0 points are awarded for a response that fails to meet requirements. Each question must receive at least a score of “1,” making each a “pass/fail” question.

• In the Continuity question in the financial section (see Question #50), up to 3 points are awarded if an applicant provides, at the application stage, a financial instrument that will guarantee ongoing registry operations in the event of a business failure. This extra
point can serve to guarantee passing the financial criteria for applicants who score the
minimum passing score for each of the individual criteria. The purpose of this weighting is
to reward applicants who make early arrangements for the protection of registrants and
to accept relatively riskier business plans where registrants are protected.

- There are 21 Technical & Operational questions. Each question has a criterion and
  scoring associated with it. The scoring for each is 0, 1, or 2 points as described above.
  One of the questions (IDN implementation) is optional. Other than the optional questions,
  all Technical & Operational criteria must be scored a 1 or more or the application will fail
  the evaluation.

- The total technical score must be equal to or greater than 22 for the application to pass.
  That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, including the optional question, and a 2 on at least
    one mandatory question; or
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, excluding the optional question and a 2 on at least
    two mandatory questions.

This scoring methodology requires a minimum passing score for each question and a
slightly higher average score than the per question minimum to pass.

- There are six Financial questions and six sets of criteria that are scored by rating the
  answers to one or more of the questions. For example, the question concerning registry
  operation costs requires consistency between the technical plans (described in the
  answers to the Technical & Operational questions) and the costs (described in the
  answers to the costs question).

- The scoring for each of the Financial criteria is 0, 1 or 2 points as described above with
  the exception of the Continuity question, for which up to 3 points are possible. All
  questions must receive at least a 1 or the application will fail the evaluation.

- The total financial score on the six criteria must be 8 or greater for the application to
  pass. That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Scoring a 3 on the continuity criteria, or
  - Scoring a 2 on any two financial criteria.

- Applications that do not pass Initial Evaluation can enter into an extended evaluation
  process as described in Module 2. The scoring is the same.
<p>| #  | Question                                                                 | Included in public posting | Notes                                                                 | Scoring Range | Criteria | Scoring |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|                                                                      |               |          |         |
| Applicant Information | 1  | Full legal name of the Applicant (the established entity that would enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN) | Y | Responses to Questions 1 - 12 are required for a complete application. Responses are not scored. |               |          |         |
| Primary Contact for this Application | 6  | Name | Y | The primary contact is the individual designated with the primary responsibility for management of the application, including responding to tasks in the TLD Application System (TAS) during the various application phases. Both contacts listed should also be prepared to receive inquiries from the public. |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Title | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Date of birth | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Country of birth | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Address | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Phone number | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Fax number | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Email address | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
| Secondary Contact for this Application | 7  | Name | Y | The secondary contact is listed in the event the primary contact is unavailable to continue with the application process. |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Title | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Date of birth | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Country of birth | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Address | N |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Phone number | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |
|                                   |    | Fax number | Y |                                                                 |               |          |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proof of Legal Establishment (a) Legal form of the Applicant. (e.g., partnership, corporation, non-profit institution).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the event of questions regarding proof of establishment, the applicant may be asked for additional details, such as the specific national or other law applying to this type of entity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Attach evidence of the applicant’s establishment as the type of entity identified in Question 8(a) above, in accordance with the applicable laws identified in Question 8(b).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applications without valid proof of legal establishment will not be evaluated further. Supporting documentation for proof of legal establishment should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If the applying entity is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of the Applicant.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applicant Background (a) Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all directors (i.e., members of the applicant’s Board of Directors, if applicable).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Applicants should be aware that the names and positions of the individuals listed in response to this question will be published as part of the application. The contact information listed for individuals is for identification purposes only and will not be published as part of the application. Background checks may be conducted on individuals named in the applicant’s response to question 11. Any material misstatement or misrepresentation (or omission of material information) may cause the application to be rejected. The applicant certifies that it has obtained permission for the posting of the names and positions of individuals included in this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all officers and partners. Officers are high-level management officials of a corporation or business, for example, a CEO, vice president, secretary, chief financial officer. Partners would be listed in the context of a partnership or other such form of legal entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Enter the full name and contact information of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares, and percentage held by each. For a shareholder entity, enter the principal place of business. For a shareholder individual, enter the date and country of birth and contact information (permanent residence).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders, enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all individuals having overall legal or executive responsibility for the applying entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (e) | Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above:  
  i. within the past ten years, has been convicted of any crime related to financial or corporate governance activities, or has been judged by a court to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or has been the subject of a judicial determination that is the substantive equivalent of any of these;  
  ii. within the past ten years, has been disciplined by any government or industry regulatory body for conduct involving dishonesty or misuse of funds of others;  
  iii. within the past ten years has been convicted of any willful tax-related fraud or willful evasion of tax liabilities;  
  iv. within the past ten years has been convicted of perjury, forswearing, failing to cooperate with a law enforcement investigation, or making false statements to a law enforcement agency or representative; | N                            | ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook.                                                                                                                                  |                       |         |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) - (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (ix) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents) within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) – (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (ix) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii</td>
<td>is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time of this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any of the above events have occurred, please provide details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(f) Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above have been involved in any decisions indicating that the applicant or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting, as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name squatting under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or equivalent legislation.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Disclose whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above has been involved in any administrative or other legal proceeding in which allegations of intellectual property infringement relating to registration or use of a domain name have been made. Provide an explanation related to each such instance.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Provide an explanation for any additional background information that may be found concerning the applicant or any individual named in the application, which may affect eligibility, including any criminal convictions not identified above.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Fee 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Enter the confirmation information for payment of the evaluation fee (e.g., wire transfer confirmation number).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The evaluation fee is paid in the form of a deposit at the time of user registration, and submission of the remaining amount at the time the full application is submitted. The information in question 12 is required for each payment. The full amount in USD must be received by ICANN. Applicant is responsible for all transaction fees and exchange rate fluctuation. Fedwire is the preferred wire mechanism; SWIFT is also acceptable. ACH is not recommended as these funds will take longer to clear and could affect timing of the application processing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Payer name</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Payer address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Wiring bank</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Bank address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Wire date</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied-for gTLD string</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If applying for an IDN, provide the U-label.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Responses to Questions 13-17 are not scored, but are used for database and validation purposes. The U-label is an IDNA-valid string of Unicode characters, including at least one non-ASCII character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>(a) If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with &quot;xn--&quot;).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If an IDN, provide the meaning, or restatement of the string in English; that is, a description of the literal meaning of the string in the opinion of the applicant.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If an IDN, provide the language of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO 15924).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) If an IDN, provide the script of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO 15924).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>For example, the string “HELLO” would be listed as U+0048 U+0065 U+006C U+006F U+0066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>(a) If an IDN, upload IDN tables for the proposed registry. An IDN table must include: 1. the applied-for gTLD string relevant to the tables, 2. the script or language designator (as defined in BCP 47), 3. table version number, 4. effective date (DD Month YYYY), and 5. contact name, email address, and phone number. Submission of IDN tables in a standards-based format is encouraged.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string. IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second level (see question 44). IDN tables should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and sources used.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) List any variants to the applied-for gTLD string according to the relevant IDN tables.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Variant TLD strings will not be delegated as a result of this application. Variant strings will be checked for consistency and, if the application is approved, will be entered on a Declared IDN Variants List to allow for future allocation once a variant management mechanism is established for the top-level. Inclusion of variant TLD strings in this application is for information only and confers no right or claim to these strings upon the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OPTIONAL Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (<a href="http://www.langsci.uc.ac.uk/ipa">http://www.langsci.uc.ac.uk/ipa</a>).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>If provided, this information will be used as a guide to ICANN in communications regarding the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission/Purpose</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The information gathered in response to Question 18 is intended to inform the post-launch review of the New gTLD Program, from the perspective of assessing the relative costs and benefits achieved in the expanded gTLD space. For the application to be considered complete, answers to this section must be fulsome and sufficiently quantitative and detailed to inform future study on plans vs. results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New gTLD Program will be reviewed, as specified in section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments. This will include consideration of the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation process, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.

The information gathered in this section will be one source of input to help inform this review. This information is not used as part of the evaluation or scoring of the application, except to the extent that the information may overlap with questions or evaluation areas that are scored.

An applicant wishing to designate this application as community-based should ensure that these responses are consistent with its responses for question 20 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>What is the goal of your proposed gTLD in terms of areas of specialty, service levels, or reputation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>What do you anticipate your proposed gTLD will add to the current space, in terms of competition, differentiation, or innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>What goals does your proposed gTLD have in terms of user experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Provide a complete description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the goals listed above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Will your proposed gTLD impose any measures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) What operating rules will you adopt to eliminate or minimize social costs (e.g., time or financial resource costs, as well as various types of consumer vulnerabilities)? What other steps will you take to minimize negative consequences/costs imposed upon consumers?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. How will multiple applications for a particular domain name be resolved, for example, by auction or on a first-come/first-serve basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Explain any cost benefits for registrants you intend to implement (e.g., advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Note that the Registry Agreement requires that registrars be offered the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years. Additionally, the Registry Agreement requires advance written notice of price increases. Do you intend to make contractual commitments to registrants regarding the magnitude of price escalation? If so, please describe your plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>There is a presumption that the application is a standard application (as defined in the Applicant Guidebook) if this question is left unanswered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(a) Provide the name and full description of the community that the applicant is committing to serve. In the event that this application is included in a community priority evaluation, it will be scored based on the community identified in response to this question. The name of the community does not have to be formally adopted for the application to be designated as community-based.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How the community is delineated from Internet users generally. Such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptions may include, but are not limited to, the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership, registration, or licensing processes, operation in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particular industry, use of a language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How the community is structured and organized. For a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consisting of an alliance of groups, details about the constituent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parts are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- When the community was established, including the date(s) of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formal organization, if any, as well as a description of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community activities to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The current estimated size of the community, both as to membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and geographic extent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses to Question 20 will be regarded as firm commitments to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specified community and reflected in the Registry Agreement,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided the application is successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses are not scored in the Initial Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses may be scored in a community priority evaluation, if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applicable. Criteria and scoring methodology for the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priority evaluation are described in Module 4 of the Applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 20(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanations should clearly state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relations to any community organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relations to the community and its constituent parts/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability mechanisms of the applicant to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applied-for gTLD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intended registrants in the TLD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intended end-users of the TLD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Related activities the applicant has carried out or intends to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>carry out in service of this purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explanation of how the purpose is of a lasting nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the community identified in 20(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanations should clearly state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- relationship to the established name, if any, of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Provide a complete description of the applicant’s intended registration policies in support of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. Policies and enforcement mechanisms are expected to constitute a coherent set.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Descriptions should include proposed policies, if any, on the following:&lt;br&gt;• Eligibility: who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined.&lt;br&gt;• Name selection: what types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD.&lt;br&gt;• Content/Use: what restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name.&lt;br&gt;• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Attach any written endorsements for the application from established institutions representative of the community identified in 20(a). An applicant may submit written endorsements by multiple institutions, if relevant to the community.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement support for the application, and the supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement. Endorsements from institutions not mentioned in the response to 20(b) should be accompanied by a clear description of each such institution’s relationship to the community. Endorsements presented as supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(a) Is the application for a geographic name?</td>
<td>An applied-for gTLD string is considered a geographic name requiring government support if it is: (a) the capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; (b) a city name, where it is clear from statements in the application that the applicant intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name; (c) a sub-national place name listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard; or (d) a name listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the “Composition of macro geographic (continental) or regions, geographic sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” list. See Module 2 for complete definitions and criteria. An application for a country or territory name, as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, will not be approved.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>(b) If a geographic name, attach documentation of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities.</td>
<td>See the documentation requirements in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Documentation presented in response to this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Protection of Geographic Names</td>
<td>Describe proposed measures for protection of geographic names at the second and other levels in the applied-for gTLD. This should include any applicable rules and procedures for reservation and/or release of such names.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provide name and full description of all the Registry Services to be provided. Descriptions should include both technical and business components of each proposed service, and address any potential security or stability concerns. The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator: 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.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Registry Services are defined as the following: (1) operations of the Registry critical to the following tasks: (i) the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; (ii) provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; (iii) dissemination of TLD zone files; (iv) operation of the Registry zone servers; and (v) dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the Registry Agreement; and (2) other products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy; (3) any other products or services that only a Registry Operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the Registry Operator. A full definition of Registry Services can be found at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html">http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html</a>. Security: For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, an effect on security by the proposed Registry Service means (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of Registry Data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with applicable standards. Stability: For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, an effect on stability shall mean that the proposed Registry Service (1) is not compliant with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and widely accepted technical body, and (2) is not compliant with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and widely accepted technical body.</td>
<td>Responses are not scored. A preliminary assessment will be made to determine if there are potential security or stability issues with any of the applicant's proposed Registry Services. If any such issues are identified, the application will be referred for an extended review. See the description of the Registry Services review process in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Any information contained in the application may be considered as part of the Registry Services review. If its application is approved, applicant may engage in only those registry services defined in the application, unless a new request is submitted to ICANN in accordance with the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shared Registration System (SRS) Performance: describe</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Authoritative standards body, such as relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs sponsored by the IETF, or (2) creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and authoritative standards body, such as relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs and relying on Registry Operator's delegation information or provisioning.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) a plan for operating a robust and reliable SRS, one of the five critical registry functions; (2) scalability and performance consistent with the overall business approach, and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 (section 1.2) to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of SRS that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Details of a well-developed plan to operate a robust and reliable SRS; (3) SRS plans are sufficient to result in compliance with Specification 6 and Specification 10 to the Registry Agreement; (4) SRS is consistent with the technical, operational and financial approach described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates that adequate technical resources are already on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP): provide a detailed description of the interface with registrars, including how the applicant will comply with EPP in RFCs 3735 (if applicable), and 5730-5734. If intending to provide proprietary EPP extensions, provide documentation consistent with RFC 3735, including the EPP templates and schemas that will be used. Describe resourcing plans (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. If there are proprietary EPP extensions, a complete answer is also expected to be no more than 3 pages per EPP extension.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of EPP that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Sufficient evidence that any proprietary EPP extensions are compliant with RFCs and provide all necessary functionalities for the provision of registry services; (3) EPP interface is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates that technical resources are already on hand, or committed and readily available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whois: describe • how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookup as defined in Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement; • how the Applicant's Whois service will comply with RFC 3012; 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: The Registry Agreement (Specification 4) requires provision of Whois lookup services for all names registered in the TLD. This is a minimum requirement. Provision for Searchable Whois as defined in the scoring column is a requirement for achieving a score of 2 points.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) A Searchable Whois service: Whois service includes web-based search capabilities by domain name, registrant name, postal address, contact names, registrar IDs, and Internet Protocol addresses without arbitrary limit. Boolean search capabilities may be offered. The service shall include appropriate precautions to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., limiting access to legitimate authorized users), and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD. The description must:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- explain the various registration states as well as the criteria and procedures that are used to change state;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) complete knowledge and understanding of registration lifecycles and states;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- describe the typical registration lifecycle of create/update/delete and all intervening steps such as pending, locked, expired, and transferred that may apply;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) consistency with any specific commitments made to registrants as adapted to the overall business approach for the proposed gTLD; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) the ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- describe resourcing plans for this aspect of the criteria (number and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) ability to comply with relevant RFCs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plannned costs detailed in the financial section;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) evidence of compliance with Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) if applicable, a well-documented implementation of Searchable Whois.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) adequate description of Whois service that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Evidence that Whois services are compliant with RFCs, Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement, and any other contractual requirements including all necessary functionalities for user interface;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Whois capabilities consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 | Y | Note that, while orphan glue often supports correct and ordinary operation of the DNS, registry operators will be required to take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at [http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sgc940.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sgc940.pdf)) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct. | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) Comprehensive abuse policies, which include clear definitions of what constitutes abuse in the TLD, and procedures that will effectively minimize potential for abuse in the TLD;  
(2) Plans are adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
(3) Policies and procedures identify and address the abusive use of registered names at startup and on an ongoing basis; and  
(4) When executed in accordance with the Registry Agreement, plans will result in compliance with contractual requirements. | 2 – exceeds requirements: Response meets all the criteria for a score of 1 and includes:  
(1) Details of measures to promote Whois accuracy, using measures specified here or other measures commensurate in their effectiveness; and  
(2) Measures from at least one additional area to be eligible for 2 points as described in the question.  
1 meets requirements: Response includes:  
(1) An adequate description of abuse prevention and mitigation policies and procedures that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) Details of well-developed abuse policies and procedures;  
(3) Plans are sufficient to result in compliance with contractual requirements;  
(4) Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application, and any commitments made to registrants; and  
(5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
• 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:
  o 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.
  o 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
  o 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring multi-factor authentication (i.e., strong passwords, tokens, one-time passwords) from registrants to process update, transfers, and deletion requests;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 20 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A description of resourcing plans for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes:
(1) Identification of rights protection as a core objective, supported by a well-developed plan for rights protection; and
(2) Mechanisms for providing effective protections that exceed minimum requirements (e.g., RPMs in addition to those required in the registry agreement).

1 - meets requirements: Response includes:
(1) An adequate description of RPMs that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;
(2) A commitment from the applicant to implement of rights protection mechanisms sufficient to comply with minimum requirements in Specification 7; and
(3) Plans that are sufficient to result in compliance with contractual requirements;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 | Security Policy: provide a summary of the security policy for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
- indication of any independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities, and provisions for periodic independent assessment reports to test security capabilities;  
- description of any augmented security levels or capabilities commensurate with the nature of the applied for gTLD string, including the identification of any existing international or industry relevant security standards the applicant commits to following (reference site must be provided);  
- list of commitments made to registrants concerning security levels.  
To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:  
- Evidence of an independent assessment report demonstrating effective security controls (e.g., ISO 27001).  
A summary of the above should be no more than 20 pages. Note that the complete security policy for the registry is required to be submitted in accordance with 30(b). | Y                           | Criterion 5 calls for security levels to be appropriate for the use and level of trust associated with the TLD string, such as, for example, financial services oriented TLDs. “Financial services” are activities performed by financial institutions, including: 1) the acceptance of deposits and other repayable funds; 2) lending; 3) payment and remittance services; 4) insurance or reinsurance services; 5) brokerage services; 6) investment services and activities; 7) financial leasing; 8) issuance of guarantees and commitments; 9) provision of financial advice; 10) portfolio management and advice; or 11) acting as a financial clearinghouse. Financial services is used as an example only; other strings with exceptional potential to cause harm to consumers would also be expected to deploy appropriate levels of security. | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) detailed description of processes and solutions deployed to manage logical security across infrastructure and systems, monitoring and detecting threats and security vulnerabilities and taking appropriate steps to resolve them;  
(2) security capabilities are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
(3) a technical plan adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
(4) security measures are consistent with any commitments made to registrants regarding security levels; and  
(5) security measures are appropriate for the applied-for gTLD string (For example, applications for strings with unique trust implications, such as financial services-oriented strings, would be expected to provide a commensurate level of security). | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes:  
(1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed security capabilities, with various baseline security levels, independent benchmarking of security metrics, robust periodic security monitoring, and continuous enforcement; and  
(2) an independent assessment report is provided demonstrating effective security controls are either in place or have been designed, and are commensurate with the applied-for gTLD string. (This could be ISO 27001 certification or other well-established and recognized industry certifications for the registry operation. If new independent standards for demonstration of effective security controls are established, such as the High Security Top Level Domain (HSTLD) designation, this could also be included. An illustrative example of an independent standard is the proposed set of requirements described in http://www.icann.org/en/correspond/encrypfaa-hto-backstrom-crocker-20dec11-en.pdf). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Demonstration of Technical &amp; Operational Capability (Internal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30 | (b) Security Policy: provide the complete security policy and procedures for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
• system (data, server, application / services) and network access control, ensuring systems are maintained in a secure fashion, including details of how they are monitored, logged and backed up;  
• resources to secure integrity of updates between registry systems and nameservers, and between nameservers, if any;  
• independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities (submitted as attachments), if any;  
• provisioning and other measures that mitigate risks posed by denial of service attacks;  
• computer and network incident response | N                           |       |               |          |         |
|    | Questions 30(b) – 44 are designed to provide a description of the applicant’s intended technical and operational approach for those registry functions that are internal to the infrastructure and operations of the registry. To allow the applicant to provide full details and safeguard proprietary information, responses to these questions will not be published. |                            |       |               |          |         |

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical Overview of Proposed Registry: provide a technical overview of the proposed registry. The technical plan must be adequately resourced, with appropriate expertise and allocation of costs. The applicant will provide financial descriptions of resources in the next section and those resources must be reasonably related to these technical requirements. The overview should include information on the estimated scale of the registry’s technical operation, for example, estimates for the number of registration transactions and DNS queries per month should be provided for the first two years of operation. In addition, the overview should account for geographic dispersion of incoming network traffic such as DNS, Whois, and registrar transactions.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of technical aspects of registry requirements; (2) an adequate level of resiliency for the registry’s technical operations; (3) consistency with planned or currently deployed technical/operational solutions; (4) consistency with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (5) adequate resourcing for technical plan in the</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes: (1) A description that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Technical plans consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; (3) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the registry serves a highly localized registrant base, then traffic might be expected to come mainly from one area. This high-level summary should not repeat answers to questions below. Answers should include a visual diagram(s) to highlight dataflows, to provide context for the overall technical infrastructure. Detailed diagrams for subsequent questions should be able to map back to this high-level diagram(s). The visual diagram(s) can be supplemented with documentation, or a narrative, to explain how all of the Technical &amp; Operational components conform. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Architecture: provide documentation for the system and network architecture that will support registry operations for the proposed scale of the registry. System and network architecture documentation must clearly demonstrate the applicant’s ability to operate, manage, and monitor registry systems. Documentation should include multiple diagrams or other components including but not limited to:   • Detailed network diagram(s) showing the full interplay of registry elements, including but not limited to SRS, DNS, Whois, data escrow, and registry database functions;   • Network and associated systems necessary to support registry operations, including:   - Anticipated TCP/IP addressing scheme,   - Hardware (i.e., servers, routers, networking components, virtual machines and key characteristics (CPU and RAM, Disk space, internal network connectivity, and make and model)),   - Operating system and versions, and   - Software and applications (with version information) necessary to support registry operations, management, and monitoring   • General overview of capacity planning, including bandwidth allocation plans;   • List of providers / carriers; and   • Resourcing plans for the initial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (6) consistency with subsequent technical questions.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes   (1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed network architecture that is able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, thereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for initial registry startup; and   (2) Evidence of a highly available, robust, and secure infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes   (1) An adequate description of the architecture that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;   (2) Plans for network architecture describe all necessary elements;   (3) Descriptions demonstrate adequate network architecture providing robustness and security of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 33 | Database Capabilities: provide details of database capabilities including but not limited to:  
  - database software;  
  - storage capacity (both in raw terms [e.g., MB, GB] and in number of registrations / registration transactions);  
  - maximum transaction throughput (in total and by type of transaction);  
  - scalability;  
  - procedures for object creation, editing, and deletion, and user and credential management;  
  - high availability;  
  - change management procedures;  
  - reporting capabilities; and  
  - resource plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
  A registry database data model can be included to provide additional clarity to this response.  
  Note: Database capabilities described should be in reference to registry services and not necessarily related support functions such as Personnel or Accounting, unless such services are inherently intertwined with the delivery of registry services.  
  To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include evidence of a network architecture design that greatly reduces the risk profile of the proposed registry by providing a level of scalability and adaptability (e.g., protection against DDoS attacks) that far exceeds the minimum configuration necessary for the expected volume.  
  A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages. | N | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of database capabilities to meet the registry technical requirements;  
(2) database capabilities consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section. | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes  
(1) Highly developed and detailed description of database capabilities that are able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, whereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for registry startup; and  
(2) Evidence of comprehensive database capabilities, including high scalability and redundant database infrastructure, regularly reviewed operational and reporting procedures following leading practices.  
1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) An adequate description of database capabilities that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; and  
(2) Plans for database capabilities |
include evidence of database capabilities that greatly reduce the risk profile of the proposed registry by providing a level of scalability and adaptability that far exceeds the minimum configuration necessary for the expected volume.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Geographic Diversity: provide a description of plans for geographic diversity of:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) geographic diversity of nameservers and operations centers; (2) proposed geo-diversity measures are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) Evidence of highly developed measures for geo-diversity of operations, with locations and functions to continue all vital business functions in the event of a natural or other disaster at the principal place of business or point of presence; and (2) A high level of availability, security, and bandwidth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

35 DNS Service: describe the configuration and operation of nameservers, including how the applicant will comply with relevant RFCs. All name servers used for the new gTLD must be operated in compliance with the DNS protocol specifications defined in the relevant RFCs, including but not limited to: 1034, 1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3226, 3596, 3597, 3901, 4343, and 4472.

- Provide details of the intended DNS Service including, but not limited to: A description of the DNS services to be provided, such as query rates to be supported at initial operation, and reserve capacity of the system. Describe how your nameserver update methods will change at various scales. Describe how DNS performance will change at various scales.
- RFCs that will be followed – describe how services are compliant with RFCs and if these are dedicated or shared with any other functions (capacity/performance) or DNS zones.
- The resources used to implement the services - describe complete server hardware and software, including network bandwidth and addressing plans for servers. Also include resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).
- Demonstrate how the system will

N Note that the use of DNS wildcard resource records as described in RFC 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS resource records or using redirection within the DNS by the registry is prohibited in the Registry Agreement. Also note that name servers for the new gTLD must comply with IANA Technical requirements for authoritative name servers: http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html.

0-1 Complete answer demonstrates:
(1) adequate description of configurations of nameservers and compliance with respective DNS protocol-related RFCs;
(2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;
(4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement; and
(5) evidence of complete knowledge and understanding of requirements for DNS service, one of the five critical registry functions.

1 - meets requirements: Response includes:
(1) Adequate description of DNS service that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;
(2) Plans are sufficient to result in compliance with DNS protocols (Specification 6, section 1.1) and required performance specifications Specification 10, Service Level Matrix;
(3) Plans are consistent with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and
(4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>IPv6 Reachability: provide a description of plans for providing IPv6 transport including, but not limited to:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>IANA nameserver requirements are available at <a href="http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html">http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html</a></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of IPv6 reachability that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) A description of an adequate implementation plan addressing requirements for IPv6 reachability, indicating IPv6 reachability allowing IPv6 transport in the network over two independent IPv6 capable networks in compliance to IPv4 IANA specifications, and Specification 10; (3) IPv6 plans consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures: provide details of frequency and procedures for backup of data, hardware, and systems used for backup, data format, data backup features, backup testing procedures, procedures for retrieval of data/rebuild of database, storage controls and procedures, and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed backup and retrieval processes deployed; (2) backup and retrieval process and frequency are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of backup policies and procedures that substantially demonstrate the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) A description of leading practices being or to be followed; (3) Backup procedures consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Data Escrow: describe how the applicant will comply with the data escrow requirements documented in the Registry Data Escrow Specification (Specification 2 of the Registry Agreement); and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of data escrow, one of the five critical registry functions; (2) compliance with Specification 2 of the Registry Agreement; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) the escrow arrangement is consistent with the overall business approach and size/scope of the registry.</td>
<td>1 – meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of a Data Escrow process that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Data escrow plans are sufficient to result in compliance with the Data Escrow Specification (Specification 2 to the Registry Agreement); (3) Escrow capabilities are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to carry out this function. 0 – fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Registry Continuity: describe how the applicant will comply with registry continuity obligations as described in Specification 6 (section 3) to the registry agreement. This includes conducting registry operations using diverse, redundant servers to ensure continued operation of critical functions in the case of technical failure. Describe resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). The response should include, but is not limited to, the following elements of the business continuity plan: Identification of risks and threats to compliance with registry continuity obligations; Identification and definitions of vital business functions (which may include registry services beyond the five critical registry functions) versus other registry functions and supporting operations and technology; Definitions of Recovery Point Objectives and Recovery Time Objective; and Descriptions of testing plans to promote compliance with relevant obligations. To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include: A highly detailed plan that provides for leading practice levels of availability; and Evidence of concrete steps such as a contract with a backup provider (in addition to any currently designated service operator) or a maintained hot site. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 15 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed description showing plans for compliance with registry continuity obligations; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Registry Transition: provide a Service Migration plan (as described in the Registry Transition Processes) that could be followed in the event</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and (1) Adequate description of a registry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Failover Testing: provide</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>0 – fails requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a description of the failover testing plan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including mandatory annual testing of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technical requirements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples may include a description of plans to test failover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) a technical plan scope/scale consistent with the overall business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of data centers or operations to alternate sites, from a hot to a cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approach and planned size of the registry;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facility, registry data escrow testing, or other mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plan must take into account, be consistent with the vital business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functions identified in Question 39; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The failover testing plan should include, but is not limited to, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following elements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of testing (e.g., walkthroughs, takedown of sites) and the frequency of testing;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How results are captured, what is done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the results, and with whom results are shared;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How test plans are updated (e.g., what triggers an update, change management processes for making updates);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Length of time to restore critical registry functions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Length of time to restore all operations, inclusive of critical registry functions; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Length of time to migrate from one site to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42  Monitoring and Fault Escalation Processes: provide

• a description of the proposed (or actual) arrangements for monitoring critical registry systems (including SRS, database systems, DNS servers, Whois service, network connectivity, routers and firewalls). This description should explain how these systems are monitored and the mechanisms that will be used for fault escalation and reporting, and should provide details of the proposed support arrangements for these registry systems.

• 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:

• Meeting the fault tolerance / monitoring guidelines described

• Evidence of commitment to provide a 24x7 fault response team.

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

N

0-2 Complete answer demonstrates:
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements;
(2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and
(4) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and registrars regarding system maintenance.

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes
(1) Evidence showing highly developed and detailed fault tolerance/monitoring and redundant systems deployed with real-time monitoring tools / dashboard (metrics) deployed and reviewed regularly;
(2) A high level of availability that allows for the ability to respond to faults through a 24x7 response team.

1 - meets requirements: Response includes
(1) Adequate description of monitoring and fault escalation processes that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;
(2) Evidence showing adequate fault tolerance/monitoring systems planned with an appropriate level of monitoring and limited periodic review being performed;
(3) Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; and
(4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 43 | DNSSEC: Provide  
- The registry’s DNSSEC policy statement (DPS), which should include the policies and procedures the proposed registry will follow, for example, for signing the zone files, for verifying and accepting DS records from child domains, and for generating, exchanging, and storing keying material.  
- Describe how the DNSSEC implementation will comply with relevant RFCs, including but not limited to: RFCs 4033, 4034, 4035, 5910, 4509, and 4541, and 5155 (the latter will only be required if Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence will be offered); and  
- Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. Note, the DPS is required to be submitted as part of the application. | N | 0-1 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements, one of the five critical registry functions;  
(2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and  
(4) an ability to comply with relevant RFCs. | 1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) An adequate description of DNSSEC that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) Evidence that TLD zone files will be signed at time of launch, in compliance with required RFCs, and registry offers provisioning capabilities to accept public key material from registrants through the SRS;  
(3) An adequate description of key management procedures in the proposed TLD, including providing secure encryption key management (generation, exchange, and storage);  
(4) Technical plan is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>OPTIONAL: IDN:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>IDNs are an optional service at time of launch. Absence of IDN implementation or plans will not detract from an applicant’s score. Applicants who respond to this question with plans for implementation of IDNs at time of launch will be scored according to the criteria indicated here.reeted. The format used by RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>IDNs are an optional service. Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; (3) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; (4) issues regarding use of scripts are settled and IDN tables are complete and publicly available; and (5) ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45 | Financial Statements: provide:                                           | N                          | The questions in this section (45-50) are intended to give applicants an opportunity to demonstrate their financial capabilities to run a registry. Supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language. | 0-1 | Audited or independently certified financial statements are prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) adopted by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) or nationally recognized accounting standards (e.g., GAAP). This will include a balance sheet and income statement reflecting the applicant’s financial position and results of operations, a statement of shareholders equity/partner capital, and a cash flow statement. In the event the applicant is an entity newly formed for the purpose of applying for a gTLD and with little to no operating history.

**Demonstration of Financial Capability**

- **Financial Statements:** provide audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant, and audited or unaudited financial statements for the most recently ended interim financial period for the applicant for which this information may be released.

For newly-formed applicants, or where financial statements are not audited, provide:
- the latest available unaudited financial statements; and
- an explanation as to why audited or independently certified financial statements are not available.

At a minimum, the financial statements should be provided for the legal entity listed as the applicant.

- **IDN tables:** should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.

- **Script settlement:** should be completed.

- **IDN Tables:** should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The format used by RFC 3740 is an acceptable alternative. Names that are not expressible using these generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.

**Scoring**

1 - meets requirements for this optional element: Response includes:

1. Adequate description of IDN implementation that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;

2. An adequate description of the IDN procedures, including complete IDN tables, compliance with IDNA/IDN guidelines and RFCs, and periodic monitoring of IDN operations;

3. Evidence of ability to resolve rendering and known IDN issues or spoofing attacks;

4. IDN plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and

5. Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed readily available to carry out this function.

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial statements are used in the analysis of projections and costs. A complete answer should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• balance sheet;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• income statement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• statement of shareholders equity/partner capital;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cash flow statement, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• letter of auditor or independent certification, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Projections Template: provide financial projections for costs and funding using Template 1, Most Likely Scenario (attached). Note, if certain services are outsourced, reflect this in the relevant cost section of the template. The template is intended to provide commonality among TLD applications and thereby facilitate the evaluation process. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages in addition to the template.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Costs and capital expenditures: in conjunction with the financial projections template, describe and explain: the expected operating costs and capital expenditures of setting up and operating the proposed registry; any functions to be outsourced, as indicated in the cost section of the template, and the reasons for outsourcing; any significant variances between years in any category of expected costs; and a description of the basis / key assumptions including rationale for the costs provided in the projections template. This may include an</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>This question is based on the template submitted in question 46.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Costs identified are consistent with the proposed registry services, adequately fund technical requirements, and are consistent with proposed mission/purpose of the registry. Costs projected are reasonable for a registry of size and scope described in the application. Costs identified include the funding costs (interest expenses and fees) related to the continued operations instrument described in Question 50 below.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all of the attributes for a score of 1 and: (1) Estimated costs and assumptions are conservative and consistent with an operation of the registry's volume/scope/size as described by the applicant; (2) Estimates are derived from actual examples of previous or existing registry operations or equivalent; and (3) Conservative estimates are based on those experiences and describe a range of anticipated costs and use the high end of those estimates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
executive summary or summary outcome of studies, reference data, or other steps taken to develop the responses and validate any assumptions made.

As described in the Applicant Guidebook, the information provided will be considered in light of the entire application and the evaluation criteria. Therefore, this answer should agree with the information provided in Template 1 to: 1) maintain registry operations, 2) provide registry services described above, and 3) satisfy the technical requirements described in the Demonstration of Technical & Operational Capability section. Costs should include both fixed and variable costs.

To be eligible for a score of two points, answers must demonstrate a conservative estimate of costs based on actual examples of previous or existing registry operations with similar approach and projections for growth and costs or equivalent. Attach reference material for such examples.

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

(b) Describe anticipated ranges in projected costs. Describe factors that affect those ranges.

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

48  (a) Funding and Revenue: Funding can be derived from several sources (e.g., existing capital or proceeds/revenue from operation of the proposed registry).

Describe:
1) How existing funds will provide resources for both: a) start-up of operations, and b) ongoing operations;
2) the revenue model including projections for transaction volumes and price (if the applicant does not intend to rely on registration revenue in order to cover the costs of the registry's

Supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language.

Funding resources are clearly identified and adequately provide for registry cost projections. Sources of capital funding are clearly identified, held apart from other potential uses of those funds and available. The plan for transition of funding sources from available capital to revenue from operations (if applicable) is described.

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and

1) Existing funds (specifically all funds required for start-up) are quantified, on hand, segregated in an account available only to the applicant for purposes of the application only; and
2) If on-going operations are to be at least partially resourced from existing funds (rather than revenue from on-going operations) that funding is segregated and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation, it must clarify how the funding for the operation will be developed and maintained in a stable and sustainable manner;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside sources of funding are documented and verified. Examples of evidence for funding sources include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) outside sources of funding (the applicant must, where applicable, provide evidence of the commitment by the party committing the funds).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Executed funding agreements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secured vs unsecured funding should be clearly identified, including associated sources of funding (i.e., different types of funding, level and type of security/collateral, and key items) for each type of funding;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A letter of credit;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Any significant variances between years in any category of funding and revenue; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A commitment letter;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) A description of the basis / key assumptions including rationale for the funding and revenue provided in the projections template. This may include an executive summary or summary outcome of studies, reference data, or other steps taken to develop the response and validate any assumptions made; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A bank statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Assurances that funding and revenue projections cited in this application are consistent with other public and private claims made to promote the business and generate support. To be eligible for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding commitments may be conditional on the approval of the application. Sources of capital funding required to sustain registry operations on an on-going basis are identified. The projected revenues are consistent with the size and projected penetration of the target markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) A conservative estimate of funding and revenue; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key assumptions and their rationale are clearly described and address, at a minimum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Ongoing operations that are not dependent on projected revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Key components of the funding plan and their key terms; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Price and number of registrations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 - meets requirements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Assurances provided that materials provided to investors and/or lenders are consistent with the projections and assumptions included in the projections templates;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Existing funds (specifically all funds required for start-up) are quantified, committed, identified as available to the applicant;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) If ongoing operations are to be at least partially resourced from existing funds (rather than revenue from on-going operations) that funding is quantified and its sources identified in an amount adequate for three years operation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) If ongoing operations are to be at least partially resourced from revenues, assumptions made are reasonable and are directly related to projected business volumes, market size and penetration; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Projections are reasonably aligned with the historical financial statements provided in Question 45.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0 - fails requirements:</strong> Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Describe anticipated ranges in projected funding and revenue. Describe factors that affect those ranges. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>(a) Contingency Planning: describe your contingency planning:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Contingencies and risks are identified, quantified, and included in the cost, revenue, and funding analyses. Action plans are identified in the event contingencies occur. The model is resilient in the event those contingencies occur. Responses address the probability and resource impact of the contingencies identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify any projected barriers/risks to implementation of the business approach described in the application and how they affect cost, funding, revenue, or timeline in your planning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the impact of any particular regulation, law or policy that might impact the Registry Services offering; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the measures to mitigate the key risks as described in this question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer should include, for each contingency, a clear description of the impact to projected revenue, funding, and costs for the 3-year period presented in Template 1 (Most Likely Scenario).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be eligible for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate that action plans and operations are adequately resourced in the existing funding and revenue plan even if contingencies occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Describe your contingency planning where funding sources are so significantly reduced that material deviations from the implementation model are required. In particular, describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how on-going technical requirements will be met; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• what alternative funding can be reasonably raised at a later time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an explanation if you do not believe there is any chance of reduced funding.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(a) Provide a cost estimate for funding critical registry functions on an annual basis, and a rationale for these cost estimates commensurate with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application. The critical functions of a registry which must be supported even if an applicant’s business and/or funding fails are: (1) DNS resolution for registered domain names  Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics. (2) Operation of the Shared Registration System  Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily EPP transactions (e.g., 0-200K, 200K-2M, 2M+), the incremental costs associated with</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Describe your contingency planning where activity volumes so significantly exceed the high projections that material deviation from the implementation model are required. In particular, how will on-going technical requirements be met? A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registrant protection is critical and thus new gTLD applicants are requested to provide evidence indicating that the critical functions will continue to be performed even if the registry fails. Registrant needs are best protected by a clear demonstration that the basic registry functions are sustained for an extended period even in the face of registry failure. Therefore, this section is weighted heavily as a clear, objective measure to protect and serve registrants. The applicant has two tasks associated with adequately making this demonstration of continuity for critical registry functions. First, costs for maintaining critical registrant protection functions are to be estimated (Part a). In evaluating the application, the evaluators will adjudge whether the estimate is reasonable given the systems architecture and overall business approach described elsewhere in the application. The Continuing Operations Instrument (COI) is invoked by ICANN if necessary to pay for an Emergency Back End Registry Operator (EBERO) to maintain the five critical registry functions for a period of three to five years. Thus, the cost estimates are tied to the cost for a third party to provide the functions, not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figures provided are based on an accurate estimate of costs. Documented evidence or detailed plan for ability to fund on-going critical registry functions for registrants for a period of three years in the event of registry failure, default or until a successor operator can be designated. Evidence of financial wherewithal to fund this requirement prior to delegation. This requirement must be met prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and: (1) Financial instrument is secured and in place to provide for on-going operations for at least three years in the event of failure. 1 - meets requirements: (1) Costs are commensurate with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (2) Funding is identified and instrument is described to provide for on-going operations of at least three years in the event of failure. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics.</td>
<td></td>
<td>to the applicant's actual in-house or subcontracting costs for provision of these functions. Refer to guidelines at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm</a> regarding estimation of costs. However, the applicant must provide its own estimates and explanation in response to this question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Provision of Whois service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily Whois queries (e.g., 0-100K, 100K-1M, 1M+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics for both web-based and port-43 services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Registry data escrow deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider administration, retention, and transfer fees as well as daily deposit (e.g., full or incremental) handling. Costs may vary depending on the size of the files in escrow (i.e., the size of the registry database).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Maintenance of a properly signed zone in accordance with DNSSEC requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List the estimated annual cost for each of these functions (specify currency used).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Applicants must provide evidence as to how the funds required for performing these critical registry functions will be available and guaranteed to fund registry operations (for the protection of registrants in the new gTLD) for a</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Second (Part b), methods of securing the funds required to perform those functions for at least three years are to be described by the applicant in accordance with the criteria below. Two types of instruments will fulfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimum of three years following the termination of the Registry Agreement. ICANN has identified two methods to fulfill this requirement: (i) Irrevocable standby letter of credit (LOC) issued by a reputable financial institution. • The amount of the LOC must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund the registry operations specified above for at least three years. In the event of a draw upon the letter of credit, the actual payout would be tied to the cost of running those functions. • The LOC must name ICANN or its designee as the beneficiary. Any funds paid out would be provided to the designee who is operating the required registry functions. • The LOC must have a term of at least five years from the delegation of the TLD. The LOC may be structured with an annual expiration date if it contains an evergreen provision providing for annual extensions, without amendment, for an indefinite number of periods until the issuing bank informs the beneficiary of its final expiration or until the beneficiary releases the LOC as evidenced in writing. If the expiration date occurs prior to the fifth anniversary of the delegation of the TLD, applicant will be required to obtain a replacement instrument. • The LOC must be issued by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated). • The LOC will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee. • Applicant should attach an original copy of the executed letter of credit or a draft of the letter of credit containing the full terms and conditions. If not yet executed, the Applicant will be required to provide ICANN with an original copy of the executed LOC prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement. • The LOC must contain at least the following required elements: o Issuing bank and date of issue. o Beneficiary: ICANN / 4676 Admiralty</td>
<td>this requirement. The applicant must identify which of the two methods is being described. The instrument is required to be in place at the time of the execution of the Registry Agreement. Financial Institution Ratings: The instrument must be issued or held by a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A” (or the equivalent) by any of the following rating agencies: A.M. Best, Dominion Bond Rating Service, Egan-Jones, Fitch Ratings, Kroll Bond Rating Agency, Moody’s, Morningstar, Standard &amp; Poor’s, and Japan Credit Rating Agency. If an applicant cannot access a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A,” but a branch or subsidiary of such an institution exists in the jurisdiction of the applying entity, then the instrument may be issued by the branch or subsidiary or by a local financial institution with an equivalent or higher rating to the branch or subsidiary. If an applicant cannot access any such financial institutions, the instrument may be issued by the highest-rated financial institution in the national jurisdiction of the applying entity, if accepted by ICANN. Execution by ICANN: For any financial instruments that contemplate ICANN being a party, upon the written request of the applicant, ICANN may (but is not obligated to) execute such agreement prior to submission of the applicant's application if the agreement is on terms acceptable to ICANN. ICANN encourages applicants to deliver a written copy of any such agreement (only if it requires ICANN's signature) to ICANN as soon as possible to facilitate ICANN's review. If the financial instrument requires ICANN's signature, then the applicant will receive 3 points for question 50 (for the instrument being &quot;secured and in place&quot;) only if ICANN executes the agreement prior to submission of the application. ICANN will determine, in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Applicant’s complete name and address.</td>
<td>o LOC identifying number.</td>
<td>Partial drawings from the letter of credit may be made provided that such payment shall reduce the amount under the standby letter of credit.</td>
<td>its sole discretion, whether to execute and become a party to a financial instrument.</td>
<td>o Exact amount in USD.</td>
<td>The financial instrument should be submitted in the original language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LOC may not be modified, amended, or amplified by reference to any other document, agreement, or instrument.</td>
<td>o Expiry date.</td>
<td>All payments must be marked with the issuing bank name and the bank’s standby letter of credit number.</td>
<td>o Address, procedure, and required forms whereby presentation for payment is to be made.</td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The LOC is subject to the International Standby Practices (ISP 98) International Chamber of Commerce (Publication No. 590), or to an alternative standard that has been demonstrated to be reasonably equivalent.</td>
<td>o Expiry date.</td>
<td>The LOC may not be modified, amended, or amplified by reference to any other document, agreement, or instrument.</td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(ii) A deposit into an irrevocable cash escrow account held by a reputable financial institution.</td>
<td>o The amount of the deposit must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund registry operations for at least three years.</td>
<td>The escrow agreement relating to the escrow account will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.</td>
<td>o Cash is to be held by a third party financial institution which will not allow the funds to be commingled with the Applicant’s operating funds or other funds and may only be accessed by ICANN or its designee if certain conditions are met.</td>
<td>o The account must be held by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).</td>
<td>o The escrow agreement must have a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The escrow agreement relating to the escrow account will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.</td>
<td>o The account must be held by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).</td>
<td>o The escrow agreement must have a term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The escrow agreement relating to the escrow account will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.</td>
<td>o The account must be held by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).</td>
<td>o The escrow agreement must have a term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>of five years from the delegation of the TLD. • The funds in the deposit escrow account are not considered to be an asset of ICANN. • Any interest earnings less bank fees are to accrue to the deposit, and will be paid back to the applicant upon liquidation of the account to the extent not used to pay the costs and expenses of maintaining the escrow. • The deposit plus accrued interest, less any bank fees in respect of the escrow, is to be returned to the applicant if the funds are not used to fund registry functions due to a triggering event or after five years, whichever is greater. • The Applicant will be required to provide ICANN an explanation as to the amount of the deposit, the institution that will hold the deposit, and the escrow agreement for the account at the time of submitting an application. • Applicant should attach evidence of deposited funds in the escrow account, or evidence of provisional arrangement for deposit of funds. Evidence of deposited funds and terms of escrow agreement must be provided to ICANN prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: TLD Applicant – Financial Projections

The application process requires the applicant to submit two cash basis Financial Projections.

The first projection (Template 1) should show the Financial Projections associated with the Most Likely scenario expected. This projection should include the forecasted registration volume, registration fee, and all costs and capital expenditures expected during the start-up period and during the first three years of operations. Template 1 relates to Question 46 (Projections Template) in the application.

We also ask that applicants show as a separate projection (Template 2) the Financial Projections associated with a realistic Worst Case scenario. Template 2 relates to Question 49 (Contingency Planning) in the application.

For each Projection prepared, please include Comments and Notes on the bottom of the projection (in the area provided) to provide those reviewing these projections with information regarding:

1. Assumptions used, significant variances in Operating Cash Flows and Capital Expenditures from year-to-year;
2. How you plan to fund operations;
3. Contingency planning

As you complete Template 1 and Template 2, please reference data points and/or formulas used in your calculations (where appropriate).

Section I – Projected Cash inflows and outflows

Projected Cash Inflows

Lines A and B. Provide the number of forecasted registrations and the registration fee for years 1, 2, and 3. Leave the Start-up column blank. The start-up period is for cash costs and capital expenditures only; there should be no cash projections input to this column.

Line C. Multiply lines A and B to arrive at the Registration Cash Inflow for line C.

Line D. Provide projected cash inflows from any other revenue source for years 1, 2, and 3. For any figures provided on line D, please disclose the source in the Comments/Notes box of Section I. Note, do not include funding in Line D as that is covered in Section VI.

Line E. Add lines C and D to arrive at the total cash inflow.

Projected Operating Cash Outflows

Start up costs - For all line items (F thru L) Please describe the total period of time this start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.
Line F. Provide the projected labor costs for marketing, customer support, and technical support for start-up, year 1, year 2, and year 3. Note, other labor costs should be put in line L (Other Costs) and specify the type of labor and associated projected costs in the Comments/Notes box of this section.

Line G. Marketing Costs represent the amount spent on advertising, promotions, and other marketing activities. This amount should not include labor costs included in Marketing Labor (line F).

Lines H through K. Provide projected costs for facilities, G&A, interests and taxes, and Outsourcing for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Be sure to list the type of activities that are being outsourced. You may combine certain activities from the same provider as long as an appropriate description of the services being combined is listed in the Comments/Notes box.

Line L. Provide any other projected operating costs for start-up, year 1, year 2, year 3. Be sure to specify the type of cost in the Comments/Notes box.

Line M. Add lines F through L to arrive at the total costs for line M.

Line N. Subtract line E from line M to arrive at the projected net operation number for line N.

Section Ila – Breakout of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows

Line A. Provide the projected variable operating cash outflows including labor and other costs that are not fixed in nature. Variable operating cash outflows are expenditures that fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations.

Line B. Provide the projected fixed operating cash outflows. Fixed operating cash outflows are expenditures that do not generally fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations. Such costs are generally necessary to be incurred in order to operate the base line operations of the organization or are expected to be incurred based on contractual commitments.

Line C – Add lines A and B to arrive at total Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows for line C. This must equal Total Operating Cash Outflows from Section I, Line M.

Section IIb – Breakout of Critical Registry Function Operating Cash Outflows

Lines A – E. Provide the projected cash outflows for the five critical registry functions. If these functions are outsourced, the component of the outsourcing fee representing these functions must be separately identified and provided. These costs are based on the applicant’s cost to manage these functions and should be calculated separately from the Continued Operations Instrument (COI) for Question 50.

Line F. If there are other critical registry functions based on the applicant’s registry business model then the projected cash outflow for this function must be provided with a description added to the Comments/Notes box. This projected cash outflow may also be included in the 3-year reserve.

Line G. Add lines A through F to arrive at the Total Critical Registry Function Cash Outflows.
Section III – Projected Capital Expenditures

Lines A through C. Provide projected hardware, software, and furniture & equipment capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line D. Provide any projected capital expenditures as a result of outsourcing. This should be included for start-up and years 1, 2, and 3. Specify the type of expenditure and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box of Section III.

Line E – Please describe “other” capital expenditures in the Comments/Notes box.

Line F. Add lines A through E to arrive at the Total Capital Expenditures.

Section IV – Projected Assets & Liabilities

Lines A through C. Provide projected cash, account receivables, and other current assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For Other Current Assets, specify the type of asset and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line D. Add lines A, B, C to arrive at the Total Current Assets.

Lines E through G. Provide projected accounts payable, short-term debt, and other current liabilities for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For Other Current Liabilities, specify the type of liability and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line H. Add lines E through G to arrive at the total current liabilities.

Lines I through K. Provide the projected fixed assets (PP&E), the 3-year reserve, and long-term assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line L. Add lines I through K to arrive at the total long-term assets.

Line M. Provide the projected long-term debt for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Section V – Projected Cash Flow

Cash flow is driven by Projected Net Operations (Section I), Projected Capital Expenditures (Section III), and Projected Assets & Liabilities (Section IV).

Line A. Provide the projected net operating cash flows for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.
Line B. Provide the projected capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box of Section V.

Lines C through F. Provide the projected change in non-cash current assets, total current liabilities, debt adjustments, and other adjustments for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line G. Add lines A through F to arrive at the projected net cash flow for line H.

Section VI – Sources of Funds

Lines A & B. Provide projected funds from debt and equity at start-up. Describe the sources of debt and equity funding as well as the total period of time the start-up is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box. Please also provide evidence the funding (e.g., letter of commitment).

Line C. Add lines A and B to arrive at the total sources of funds for line C.

General Comments – Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.

Provide explanations for any significant variances between years (or expected in years beyond the timeframe of the template) in any category of costing or funding.

General Comments – Regarding how the Applicant Plans to Fund Operations

Provide general comments explaining how you will fund operations. Funding should be explained in detail in response to question 48.

General Comments – Regarding Contingencies

Provide general comments to describe your contingency planning. Contingency planning should be explained in detail in response to question 49.
### TLD Applicant – Financial Projections: Sample

**General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.)**

We have reviewed the data and projections provided by the Applicant and have found them to be well-supported and reasonable. The projections are based on a thorough understanding of the Applicant's business model, and the assumptions used in the projections are well-documented. The projections include a detailed analysis of the Applicant's revenue streams and cost structures, and the assumptions used in the projections are based on industry standards and best practices. We have also reviewed the Applicant's financial statements and have found them to be consistent with the projections.

We have also reviewed the Applicant's business plan and have found it to be well-written and detailed. The business plan includes a thorough analysis of the Applicant's market and competition, and the projections are based on a thorough understanding of the Applicant's business model. The projections include a detailed analysis of the Applicant's revenue streams and cost structures, and the assumptions used in the projections are based on industry standards and best practices. We have also reviewed the Applicant's financial statements and have found them to be consistent with the projections.

We recommend that the Applicant submit the financial projections provided in this report to the relevant authorities as part of its application. The financial projections provide a clear and comprehensive picture of the Applicant's financial situation and are an important part of the Applicant's application. We also recommend that the Applicant continue to monitor its financial performance and update the financial projections as necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A)</td>
<td>I)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V)</td>
<td>IV)</td>
<td>Breakout</td>
<td>Breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E)</td>
<td>K)</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M)</td>
<td>D)</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C)</td>
<td>A)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A)</td>
<td>D)</td>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C)</td>
<td>A)</td>
<td>A)</td>
<td>A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**

- Item iii) {list
- Item vi) {list
- Item iv) {list

**Changes:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Breakout:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Budget:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Forecasted:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Registration:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Total:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Critical Function:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Domain:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Outsourcing:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Technology:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Term:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Zone:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list

**Zone:**

- Item i) {list
- Item ii) {list
- Item iii) {list
## Template 2: Financial Projections: Worst Case

### In local currency (unless noted otherwise)

#### Startup Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference / Formula</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a)</td>
<td>Projected Cash inflows and outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b)</td>
<td>A) Forecasted registration volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c)</td>
<td>B) Registration fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d)</td>
<td>C) Registration cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e)</td>
<td>D) Other cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f)</td>
<td>E) Total-Cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g)</td>
<td>Projected Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h)</td>
<td>F) Operating Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a)</td>
<td>G) Total Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b)</td>
<td>A) Total Fixed Operating Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c)</td>
<td>B) Total Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a)</td>
<td>II) Break out of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b)</td>
<td>A) Total Variable Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c)</td>
<td>B) Total Fixed Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d)</td>
<td>C) Total Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a)</td>
<td>III) Projected Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b)</td>
<td>A) Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c)</td>
<td>B) Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d)</td>
<td>C) Furniture &amp; Other Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e)</td>
<td>D) Outsourcing Capital Expenditures, if any (list the type of capital expenditure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f)</td>
<td>E) Total Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a)</td>
<td>IV) Projected Assets &amp; Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b)</td>
<td>A) Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c)</td>
<td>B) Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d)</td>
<td>C) Other current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e)</td>
<td>D) Total Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f)</td>
<td>E) Accounts payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5g)</td>
<td>F) Short-term Debts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h)</td>
<td>G) Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5i)</td>
<td>H) Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5j)</td>
<td>I) Property, Plant &amp; Equipment (PP&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5k)</td>
<td>J) Total Non-current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5l)</td>
<td>A) Total Non-current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m)</td>
<td>N) Total Long-term Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a)</td>
<td>V) Projected Cash Flow (excl. 3-year Reserve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b)</td>
<td>A) Net operating cash flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c)</td>
<td>B) Capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d)</td>
<td>C) Change in Non-Cash Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e)</td>
<td>D) Change in Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f)</td>
<td>E) Debt Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g)</td>
<td>F) Other Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h)</td>
<td>H) Projected Net cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a)</td>
<td>VI) Sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b)</td>
<td>A) Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c)</td>
<td>B) Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d)</td>
<td>C) Total Sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.)

#### General Comments regarding how the Applicant plans to fund ongoing operations:

#### General Comments regarding contingencies:

---

**General Comments**: The above table outlines the financial projections for the worst-case scenario, detailing projected cash inflows, operating cash outflows, capital expenditures, assets, liabilities, cash flow, and sources of funds. The table is designed to help applicants understand their financial requirements and plan accordingly.
Module 3
Objection Procedures

This module describes two types of mechanisms that may affect an application:

I. The procedure by which ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee may provide GAC Advice on New gTLDs to the ICANN Board of Directors concerning a specific application. This module describes the purpose of this procedure, and how GAC Advice on New gTLDs is considered by the ICANN Board once received.

II. The dispute resolution procedure triggered by a formal objection to an application by a third party. This module describes the purpose of the objection and dispute resolution mechanisms, the grounds for lodging a formal objection to a gTLD application, the general procedures for filing or responding to an objection, and the manner in which dispute resolution proceedings are conducted.

This module also discusses the guiding principles, or standards, that each dispute resolution panel will apply in reaching its expert determination.

All applicants should be aware of the possibility that a formal objection may be filed against any application, and of the procedures and options available in the event of such an objection.

3.1 GAC Advice on New gTLDs

ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee was formed to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN’s policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues.

The process for GAC Advice on New gTLDs is intended to address applications that are identified by governments to be problematic, e.g., that potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities.

GAC members can raise concerns about any application to the GAC. The GAC as a whole will consider concerns
raised by GAC members, and agree on GAC advice to forward to the ICANN Board of Directors.

The GAC can provide advice on any application. For the Board to be able to consider the GAC advice during the evaluation process, the GAC advice would have to be submitted by the close of the Objection Filing Period (see Module 1).

GAC Advice may take one of the following forms:

I. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

II. The GAC advises ICANN that there are concerns about a particular application “dot-example.” The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns. The ICANN Board is also expected to provide a rationale for its decision.

III. The GAC advises ICANN that an application should not proceed unless remediated. This will raise a strong presumption for the Board that the application should not proceed unless there is a remediation method available in the Guidebook (such as securing the approval of one or more governments), that is implemented by the applicant.

Where GAC Advice on New gTLDs is received by the Board concerning an application, ICANN will publish the Advice and endeavor to notify the relevant applicant(s) promptly. The applicant will have a period of 21 calendar days from the publication date in which to submit a response to the ICANN Board.

ICANN will consider the GAC Advice on New gTLDs as soon as practicable. The Board may consult with independent experts, such as those designated to hear objections in the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure, in cases where the issues raised in the GAC advice are pertinent to one of the subject matter areas of the objection procedures. The receipt of GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process).
3.2 Public Objection and Dispute Resolution Process

The independent dispute resolution process is designed to protect certain interests and rights. The process provides a path for formal objections during evaluation of the applications. It allows a party with standing to have its objection considered before a panel of qualified experts.

A formal objection can be filed only on four enumerated grounds, as described in this module. A formal objection initiates a dispute resolution proceeding. In filing an application for a gTLD, the applicant agrees to accept the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process. Similarly, an objector accepts the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process by filing its objection.

As described in section 3.1 above, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee has a designated process for providing advice to the ICANN Board of Directors on matters affecting public policy issues, and these objection procedures would not be applicable in such a case. The GAC may provide advice on any topic and is not limited to the grounds for objection enumerated in the public objection and dispute resolution process.

3.2.1 Grounds for Objection

A formal objection may be filed on any one of the following four grounds:

**String Confusion Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string is confusingly similar to an existing TLD or to another applied-for gTLD string in the same round of applications.

**Legal Rights Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string infringes the existing legal rights of the objector.

**Limited Public Interest Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law.

**Community Objection** – There is substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

The rationales for these objection grounds are discussed in the final report of the ICANN policy development process for new gTLDs. For more information on this process, see...
3.2.2 Standing to Object

Objectors must satisfy standing requirements to have their objections considered. As part of the dispute proceedings, all objections will be reviewed by a panel of experts designated by the applicable Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) to determine whether the objector has standing to object. Standing requirements for the four objection grounds are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection ground</th>
<th>Who may object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String confusion</td>
<td>Existing TLD operator or gTLD applicant in current round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the case where an IDN ccTLD Fast Track request has been submitted before the public posting of gTLD applications received, and the Fast Track requestor wishes to file a string confusion objection to a gTLD application, the Fast Track requestor will be granted standing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights</td>
<td>Rightsholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public interest</td>
<td>No limitations on who may file – however, subject to a “quick look” designed for early conclusion of frivolous and/or abusive objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Established institution associated with a clearly delineated community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.1 String Confusion Objection

Two types of entities have standing to object:

- An existing TLD operator may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the TLD that it currently operates.

- Any gTLD applicant in this application round may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the gTLD for which it has applied, where string confusion between the two applicants has not already been found in the Initial Evaluation. That is, an applicant does not have standing to object to another application with which it is already in a contention set as a result of the Initial Evaluation.

In the case where an existing TLD operator successfully asserts string confusion with an applicant, the application will be rejected.

In the case where a gTLD applicant successfully asserts string confusion with another applicant, the only possible
outcome is for both applicants to be placed in a contention set and to be referred to a contention resolution procedure (refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures). If an objection by one gTLD applicant to another gTLD application is unsuccessful, the applicants may both move forward in the process without being considered in direct contention with one another.

3.2.2.2 Legal Rights Objection

A rightsholder has standing to file a legal rights objection. The source and documentation of the existing legal rights the objector is claiming (which may include either registered or unregistered trademarks) are infringed by the applied-for gTLD must be included in the filing.

An intergovernmental organization (IGO) is eligible to file a legal rights objection if it meets the criteria for registration of a .INT domain name:

a) An international treaty between or among national governments must have established the organization; and

b) The organization that is established must be widely considered to have independent international legal personality and must be the subject of and governed by international law.

The specialized agencies of the UN and the organizations having observer status at the UN General Assembly are also recognized as meeting the criteria.

3.2.2.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

Anyone may file a Limited Public Interest Objection. Due to the inclusive standing base, however, objectors are subject to a “quick look” procedure designed to identify and eliminate frivolous and/or abusive objections. An objection found to be manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object may be dismissed at any time.

A Limited Public Interest objection would be manifestly unfounded if it did not fall within one of the categories that have been defined as the grounds for such an objection (see subsection 3.5.3).

A Limited Public Interest objection that is manifestly unfounded may also be an abuse of the right to object. An objection may be framed to fall within one of the

---

1 See also http://www.iana.org/domains/int/policy/.
accepted categories for Limited Public Interest objections, but other facts may clearly show that the objection is abusive. For example, multiple objections filed by the same or related parties against a single applicant may constitute harassment of the applicant, rather than a legitimate defense of legal norms that are recognized under general principles of international law. An objection that attacks the applicant, rather than the applied-for string, could be an abuse of the right to object.2

The quick look is the Panel’s first task, after its appointment by the DRSP and is a review on the merits of the objection. The dismissal of an objection that is manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object would be an Expert Determination, rendered in accordance with Article 21 of the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure.

In the case where the quick look review does lead to the dismissal of the objection, the proceedings that normally follow the initial submissions (including payment of the full advance on costs) will not take place, and it is currently contemplated that the filing fee paid by the applicant would be refunded, pursuant to Procedure Article 14(e).

### 3.2.2.4 Community Objection

Established institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection. The community named by the objector must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection. To qualify for standing for a community objection, the objector must prove both of the following:

---

2 The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights offers specific examples of how the term “manifestly ill-founded” has been interpreted in disputes relating to human rights. Article 35(3) of the European Convention on Human Rights provides: “The Court shall declare inadmissible any individual application submitted under Article 34 which it considers incompatible with the provisions of the Convention or the protocols thereto, manifestly ill-founded, or an abuse of the right of application.” The ECHR renders reasoned decisions on admissibility, pursuant to Article 35 of the Convention. (Its decisions are published on the Court’s website [http://www.echr.coe.int](http://www.echr.coe.int).) In some cases, the Court briefly states the facts and the law and then announces its decision, without discussion or analysis. E.g., Decision as to the Admissibility of Application No. 34328/96 by Egbert Peree against the Netherlands (1998). In other cases, the Court reviews the facts and the relevant legal rules in detail, providing an analysis to support its conclusion on the admissibility of an application. Examples of such decisions regarding applications alleging violations of Article 10 of the Convention (freedom of expression) include: Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65831/01 présentée par Roger Garaudy contre la France (2003); Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65297/01 présentée par Eduardo Fernando Alves Costa contre le Portugal (2004).

The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights also provides examples of the abuse of the right of application being sanctioned, in accordance with ECHR Article 35(3). See, for example, Décision partielle sur la recevabilité de la requête no 61164/00 présentée par Gérard Duringer et autres contre la France et de la requête no 18589/02 contre la France (2003).
It is an established institution - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- Level of global recognition of the institution;
- Length of time the institution has been in existence; and
- Public historical evidence of its existence, such as the presence of a formal charter or national or international registration, or validation by a government, inter-governmental organization, or treaty. The institution must not have been established solely in conjunction with the gTLD application process.

It has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- The presence of mechanisms for participation in activities, membership, and leadership;
- Institutional purpose related to the benefit of the associated community;
- Performance of regular activities that benefit the associated community; and
- The level of formal boundaries around the community.

The panel will perform a balancing of the factors listed above, as well as other relevant information, in making its determination. It is not expected that an objector must demonstrate satisfaction of each and every factor considered in order to satisfy the standing requirements.

3.2.3 Dispute Resolution Service Providers

To trigger a dispute resolution proceeding, an objection must be filed by the posted deadline date, directly with the appropriate DRSP for each objection ground.

- The International Centre for Dispute Resolution has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to string confusion objections.
- The Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to legal rights objections.
• The International Center of Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to Limited Public Interest and Community Objections.

ICANN selected DRSPs on the basis of their relevant experience and expertise, as well as their willingness and ability to administer disputes in the new gTLD Program. The selection process began with a public call for expressions of interest followed by dialogue with those candidates who responded. The call for expressions of interest specified several criteria for providers, including established services, subject matter expertise, global capacity, and operational capabilities. An important aspect of the selection process was the ability to recruit panelists who will engender the respect of the parties to the dispute.

3.2.4 Options in the Event of Objection

Applicants whose applications are the subject of an objection have the following options:

The applicant can work to reach a settlement with the objector, resulting in withdrawal of the objection or the application;

The applicant can file a response to the objection and enter the dispute resolution process (refer to Section 3.2); or

The applicant can withdraw, in which case the objector will prevail by default and the application will not proceed further.

If for any reason the applicant does not file a response to an objection, the objector will prevail by default.

3.2.5 Independent Objector

A formal objection to a gTLD application may also be filed by the Independent Objector (IO). The IO does not act on behalf of any particular persons or entities, but acts solely in the best interests of the public who use the global Internet.

In light of this public interest goal, the Independent Objector is limited to filing objections on the grounds of Limited Public Interest and Community.

---

Neither ICANN staff nor the ICANN Board of Directors has authority to direct or require the IO to file or not file any particular objection. If the IO determines that an objection should be filed, he or she will initiate and prosecute the objection in the public interest.

**Mandate and Scope** - The IO may file objections against “highly objectionable” gTLD applications to which no objection has been filed. The IO is limited to filing two types of objections: (1) Limited Public Interest objections and (2) Community objections. The IO is granted standing to file objections on these enumerated grounds, notwithstanding the regular standing requirements for such objections (see subsection 3.1.2).

The IO may file a Limited Public Interest objection against an application even if a Community objection has been filed, and vice versa.

The IO may file an objection against an application, notwithstanding the fact that a String Confusion objection or a Legal Rights objection was filed.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, the IO is not permitted to file an objection to an application where an objection has already been filed on the same ground.

The IO may consider public comment when making an independent assessment whether an objection is warranted. The IO will have access to application comments received during the comment period.

In light of the public interest goal noted above, the IO shall not object to an application unless at least one comment in opposition to the application is made in the public sphere.

**Selection** - The IO will be selected by ICANN, through an open and transparent process, and retained as an independent consultant. The Independent Objector will be an individual with considerable experience and respect in the Internet community, unaffiliated with any gTLD applicant.

Although recommendations for IO candidates from the community are welcomed, the IO must be and remain independent and unaffiliated with any of the gTLD applicants. The various rules of ethics for judges and international arbitrators provide models for the IO to declare and maintain his/her independence.
The IO’s (renewable) tenure is limited to the time necessary to carry out his/her duties in connection with a single round of gTLD applications.

**Budget and Funding** - The IO’s budget would comprise two principal elements: (a) salaries and operating expenses, and (b) dispute resolution procedure costs – both of which should be funded from the proceeds of new gTLD applications.

As an objector in dispute resolution proceedings, the IO is required to pay filing and administrative fees, as well as advance payment of costs, just as all other objectors are required to do. Those payments will be refunded by the DRSP in cases where the IO is the prevailing party.

In addition, the IO will incur various expenses in presenting objections before DRSP panels that will not be refunded, regardless of the outcome. These expenses include the fees and expenses of outside counsel (if retained) and the costs of legal research or factual investigations.

### 3.3 Filing Procedures

The information included in this section provides a summary of procedures for filing:

- Objections; and
- Responses to objections.

For a comprehensive statement of filing requirements applicable generally, refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”) included as an attachment to this module. In the event of any discrepancy between the information presented in this module and the Procedure, the Procedure shall prevail.

Note that the rules and procedures of each DRSP specific to each objection ground must also be followed. See [http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution).

#### 3.3.1 Objection Filing Procedures

The procedures outlined in this subsection must be followed by any party wishing to file a formal objection to an application that has been posted by ICANN. Should an applicant wish to file a formal objection to another gTLD application, it would follow these same procedures.

- All objections must be filed electronically with the appropriate DRSP by the posted deadline date.
Objections will not be accepted by the DRSPs after this date.

- All objections must be filed in English.
- Each objection must be filed separately. An objector wishing to object to several applications must file a separate objection and pay the accompanying filing fees for each application that is the subject of an objection. If an objector wishes to object to an application on more than one ground, the objector must file separate objections and pay the accompanying filing fees for each objection ground.

Each objection filed by an objector must include:

- The name and contact information of the objector.
- A statement of the objector’s basis for standing; that is, why the objector believes it meets the standing requirements to object.
- A description of the basis for the objection, including:
  - A statement giving the specific ground upon which the objection is being filed.
  - A detailed explanation of the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld.
- Copies of any documents that the objector considers to be a basis for the objection.

Objections are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

An objector must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the applicant.

The DRSP will publish, and regularly update a list on its website identifying all objections as they are filed. ICANN will post on its website a notice of all objections filed once the objection filing period has closed.

### 3.3.2 Objection Filing Fees

At the time an objection is filed, the objector is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP. If the filing fee is not paid, the DRSP will
dismiss the objection without prejudice. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 regarding fees.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs (see subsection 3.4.7 below) is available to the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). Funding for ALAC objection filing and dispute resolution fees is contingent on publication by ALAC of its approved process for considering and making objections. At a minimum, the process for objecting to a gTLD application will require: bottom-up development of potential objections, discussion and approval of objections at the Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) level, and a process for consideration and approval of the objection by the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs, is available to individual national governments in the amount of USD 50,000 with the guarantee that a minimum of one objection per government will be fully funded by ICANN where requested. ICANN will develop a procedure for application and disbursement of funds.

Funding available from ICANN is to cover costs payable to the dispute resolution service provider and made directly to the dispute resolution service provider; it does not cover other costs such as fees for legal advice.

### 3.3.3 Response Filing Procedures

Upon notification that ICANN has published the list of all objections filed (refer to subsection 3.3.1), the DRSPs will notify the parties that responses must be filed within 30 calendar days of receipt of that notice. DRSPs will not accept late responses. Any applicant that fails to respond to an objection within the 30-day response period will be in default, which will result in the objector prevailing.

- All responses must be filed in English.

- Each response must be filed separately. That is, an applicant responding to several objections must file a separate response and pay the accompanying filing fee to respond to each objection.

- Responses must be filed electronically.

Each response filed by an applicant must include:

- The name and contact information of the applicant.
• A point-by-point response to the claims made by the objector.

• Any copies of documents that it considers to be a basis for the response.

Responses are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

Each applicant must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the objector.

### 3.3.4 Response Filing Fees

At the time an applicant files its response, it is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP, which will be the same as the filing fee paid by the objector. If the filing fee is not paid, the response will be disregarded, which will result in the objector prevailing.

### 3.4 Objection Processing Overview

The information below provides an overview of the process by which DRSPs administer dispute proceedings that have been initiated. For comprehensive information, please refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (included as an attachment to this module).

#### 3.4.1 Administrative Review

Each DRSP will conduct an administrative review of each objection for compliance with all procedural rules within 14 calendar days of receiving the objection. Depending on the number of objections received, the DRSP may ask ICANN for a short extension of this deadline.

If the DRSP finds that the objection complies with procedural rules, the objection will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue. If the DRSP finds that the objection does not comply with procedural rules, the DRSP will dismiss the objection and close the proceedings without prejudice to the objector’s right to submit a new objection that complies with procedural rules. The DRSP’s review or rejection of the objection will not interrupt the time limit for filing an objection.

#### 3.4.2 Consolidation of Objections

Once the DRSP receives and processes all objections, at its discretion the DRSP may elect to consolidate certain objections. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon
consolidation prior to issuing its notice to applicants that the response should be filed and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

An example of a circumstance in which consolidation might occur is multiple objections to the same application based on the same ground.

In assessing whether to consolidate objections, the DRSP will weigh the efficiencies in time, money, effort, and consistency that may be gained by consolidation against the prejudice or inconvenience consolidation may cause. The DRSPs will endeavor to have all objections resolved on a similar timeline. It is intended that no sequencing of objections will be established.

New gTLD applicants and objectors also will be permitted to propose consolidation of objections, but it will be at the DRSP’s discretion whether to agree to the proposal.

ICANN continues to strongly encourage all of the DRSPs to consolidate matters whenever practicable.

### 3.4.3 Mediation

The parties to a dispute resolution proceeding are encouraged—but not required—to participate in mediation aimed at settling the dispute. Each DRSP has experts who can be retained as mediators to facilitate this process, should the parties elect to do so, and the DRSPs will communicate with the parties concerning this option and any associated fees.

If a mediator is appointed, that person may not serve on the panel constituted to issue an expert determination in the related dispute.

There are no automatic extensions of time associated with the conduct of negotiations or mediation. The parties may submit joint requests for extensions of time to the DRSP according to its procedures, and the DRSP or the panel, if appointed, will decide whether to grant the requests, although extensions will be discouraged. Absent exceptional circumstances, the parties must limit their requests for extension to 30 calendar days.

The parties are free to negotiate without mediation at any time, or to engage a mutually acceptable mediator of their own accord.
3.4.4 Selection of Expert Panels

A panel will consist of appropriately qualified experts appointed to each proceeding by the designated DRSP. Experts must be independent of the parties to a dispute resolution proceeding. Each DRSP will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an expert for lack of independence.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a string confusion objection.

There will be one expert, or, if all parties agree, three experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an existing legal rights objection.

There will be three experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, with expertise in relevant fields as appropriate, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest objection.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a community objection.

Neither the experts, the DRSP, ICANN, nor their respective employees, directors, or consultants will be liable to any party in any action for damages or injunctive relief for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding under the dispute resolution procedures.

3.4.5 Adjudication

The panel may decide whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the filed objection and response, and may specify time limits for such submissions.

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the panel may require a party to produce additional evidence.

Disputes will usually be resolved without an in-person hearing. The panel may decide to hold such a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

3.4.6 Expert Determination

The DRSPs' final expert determinations will be in writing and will include:

- A summary of the dispute and findings;
• An identification of the prevailing party; and
• The reasoning upon which the expert determination is based.

Unless the panel decides otherwise, each DRSP will publish all decisions rendered by its panels in full on its website.

The findings of the panel will be considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process.

3.4.7 Dispute Resolution Costs

Before acceptance of objections, each DRSP will publish a schedule of costs or statement of how costs will be calculated for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure. These costs cover the fees and expenses of the members of the panel and the DRSP’s administrative costs.

ICANN expects that string confusion and legal rights objection proceedings will involve a fixed amount charged by the panelists while Limited Public Interest and community objection proceedings will involve hourly rates charged by the panelists.

Within ten (10) calendar days of constituting the panel, the DRSP will estimate the total costs and request advance payment in full of its costs from both the objector and the applicant. Each party must make its advance payment within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the parties will be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of costs.

The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the resolution proceedings.

Additional fees may be required in specific circumstances; for example, if the DRSP receives supplemental submissions or elects to hold a hearing.

If an objector fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will dismiss its objection and no fees paid by the objector will be refunded.

If an applicant fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will sustain the objection and no fees paid by the applicant will be refunded.
After the hearing has taken place and the panel renders its expert determination, the DRSP will refund the advance payment of costs to the prevailing party.

3.5 Dispute Resolution Principles (Standards)

Each panel will use appropriate general principles (standards) to evaluate the merits of each objection. The principles for adjudication on each type of objection are specified in the paragraphs that follow. The panel may also refer to other relevant rules of international law in connection with the standards.

The objector bears the burden of proof in each case.

The principles outlined below are subject to evolution based on ongoing consultation with DRSPs, legal experts, and the public.

3.5.1 String Confusion Objection

A DRSP panel hearing a string confusion objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For a likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

3.5.2 Legal Rights Objection

In interpreting and giving meaning to GNSO Recommendation 3 ("Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law"), a DRSP panel of experts presiding over a legal rights objection will determine whether the potential use of the applied-for gTLD by the applicant takes unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s registered or unregistered trademark or service mark (“mark”) or IGO name or acronym (as identified in the treaty establishing the organization), or unjustifiably impairs the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym, or otherwise creates an impermissible likelihood of confusion between the applied-for gTLD and the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym.
In the case where the objection is based on trademark rights, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive factors:

1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound, or meaning, to the objector's existing mark.
2. Whether the objector's acquisition and use of rights in the mark has been bona fide.
3. Whether and to what extent there is recognition in the relevant sector of the public of the sign corresponding to the gTLD, as the mark of the objector, of the applicant or of a third party.
4. Applicant's intent in applying for the gTLD, including whether the applicant, at the time of application for the gTLD, had knowledge of the objector's mark, or could not have reasonably been unaware of that mark, and including whether the applicant has engaged in a pattern of conduct whereby it applied for or operates TLDs or registrations in TLDs which are identical or confusingly similar to the marks of others.
5. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the gTLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise by the objector of its mark rights.
6. Whether the applicant has marks or other intellectual property rights in the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and, if so, whether any acquisition of such a right in the sign, and use of the sign, has been bona fide, and whether the purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent with such acquisition or use.
7. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide.
8. Whether the applicant's intended use of the gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objector's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the gTLD.
In the case where a legal rights objection has been filed by an IGO, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive factors:

1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound or meaning, to the name or acronym of the objecting IGO;

2. Historical coexistence of the IGO and the applicant’s use of a similar name or acronym. Factors considered may include:
   a. Level of global recognition of both entities;
   b. Length of time the entities have been in existence;
   c. Public historical evidence of their existence, which may include whether the objecting IGO has communicated its name or abbreviation under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property;

3. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the TLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise of the objecting IGO’s name or acronym;

4. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the applied-for gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide; and

5. Whether the applicant’s intended use of the applied-for gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objecting IGO’s name or acronym as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the TLD.

3.5.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

An expert panel hearing a Limited Public Interest objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to general principles of international law for morality and public order.

Examples of instruments containing such general principles include:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)
• The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
• The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
• The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
• Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women
• The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights
• The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
• The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families
• Slavery Convention
• Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
• Convention on the Rights of the Child

Note that these are included to serve as examples, rather than an exhaustive list. It should be noted that these instruments vary in their ratification status. Additionally, states may limit the scope of certain provisions through reservations and declarations indicating how they will interpret and apply certain provisions. National laws not based on principles of international law are not a valid ground for a Limited Public Interest objection.

Under these principles, everyone has the right to freedom of expression, but the exercise of this right carries with it special duties and responsibilities. Accordingly, certain limited restrictions may apply.

The grounds upon which an applied-for gTLD string may be considered contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law are:

• Incitement to or promotion of violent lawless action;
• Incitement to or promotion of discrimination based upon race, color, gender, ethnicity, religion or national origin, or other similar types of...
discrimination that violate generally accepted legal norms recognized under principles of international law;

- Incitement to or promotion of child pornography or other sexual abuse of children; or

- A determination that an applied-for gTLD string would be contrary to specific principles of international law as reflected in relevant international instruments of law.

The panel will conduct its analysis on the basis of the applied-for gTLD string itself. The panel may, if needed, use as additional context the intended purpose of the TLD as stated in the application.

3.5.4 Community Objection

The four tests described here will enable a DRSP panel to determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted. For an objection to be successful, the objector must prove that:

- The community invoked by the objector is a clearly delineated community; and

- Community opposition to the application is substantial; and

- There is a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string; and

- The application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Each of these tests is described in further detail below.

Community - The objector must prove that the community expressing opposition can be regarded as a clearly delineated community. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine this, including but not limited to:

- The level of public recognition of the group as a community at a local and/or global level;

- The level of formal boundaries around the community and what persons or entities are considered to form the community;
• The length of time the community has been in existence;
• The global distribution of the community (this may not apply if the community is territorial); and
• The number of people or entities that make up the community.

If opposition by a number of people/entities is found, but the group represented by the objector is not determined to be a clearly delineated community, the objection will fail.

**Substantial Opposition** - The objector must prove substantial opposition within the community it has identified itself as representing. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine whether there is substantial opposition, including but not limited to:

• Number of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the community;
• The representative nature of entities expressing opposition;
• Level of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition;
• Distribution or diversity among sources of expressions of opposition, including:
  - Regional
  - Subsectors of community
  - Leadership of community
  - Membership of community
• Historical defense of the community in other contexts; and
• Costs incurred by objector in expressing opposition, including other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition.

If some opposition within the community is determined, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection will fail.

**Targeting** - The objector must prove a strong association between the applied-for gTLD string and the community represented by the objector. Factors that could be
balanced by a panel to determine this include but are not limited to:

- Statements contained in application;
- Other public statements by the applicant;
- Associations by the public.

If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no strong association between the community and the applied-for gTLD string, the objection will fail.

**Detriment** - The objector must prove that the application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. An allegation of detriment that consists only of the applicant being delegated the string instead of the objector will not be sufficient for a finding of material detriment.

Factors that could be used by a panel in making this determination include but are not limited to:

- Nature and extent of damage to the reputation of the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Evidence that the applicant is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the community or of users more widely, including evidence that the applicant has not proposed or does not intend to institute effective security protection for user interests;
- Interference with the core activities of the community that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Dependence of the community represented by the objector on the DNS for its core activities;
- Nature and extent of concrete or economic damage to the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string; and
- Level of certainty that alleged detrimental outcomes would occur.
If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community resulting from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD, the objection will fail.

The objector must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to prevail.
DRAFT - New gTLD Program – Objection and Dispute Resolution

Party files objection directly with Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) for these grounds:
- String Confusion
- Legal Rights
- Limited Public Interest; and/or
- Community

Objection filing period opens

DRSPs notify applicants of relevant objections
Applicant files response and pays filing fee

Consolidation of objections, if applicable

30 Days

Objecting party notifies DRSP of objection

90 Days

DRSP appoints panel
DRSP sends estimation of costs to parties
Advance payment of costs due

30 Days

Expert Determination

DRSP and ICANN update respective websites to reflect determination

45 Days

Applicant proceeds to subsequent stage

Yes

Does applicant clear all objections?

No

Applicant withdraws

No

Objection filed with correct DRSP?

Yes

Administrative Review of objections

Yes

Objection meets procedural rules?

No

Objection dismissed

Yes

Objecting party notified of all objections filed

Objection filing period closes

DRSP posts objection details on its website

Administrative Review of objections

50 Days
These Procedures were designed with an eye toward timely and efficient dispute resolution. As part of the New gTLD Program, these Procedures apply to all proceedings administered by each of the dispute resolution service providers (DRSP). Each of the DRSPs has a specific set of rules that will also apply to such proceedings.
NEW gTLD DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

Article 1. ICANN’s New gTLD Program

(a) The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") has implemented a program for the introduction of new generic Top-Level Domain Names ("gTLDs") in the internet. There will be a succession of rounds, during which applicants may apply for new gTLDs, in accordance with terms and conditions set by ICANN.

(b) The new gTLD program includes a dispute resolution procedure, pursuant to which disputes between a person or entity who applies for a new gTLD and a person or entity who objects to that gTLD are resolved in accordance with this New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the "Procedure").

(c) Dispute resolution proceedings shall be administered by a Dispute Resolution Service Provider ("DRSP") in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) By applying for a new gTLD, an applicant accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b); by filing an objection to a new gTLD, an objector accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b). The parties cannot derogate from this Procedure without the express approval of ICANN and from the applicable DRSP Rules without the express approval of the relevant DRSP.

Article 2. Definitions

(a) The “Applicant” or “Respondent” is an entity that has applied to ICANN for a new gTLD and that will be the party responding to the Objection.

(b) The “Objector” is one or more persons or entities who have filed an objection against a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted.

(c) The “Panel” is the panel of Experts, comprising one or three “Experts,” that has been constituted by a DRSP in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) The “Expert Determination” is the decision upon the merits of the Objection that is rendered by a Panel in a proceeding conducted under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(e) The grounds upon which an objection to a new gTLD may be filed are set out in full in Module 3 of the Applicant Guidebook. Such grounds are identified in this Procedure, and are based upon the Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains, dated 7 August 2007, issued by the ICANN Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), as follows:

(i) “String Confusion Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential gTLD is confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or another string applied for in the same round of applications.

(ii) “Existing Legal Rights Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential new gTLD infringes the existing legal rights of others.
that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law.

(iii) “Limited Public Interest Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential new gTLD is contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law.

(iv) “Community Objection” refers to the objection that there is substantial opposition to the application from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

(f) “DRSP Rules” are the rules of procedure of a particular DRSP that have been identified as being applicable to objection proceedings under this Procedure.

Article 3. Dispute Resolution Service Providers

The various categories of disputes shall be administered by the following DRSPs:

(a) String Confusion Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution.

(b) Existing Legal Rights Objections shall be administered by the Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

(c) Limited Public Interest Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.

(d) Community Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Article 4. Applicable Rules

(a) All proceedings before the Panel shall be governed by this Procedure and by the DRSP Rules that apply to a particular category of objection. The outcome of the proceedings shall be deemed an Expert Determination, and the members of the Panel shall act as experts.

(b) The applicable DRSP Rules are the following:

(i) For a String Confusion Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the ICDR Supplementary Procedures for ICANN’s New gTLD Program.

(ii) For an Existing Legal Rights Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the WIPO Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution.

(iii) For a Limited Public Interest Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as supplemented by the ICC as needed.

(iv) For a Community Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as supplemented by the ICC as needed.

(c) In the event of any discrepancy between this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, this Procedure shall prevail.
(d) The place of the proceedings, if relevant, shall be the location of the DRSP that is administering the proceedings.

(e) In all cases, the Panel shall ensure that the parties are treated with equality, and that each party is given a reasonable opportunity to present its position.

Article 5. Language

(a) The language of all submissions and proceedings under this Procedure shall be English.

(b) Parties may submit supporting evidence in its original language, provided and subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by a certified or otherwise official English translation of all relevant text.

Article 6. Communications and Time Limits

(a) All communications by the Parties with the DRSPs and Panels must be submitted electronically. A Party that wishes to make a submission that is not available in electronic form (e.g., evidentiary models) shall request leave from the Panel to do so, and the Panel, in its sole discretion, shall determine whether to accept the non-electronic submission.

(b) The DRSP, Panel, Applicant, and Objector shall provide copies to one another of all correspondence (apart from confidential correspondence between the Panel and the DRSP and among the Panel) regarding the proceedings.

(c) For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article.

(d) For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted if it is dispatched in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article prior to or on the day of the expiration of the time limit.

(e) For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this Procedure, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a notice or other communication is received.

(f) Unless otherwise stated, all time periods provided in the Procedure are calculated on the basis of calendar days.

Article 7. Filing of the Objection

(a) A person wishing to object to a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted may file an objection ("Objection"). Any Objection to a proposed new gTLD must be filed before the published closing date for the Objection Filing period.

(b) The Objection must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Applicant.

(c) The electronic addresses for filing Objections (the specific addresses shall be made available once they are created by providers):

(i) A String Confusion Objection must be filed at: [●].
(ii) An Existing Legal Rights Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iii) A Limited Public Interest Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iv) A Community Objection must be filed at: [●].

(d) All Objections must be filed separately:

(i) An Objector who wishes to object to an application on more than one ground must file separate objections with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(ii) An Objector who wishes to object to more than one gTLD must file separate objections to each gTLD with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(e) If an Objection is filed with the wrong DRSP, that DRSP shall promptly notify the Objector of the error and that DRSP shall not process the incorrectly filed Objection. The Objector may then cure the error by filing its Objection with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice, failing which the Objection shall be disregarded. If the Objection is filed with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice but after the lapse of the time for submitting an Objection stipulation by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, it shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

Article 8. Content of the Objection

(a) The Objection shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Objector;

(ii) A statement of the Objector's basis for standing; and

(iii) A description of the basis for the Objection, including:

(aa) A statement of the ground upon which the Objection is being filed, as stated in Article 2(e) of this Procedure;

(bb) An explanation of the validity of the Objection and why the objection should be upheld.

(b) The substantive portion of the Objection shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Objector shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Objection is based.

(c) At the same time as the Objection is filed, the Objector shall pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules and include evidence of such payment in the Objection. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Objection by the DRSP, the Objection shall be dismissed without prejudice.

Article 9. Administrative Review of the Objection

(a) The DRSP shall conduct an administrative review of the Objection for the purpose of verifying compliance with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and inform the Objector, the Applicant and ICANN of the result of its review within
fourteen (14) days of its receipt of the Objection. The DRSP may extend this time limit for reasons explained in the notification of such extension.

(b) If the DRSP finds that the Objection complies with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall confirm that the Objection shall be registered for processing.

(c) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Objection be corrected within five (5) days. If the deficiencies in the Objection are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, the Objection shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

(d) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and the deficiencies in the Objection are not corrected within the period specified in Article 9(c), the DRSP shall dismiss the Objection and close the proceedings, without prejudice to the Objector's submission of a new Objection that complies with this Procedure, provided that the Objection is filed within the deadline for filing such Objections. The DRSP's review of the Objection shall not interrupt the running of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure.

(e) Immediately upon registering an Objection for processing, pursuant to Article 9(b), the DRSP shall post the following information about the Objection on its website: (i) the proposed string to which the Objection is directed; (ii) the names of the Objector and the Applicant; (iii) the grounds for the Objection; and (iv) the dates of the DRSP's receipt of the Objection.

Article 10. ICANN's Dispute Announcement

(a) Within thirty (30) days of the deadline for filing Objections in relation to gTLD applications in a given round, ICANN shall publish a document on its website identifying all of the admissible Objections that have been filed (the “Dispute Announcement”). ICANN shall also directly inform each DRSP of the posting of the Dispute Announcement.

(b) ICANN shall monitor the progress of all proceedings under this Procedure and shall take steps, where appropriate, to coordinate with any DRSP in relation to individual applications for which objections are pending before more than one DRSP.

Article 11. Response to the Objection

(a) Upon receipt of the Dispute Announcement, each DRSP shall promptly send a notice to: (i) each Applicant for a new gTLD to which one or more admissible Objections have been filed with that DRSP; and (ii) the respective Objector(s).

(b) The Applicant shall file a response to each Objection (the “Response”). The Response shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the transmission of the notice by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a).

(c) The Response must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Objector.
(d) The Response shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Applicant; and

(ii) A point-by-point response to the statements made in the Objection.

(e) The substantive portion of the Response shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Applicant shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Response is based.

(f) At the same time as the Response is filed, the Applicant shall pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP (which shall be the same as the filing fee paid by the Objector) and include evidence of such payment in the Response. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Response by the DRSP, the Applicant shall be deemed to be in default, any Response disregarded and the Objection shall be deemed successful.

(g) If the DRSP finds that the Response does not comply with Articles 11(c) and (d)(1) of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Response be corrected within five (5) days. If the administrative deficiencies in the Response are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting a Response pursuant to this Procedure, the Response shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

(g) If the Applicant fails to file a Response to the Objection within the 30-day time limit, the Applicant shall be deemed to be in default and the Objection shall be deemed successful. No fees paid by the Applicant will be refunded in case of default.

Article 12. Consolidation of Objections

(a) The DRSP is encouraged, whenever possible and practicable, and as may be further stipulated in the applicable DRSP Rules, to consolidate Objections, for example, when more than one Objector has filed an Objection to the same gTLD on the same grounds. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon consolidation prior to issuing its notice pursuant to Article 11(a) and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

(b) If the DRSP itself has not decided to consolidate two or more Objections, any Applicant or Objector may propose the consolidation of Objections within seven (7) days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a). If, following such a proposal, the DRSP decides to consolidate certain Objections, which decision must be made within 14 days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a), the deadline for the Applicant’s Response in the consolidated proceeding shall be thirty (30) days from the Applicant’s receipt of the DRSP’s notice of consolidation.

(c) In deciding whether to consolidate Objections, the DRSP shall weigh the benefits (in terms of time, cost, consistency of decisions, etc.) that may result from the consolidation against the possible prejudice or inconvenience that the consolidation may cause. The DRSP’s determination on consolidation shall be final and not subject to appeal.

(d) Objections based upon different grounds, as summarized in Article 2(e), shall not be consolidated.
Article 13. The Panel

(a) The DRSP shall select and appoint the Panel of Expert(s) within thirty (30) days after receiving the Response.

(b) Number and specific qualifications of Expert(s):

(i) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a String Confusion Objection.

(ii) There shall be one Expert or, if all of the Parties so agree, three Experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an Existing Legal Rights Objection.

(iii) There shall be three Experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, one of whom shall be designated as the Chair. The Chair shall be of a nationality different from the nationalities of the Applicant and of the Objector, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest Objection.

(iv) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a Community Objection.

(c) All Experts acting under this Procedure shall be impartial and independent of the parties. The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the manner by which each Expert shall confirm and maintain their impartiality and independence.

(d) The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the procedures for challenging an Expert and replacing an Expert.

(e) Unless required by a court of law or authorized in writing by the parties, an Expert shall not act in any capacity whatsoever, in any pending or future proceedings, whether judicial, arbitral or otherwise, relating to the matter referred to expert determination under this Procedure.

Article 14. Costs

(a) Each DRSP shall determine the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this Procedure in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules. Such costs shall cover the fees and expenses of the members of the Panel, as well as the administrative fees of the DRSP (the “Costs”).

(b) Within ten (10) days of constituting the Panel, the DRSP shall estimate the total Costs and request the Objector and the Applicant/Respondent each to pay in advance the full amount of the Costs to the DRSP. Each party shall make its advance payment of Costs within ten (10) days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the Parties shall be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of Costs.

(c) The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total Costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the proceedings.

(d) Failure to make an advance payment of Costs:

(i) If the Objector fails to make the advance payment of Costs, its Objection shall be dismissed and no fees that it has paid shall be refunded.
(ii) If the Applicant fails to make the advance payment of Costs, the Objection will be deemed to have been sustained and no fees that the Applicant has paid shall be refunded.

(e) Upon the termination of the proceedings, after the Panel has rendered its Expert Determination, the DRSP shall refund to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel, its advance payment(s) of Costs.

Article 15. Representation and Assistance

(a) The parties may be represented or assisted by persons of their choice.

(b) Each party or party representative shall communicate the name, contact information and function of such persons to the DRSP and the other party (or parties in case of consolidation).

Article 16. Negotiation and Mediation

(a) The parties are encouraged, but not required, to participate in negotiations and/or mediation at any time throughout the dispute resolution process aimed at settling their dispute amicably.

(b) Each DRSP shall be able to propose, if requested by the parties, a person who could assist the parties as mediator.

(c) A person who acts as mediator for the parties shall not serve as an Expert in a dispute between the parties under this Procedure or any other proceeding under this Procedure involving the same gTLD.

(d) The conduct of negotiations or mediation shall not, ipso facto, be the basis for a suspension of the dispute resolution proceedings or the extension of any deadline under this Procedure. Upon the joint request of the parties, the DRSP or (after it has been constituted) the Panel may grant the extension of a deadline or the suspension of the proceedings. Absent exceptional circumstances, such extension or suspension shall not exceed thirty (30) days and shall not delay the administration of any other Objection.

(e) If, during negotiations and/or mediation, the parties agree on a settlement of the matter referred to the DRSP under this Procedure, the parties shall inform the DRSP, which shall terminate the proceedings, subject to the parties' payment obligation under this Procedure having been satisfied, and inform ICANN and the parties accordingly.

Article 17. Additional Written Submissions

(a) The Panel may decide whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the Objection and the Response, and it shall fix time limits for such submissions.

(b) The time limits fixed by the Panel for additional written submissions shall not exceed thirty (30) days, unless the Panel, having consulted the DRSP, determines that exceptional circumstances justify a longer time limit.
Article 18. Evidence

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes over new gTLDs rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence.

Article 19. Hearings

(a) Disputes under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules will usually be resolved without a hearing.

(b) The Panel may decide, on its own initiative or at the request of a party, to hold a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

(c) In the event that the Panel decides to hold a hearing:
   (i) The Panel shall decide how and where the hearing shall be conducted.
   (ii) In order to expedite the proceedings and minimize costs, the hearing shall be conducted by videoconference if possible.
   (iii) The hearing shall be limited to one day, unless the Panel decides, in exceptional circumstances, that more than one day is required for the hearing.
   (iv) The Panel shall decide whether the hearing will be open to the public or conducted in private.

Article 20. Standards

(a) For each category of Objection identified in Article 2(e), the Panel shall apply the standards that have been defined by ICANN.

(b) In addition, the Panel may refer to and base its findings upon the statements and documents submitted and any rules or principles that it determines to be applicable.

(c) The Objector bears the burden of proving that its Objection should be sustained in accordance with the applicable standards.

Article 21. The Expert Determination

(a) The DRSP and the Panel shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within forty-five (45) days of the constitution of the Panel. In specific circumstances such as consolidated cases and in consultation with the DRSP, if significant additional documentation is requested by the Panel, a brief extension may be allowed.

(b) The Panel shall submit its Expert Determination in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it is signed, unless such scrutiny is specifically excluded by the applicable DRSP Rules. The modifications proposed by the DRSP to the Panel, if any, shall address only the form of the Expert Determination. The signed Expert Determination shall be communicated to the DRSP, which in turn will communicate that Expert Determination to the Parties and ICANN.

(c) When the Panel comprises three Experts, the Expert Determination shall be made by a majority of the Experts.
(d) The Expert Determination shall be in writing, shall identify the prevailing party and shall state the reasons upon which it is based. The remedies available to an Applicant or an Objector pursuant to any proceeding before a Panel shall be limited to the success or dismissal of an Objection and to the refund by the DRSP to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel in its Expert Determination, of its advance payment(s) of Costs pursuant to Article 14(e) of this Procedure and any relevant provisions of the applicable DRSP Rules.

(e) The Expert Determination shall state the date when it is made, and it shall be signed by the Expert(s). If any Expert fails to sign the Expert Determination, it shall be accompanied by a statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

(f) In addition to providing electronic copies of its Expert Determination, the Panel shall provide a signed hard copy of the Expert Determination to the DRSP, unless the DRSP Rules provide for otherwise.

(g) Unless the Panel decides otherwise, the Expert Determination shall be published in full on the DRSP’s website.

Article 22. Exclusion of Liability

In addition to any exclusion of liability stipulated by the applicable DRSP Rules, neither the Expert(s), nor the DRSP and its employees, nor ICANN and its Board members, employees and consultants shall be liable to any person for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding conducted under this Procedure.

Article 23. Modification of the Procedure

(a) ICANN may from time to time, in accordance with its Bylaws, modify this Procedure.

(b) The version of this Procedure that is applicable to a dispute resolution proceeding is the version that was in effect on the day when the relevant application for a new gTLD is submitted.
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Module 4
String Contention Procedures

This module describes situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or
2. Two or more applicants for similar gTLD strings successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes, and the similarity of the strings is identified as creating a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated.

ICANN will not approve applications for proposed gTLD strings that are identical or that would result in user confusion, called contending strings. If either situation above occurs, such applications will proceed to contention resolution through either community priority evaluation, in certain cases, or through an auction. Both processes are described in this module. A group of applications for contending strings is referred to as a contention set.

(In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.)

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

Contention sets are groups of applications containing identical or similar applied-for gTLD strings. Contention sets are identified during Initial Evaluation, following review of all applied-for gTLD strings. ICANN will publish preliminary contention sets once the String Similarity review is completed, and will update the contention sets as necessary during the evaluation and dispute resolution stages.)
Applications for identical gTLD strings will be automatically assigned to a contention set. For example, if Applicant A and Applicant B both apply for .TLDSTRING, they will be identified as being in a contention set. Such testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. That is, two or more applicants whose applied-for strings or designated variants are variant strings according to an IDN table submitted to ICANN would be considered in direct contention with one another. For example, if one applicant applies for string A and another applies for string B, and strings A and B are variant TLD strings as defined in Module 1, then the two applications are in direct contention.

The String Similarity Panel will also review the entire pool of applied-for strings to determine whether the strings proposed in any two or more applications are so similar that they would create a probability of user confusion if allowed to coexist in the DNS. The panel will make such a determination for each pair of applied-for gTLD strings. The outcome of the String Similarity review described in Module 2 is the identification of contention sets among applications that have direct or indirect contention relationships with one another.

Two strings are in **direct contention** if they are identical or similar to one another. More than two applicants might be represented in a direct contention situation: if four different applicants applied for the same gTLD string, they would all be in direct contention with one another.

Two strings are in **indirect contention** if they are both in direct contention with a third string, but not with one another. The example that follows explains direct and indirect contention in greater detail.

In Figure 4-1, Strings A and B are an example of direct contention. Strings C and G are an example of indirect contention. C and G both contend with B, but not with one another. The figure as a whole is one contention set. A contention set consists of all applications that are linked by string contention to one another, directly or indirectly.
While preliminary contention sets are determined during Initial Evaluation, the final configuration of the contention sets can only be established once the evaluation and dispute resolution process stages have concluded. This is because any application excluded through those processes might modify a contention set identified earlier.

A contention set may be augmented, split into two sets, or eliminated altogether as a result of an Extended Evaluation or dispute resolution proceeding. The composition of a contention set may also be modified as some applications may be voluntarily withdrawn throughout the process.

Refer to Figure 4-2: In contention set 1, applications D and G are eliminated. Application A is the only remaining application, so there is no contention left to resolve.

In contention set 2, all applications successfully complete Extended Evaluation and Dispute Resolution, so the original contention set remains to be resolved.

In contention set 3, application F is eliminated. Since application F was in direct contention with E and J, but E and J are not in contention with one other, the original contention set splits into two sets: one containing E and K in direct contention, and one containing I and J.
Figure 4-2 – Resolution of string contention cannot begin until all applicants within a contention set have completed all applicable previous stages.

The remaining contention cases must then be resolved through community priority evaluation or by other means, depending on the circumstances. In the string contention resolution stage, ICANN addresses each contention set to achieve an unambiguous resolution.

As described elsewhere in this guidebook, cases of contention might be resolved by community priority evaluation or an agreement among the parties. Absent that, the last-resort contention resolution mechanism will be an auction.

4.1.2 Impact of String Confusion Dispute Resolution Proceedings on Contention Sets

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application (refer to Module 3), and the panel finds that user confusion is probable (that is, finds in favor of the objector), the two applications will be placed in direct contention with each other. Thus, the outcome of a dispute resolution proceeding based on a string confusion objection would be a new contention set structure for the relevant applications, augmenting the original contention set.

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application, and the panel finds that string
confusion does not exist (that is, finds in favor of the responding applicant), the two applications will not be considered in direct contention with one another.

A dispute resolution outcome in the case of a string confusion objection filed by another applicant will not result in removal of an application from a previously established contention set.

### 4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention. This may occur at any stage of the process, once ICANN publicly posts the applications received and the preliminary contention sets on its website.

Applicants may resolve string contention in a manner whereby one or more applicants withdraw their applications. An applicant may not resolve string contention by selecting a new string or by replacing itself with a joint venture. It is understood that applicants may seek to establish joint ventures in their efforts to resolve string contention. However, material changes in applications (for example, combinations of applicants to resolve contention) will require re-evaluation. This might require additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round. Applicants are encouraged to resolve contention by combining in a way that does not materially affect the remaining application. Accordingly, new joint ventures must take place in a manner that does not materially change the application, to avoid being subject to re-evaluation.

### 4.1.4 Possible Contention Resolution Outcomes

An application that has successfully completed all previous stages and is no longer part of a contention set due to changes in the composition of the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.1) or self-resolution by applicants in the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.3) may proceed to the next stage.

An application that prevails in a contention resolution procedure, either community priority evaluation or auction, may proceed to the next stage.
In some cases, an applicant who is not the outright winner of a string contention resolution process can still proceed. This situation is explained in the following paragraphs.

If the strings within a given contention set are all identical, the applications are in direct contention with each other and there can only be one winner that proceeds to the next step.

However, where there are both direct and indirect contention situations within a set, more than one string may survive the resolution.

For example, consider a case where string A is in contention with B, and B is in contention with C, but C is not in contention with A. If A wins the contention resolution procedure, B is eliminated but C can proceed since C is not in direct contention with the winner and both strings can coexist in the DNS without risk for confusion.

### 4.2 Community Priority Evaluation

Community priority evaluation will only occur if a community-based applicant selects this option. Community priority evaluation can begin once all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the process.

The community priority evaluation is an independent analysis. Scores received in the applicant reviews are not carried forward to the community priority evaluation. Each application participating in the community priority evaluation begins with a score of zero.

#### 4.2.1 Eligibility for Community Priority Evaluation

As described in subsection 1.2.3 of Module 1, all applicants are required to identify whether their application type is:

- Community-based; or
- Standard.

Applicants designating their applications as community-based are also asked to respond to a set of questions in the application form to provide relevant information if a community priority evaluation occurs.

Only community-based applicants are eligible to participate in a community priority evaluation.
At the start of the contention resolution stage, all community-based applicants within remaining contention sets will be notified of the opportunity to opt for a community priority evaluation via submission of a deposit by a specified date. Only those applications for which a deposit has been received by the deadline will be scored in the community priority evaluation. Following the evaluation, the deposit will be refunded to applicants that score 14 or higher.

Before the community priority evaluation begins, the applicants who have elected to participate may be asked to provide additional information relevant to the community priority evaluation.

**4.2.2 Community Priority Evaluation Procedure**

Community priority evaluations for each eligible contention set will be performed by a community priority panel appointed by ICANN to review these applications. The panel’s role is to determine whether any of the community-based applications fulfills the community priority criteria. Standard applicants within the contention set, if any, will not participate in the community priority evaluation.

If a single community-based application is found to meet the community priority criteria (see subsection 4.2.3 below), that applicant will be declared to prevail in the community priority evaluation and may proceed. If more than one community-based application is found to meet the criteria, the remaining contention between them will be resolved as follows:

- In the case where the applications are in indirect contention with one another (see subsection 4.1.1), they will both be allowed to proceed to the next stage. In this case, applications that are in direct contention with any of these community-based applications will be eliminated.

- In the case where the applications are in direct contention with one another, these applicants will proceed to an auction. If all parties agree and present a joint request, ICANN may postpone the auction for a three-month period while the parties attempt to reach a settlement before proceeding to auction. This is a one-time option; ICANN will grant no more than one such request for each set of contending applications.
If none of the community-based applications are found to meet the criteria, then all of the parties in the contention set (both standard and community-based applicants) will proceed to an auction.

Results of each community priority evaluation will be posted when completed.

Applicants who are eliminated as a result of a community priority evaluation are eligible for a partial refund of the gTLD evaluation fee (see Module 1).

### 4.2.3 Community Priority Evaluation Criteria

The Community Priority Panel will review and score the one or more community-based applications having elected the community priority evaluation against four criteria as listed below.

The scoring process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). This calls for a holistic approach, taking multiple criteria into account, as reflected in the process. The scoring will be performed by a panel and be based on information provided in the application plus other relevant information available (such as public information regarding the community represented). The panel may also perform independent research, if deemed necessary to reach informed scoring decisions.

It should be noted that a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be. This is a fundamental reason for very stringent requirements for qualification of a community-based application, as embodied in the criteria below. Accordingly, a finding by the panel that an application does not meet the scoring threshold to prevail in a community priority evaluation is not necessarily an indication the community itself is in some way inadequate or invalid.

The sequence of the criteria reflects the order in which they will be assessed by the panel. The utmost care has been taken to avoid any “double-counting” - any negative aspect found in assessing an application for one criterion
should only be counted there and should not affect the assessment for other criteria.

An application must score at least 14 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation. The outcome will be determined according to the procedure described in subsection 4.2.2.

**Criterion #1: Community Establishment (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Community Establishment criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Establishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As measured by:

**A. Delineation (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly delineated, organized, and pre-existing community.</td>
<td>Clearly delineated and pre-existing community, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Insufficient delineation and pre-existence for a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Extension (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community of considerable size and longevity.</td>
<td>Community of either considerable size or longevity, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Community of neither considerable size nor longevity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section relates to the community as explicitly identified and defined according to statements in the application. (The implicit reach of the applied-for string is not
Considered here, but taken into account when scoring Criterion #2, “Nexus between Proposed String and Community.”

**Criterion 1 Definitions**

- “Community” - Usage of the expression “community” has evolved considerably from its Latin origin – “communitas” meaning “fellowship” – while still implying more of cohesion than a mere commonality of interest. Notably, as “community” is used throughout the application, there should be: (a) an awareness and recognition of a community among its members; (b) some understanding of the community’s existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed); and (c) extended tenure or longevity—non-transience—into the future.

- “Delineation” relates to the membership of a community, where a clear and straightforward membership definition scores high, while an unclear, dispersed or unbound definition scores low.

- “Pre-existing” means that a community has been active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007.

- “Organized” implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities.

- “Extension” relates to the dimensions of the community, regarding its number of members, geographical reach, and foreseeable activity lifetime, as further explained in the following.

- “Size” relates both to the number of members and the geographical reach of the community, and will be scored depending on the context rather than on absolute numbers - a geographic location community may count millions of members in a limited location, a language community may have a million members with some spread over the globe, a community of service providers may have “only” some hundred members although well spread over the globe, just to mention some examples - all these can be regarded as of “considerable size.”
"Longevity" means that the pursuits of a community are of a lasting, non-transient nature.

**Criterion 1 Guidelines**

With respect to "Delineation" and "Extension," it should be noted that a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service), of individuals (for example, a language community) or of a logical alliance of communities (for example, an international federation of national communities of a similar nature). All are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both "Delineation" and "Extension."

With respect to "Delineation," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates all three relevant parameters (delineation, pre-existing and organized), then it scores a 2.

With respect to "Extension," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates both community size and longevity, it scores a 2.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Nexus criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nexus between String &amp; Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As measured by:

A. **Nexus (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The string matches the name of the community or is a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community</td>
<td>String identifies the community, but does not qualify for a score of 3.</td>
<td>String nexus does not fulfill the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section evaluates the relevance of the string to the specific community that it claims to represent.

**Criterion 2 Definitions**

- "Name" of the community means the established name by which the community is commonly known by others. It may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to the community.

- “Identify” means that the applied-for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

**Criterion 2 Guidelines**

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string is commonly known by others as the identification / name of the community.

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 2, the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community. As an example, a string could qualify for a score of 2 if it is a noun that the typical community member would naturally be called in the context. If the string appears excessively broad (such as, for example, a globally well-known but local tennis club applying for “.TENNIS”) then it would not qualify for a 2.
With respect to "Uniqueness," "significant meaning" relates to the public in general, with consideration of the community language context added.

"Uniqueness" will be scored both with regard to the community context and from a general point of view. For example, a string for a particular geographic location community may seem unique from a general perspective, but would not score a 1 for uniqueness if it carries another significant meaning in the common language used in the relevant community location. The phrasing "...beyond identifying the community" in the score of 1 for "uniqueness" implies a requirement that the string does identify the community, i.e. scores 2 or 3 for "Nexus," in order to be eligible for a score of 1 for "Uniqueness."

It should be noted that "Uniqueness" is only about the meaning of the string - since the evaluation takes place to resolve contention there will obviously be other applications, community-based and/or standard, with identical or confusingly similar strings in the contention set to resolve, so the string will clearly not be "unique" in the sense of "alone."

**Criterion #3: Registration Policies (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Registration Policies criterion:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration Policies

High → Low

As measured by:

A. **Eligibility (1)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility restricted to community members. Largely unrestricted approach to eligibility.
B. **Name selection (1)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies include name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

C. **Content and use (1)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies include rules for content and use consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

D. **Enforcement (1)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies include specific enforcement measures (e.g. investigation practices, penalties, takedown procedures) constituting a coherent set with appropriate appeal mechanisms. Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

This section evaluates the applicant’s registration policies as indicated in the application. Registration policies are the conditions that the future registry will set for prospective registrants, i.e. those desiring to register second-level domain names under the registry.
Criterion 3 Definitions

- "Eligibility" means the qualifications that entities or individuals must have in order to be allowed as registrants by the registry.

- "Name selection" means the conditions that must be fulfilled for any second-level domain name to be deemed acceptable by the registry.

- "Content and use" means the restrictions stipulated by the registry as to the content provided in and the use of any second-level domain name in the registry.

- "Enforcement" means the tools and provisions set out by the registry to prevent and remedy any breaches of the conditions by registrants.

Criterion 3 Guidelines

With respect to “Eligibility,” the limitation to community “members” can invoke a formal membership but can also be satisfied in other ways, depending on the structure and orientation of the community at hand. For example, for a geographic location community TLD, a limitation to members of the community can be achieved by requiring that the registrant's physical address is within the boundaries of the location.

With respect to “Name selection,” “Content and use,” and “Enforcement,” scoring of applications against these sub-criteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.
Criterion #4: Community Endorsement (0-4 points)

4 3 2 1 0

Community Endorsement

High ← Community Endorsement → Low

As measured by:

A. Support (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s) or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community.</td>
<td>Documented support from at least one group with relevance, but insufficient support for a score of 1.</td>
<td>Insufficient proof of support for a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Opposition (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opposition of relevance.</td>
<td>Relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size.</td>
<td>Relevant opposition from two or more groups of non-negligible size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section evaluates community support and/or opposition to the application. Support and opposition will be scored in relation to the communities explicitly addressed as stated in the application, with due regard for the communities implicitly addressed by the string.

Criterion 4 Definitions

- "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by
the community members as representative of the community.

- "Relevance" and "relevant" refer to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed. This means that opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied-for string would be considered relevant.

**Criterion 4 Guidelines**

With respect to “Support,” it follows that documented support from, for example, the only national association relevant to a particular community on a national level would score a 2 if the string is clearly oriented to that national level, but only a 1 if the string implicitly addresses similar communities in other nations.

Also with respect to “Support,” the plurals in brackets for a score of 2, relate to cases of multiple institutions/organizations. In such cases there must be documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed in order to score 2.

The applicant will score a 1 for “Support” if it does not have support from the majority of the recognized community institutions/member organizations, or does not provide full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application. A 0 will be scored on “Support” if the applicant fails to provide documentation showing support from recognized community institutions/community member organizations, or does not provide documentation showing that it has the authority to represent the community. It should be noted, however, that documented support from groups or communities that may be seen as implicitly addressed but have completely different orientations compared to the applicant community will not be required for a score of 2 regarding support.

To be taken into account as relevant support, such documentation must contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. Consideration of support is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of support received.

When scoring “Opposition,” previous objections to the application as well as public comments during the same application round will be taken into account and assessed.
in this context. There will be no presumption that such objections or comments would prevent a score of 2 or lead to any particular score for “Opposition.” To be taken into account as relevant opposition, such objections or comments must be of a reasoned nature. Sources of opposition that are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, made for a purpose incompatible with competition objectives, or filed for the purpose of obstruction will not be considered relevant.

4.3 Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort

It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.

An auction will not take place to resolve contention in the case where the contending applications are for geographic names (as defined in Module 2). In this case, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants.

An auction will take place, where contention has not already been resolved, in the case where an application for a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographic names.

In practice, ICANN expects that most contention cases will be resolved through other means before reaching the auction stage. However, there is a possibility that significant funding will accrue to ICANN as a result of one or more auctions.¹

¹ The purpose of an auction is to resolve contention in a clear, objective manner. It is planned that costs of the new gTLD program will offset by fees, so any funds coming from a last resort contention resolution mechanism such as auctions would result (after paying for the auction process) in additional funding. Any proceeds from auctions will be reserved and earmarked until the uses of funds are determined. Funds must be used in a manner that supports directly ICANN’s Mission and Core Values and also allows ICANN to maintain its not for profit status.

Possible uses of auction funds include formation of a foundation with a clear mission and a transparent way to allocate funds to projects that are of interest to the greater Internet community, such as grants to support new gTLD applications or registry operators from communities in subsequent gTLD rounds, the creation of an ICANN-administered/community-based fund for specific projects for the benefit of the Internet community, the creation of a registry continuity fund for the protection of registrants (ensuring that funds would be in place to support the operation of a gTLD registry until a successor could be found), or establishment of a security fund to expand use of secure protocols, conduct research, and support standards development organizations in accordance with ICANN’s security and stability mission.
4.3.1 Auction Procedures

An auction of two or more applications within a contention set is conducted as follows. The auctioneer successively increases the prices associated with applications within the contention set, and the respective applicants indicate their willingness to pay these prices. As the prices rise, applicants will successively choose to exit from the auction. When a sufficient number of applications have been eliminated so that no direct contentions remain (i.e., the remaining applications are no longer in contention with one another and all the relevant strings can be delegated as TLDs), the auction will be deemed to conclude. At the auction's conclusion, the applicants with remaining applications will pay the resulting prices and proceed toward delegation. This procedure is referred to as an “ascending-clock auction.”

This section provides applicants an informal introduction to the practicalities of participation in an ascending-clock auction. It is intended only as a general introduction and is only preliminary. The detailed set of Auction Rules will be available prior to the commencement of any auction proceedings. If any conflict arises between this module and the auction rules, the auction rules will prevail.

For simplicity, this section will describe the situation where a contention set consists of two or more applications for identical strings.

All auctions will be conducted over the Internet, with participants placing their bids remotely using a web-based software system designed especially for auction. The auction software system will be compatible with current versions of most prevalent browsers, and will not require the local installation of any additional software.

Auction participants (“bidders”) will receive instructions for access to the online auction site. Access to the site will be password-protected and bids will be encrypted through SSL. If a bidder temporarily loses connection to the Internet, that bidder may be permitted to submit its bids in a given auction round by fax, according to procedures described.

The amount of funding resulting from auctions, if any, will not be known until all relevant applications have completed this step. Thus, a detailed mechanism for allocation of these funds is not being created at present. However, a process can be pre-established to enable community consultation in the event that such funds are collected. This process will include, at a minimum, publication of data on any funds collected, and public comment on any proposed models.
in the auction rules. The auctions will generally be conducted to conclude quickly, ideally in a single day.

The auction will be carried out in a series of auction rounds, as illustrated in Figure 4-3. The sequence of events is as follows:

1. For each auction round, the auctioneer will announce in advance: (1) the start-of-round price, (2) the end-of-round price, and (3) the starting and ending times of the auction round. In the first auction round, the start-of-round price for all bidders in the auction will be USD 0. In later auction rounds, the start-of-round price will be its end-of-round price from the previous auction round.

2. During each auction round, bidders will be required to submit a bid or bids representing their willingness to pay within the range of intermediate prices between the start-of-round and end-of-round prices. In this way a bidder indicates its willingness to stay in the auction at all prices through and including the end-of-auction round price, or its wish to exit the auction at a price less than the end-of-auction round price, called the exit bid.

3. Exit is irrevocable. If a bidder exited the auction in a previous auction round, the bidder is not permitted to re-enter in the current auction round.
4. Bidders may submit their bid or bids at any time during the auction round.

5. Only bids that comply with all aspects of the auction rules will be considered valid. If more than one valid bid is submitted by a given bidder within the time limit of the auction round, the auctioneer will treat the last valid submitted bid as the actual bid.

6. At the end of each auction round, bids become the bidders' legally-binding offers to secure the relevant gTLD strings at prices up to the respective bid amounts, subject to closure of the auction in accordance with the auction rules. In later auction rounds, bids may be used to exit from the auction at subsequent higher prices.

7. After each auction round, the auctioneer will disclose the aggregate number of bidders remaining in the auction at the end-of-round prices for the auction round, and will announce the prices and times for the next auction round.

   - Each bid should consist of a single price associated with the application, and such price must be greater than or equal to the start-of-round price.

   - If the bid amount is strictly less than the end-of-round price, then the bid is treated as an exit bid at the specified amount, and it signifies the bidder's binding commitment to pay up to the bid amount if its application is approved.

   - If the bid amount is greater than or equal to the end-of-round price, then the bid signifies that the bidder wishes to remain in the auction at all prices in the current auction round, and it signifies the bidder's binding commitment to pay up to the end-of-round price if its application is approved. Following such bid, the application cannot be eliminated within the current auction round.

   - To the extent that the bid amount exceeds the end-of-round price, then the bid is also treated as a proxy bid to be carried forward to the next auction round. The bidder will be permitted to change the proxy bid amount in the next auction round, and the amount of the proxy bid will not constrain the bidder's ability to submit any valid bid amount in the next auction round.
• No bidder is permitted to submit a bid for any application for which an exit bid was received in a prior auction round. That is, once an application has exited the auction, it may not return.

• If no valid bid is submitted within a given auction round for an application that remains in the auction, then the bid amount is taken to be the amount of the proxy bid, if any, carried forward from the previous auction round or, if none, the bid is taken to be an exit bid at the start-of-round price for the current auction round.

8. This process continues, with the auctioneer increasing the price range for each given TLD string in each auction round, until there is one remaining bidder at the end-of-round price. After an auction round in which this condition is satisfied, the auction concludes and the auctioneer determines the clearing price. The last remaining application is deemed the successful application, and the associated bidder is obligated to pay the clearing price.

Figure 4-4 illustrates how an auction for five contending applications might progress.

![Figure 4-4 - Example of an auction for five mutually-contending applications.](image)
• Before the first auction round, the auctioneer announces the end-of-round price $P_1$.

• During Auction round 1, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_1$. Since the aggregate demand exceeds one, the auction proceeds to Auction round 2. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_1$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_2$.

• During Auction round 2, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_2$. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_2$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_3$.

• During Auction round 3, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly below $P_3$, while the other four bidders submit bids of at least $P_3$. The auctioneer discloses that four contending applications remained at $P_3$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_4$.

• During Auction round 4, one of the bidders submits an exit bid midway between $P_3$ and $P_4$, while the other three remaining bidders submit bids of at least $P_4$. The auctioneer discloses that three contending applications remained at $P_4$ and announces the end-of-auction round price $P_5$.

• During Auction round 5, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly above $P_5$, and one of the bidders submits an exit bid at $P_5$ midway between $P_4$ and $P_5$. The final bidder submits a bid greater than $P_5$. Since the aggregate demand at $P_5$ does not exceed one, the auction concludes in Auction round 5. The application associated with the highest bid in Auction round 5 is deemed the successful application. The clearing price is $P_c$, as this is the lowest price at which aggregate demand can be met.

To the extent possible, auctions to resolve multiple string contention situations will be conducted simultaneously.

4.3.1.1 Currency

For bids to be comparable, all bids in the auction will be submitted in any integer (whole) number of US dollars.
4.3.1.2 Fees

A bidding deposit will be required of applicants participating in the auction, in an amount to be determined. The bidding deposit must be transmitted by wire transfer to a specified bank account specified by ICANN or its auction provider at a major international bank, to be received in advance of the auction date. The amount of the deposit will determine a bidding limit for each bidder: the bidding deposit will equal 10% of the bidding limit; and the bidder will not be permitted to submit any bid in excess of its bidding limit.

In order to avoid the need for bidders to pre-commit to a particular bidding limit, bidders may be given the option of making a specified deposit that will provide them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application. The amount of the deposit required for unlimited bidding authority will depend on the particular contention set and will be based on an assessment of the possible final prices within the auction.

All deposits from non-defaulting losing bidders will be returned following the close of the auction.

4.3.2 Winning Bid Payments

Any applicant that participates in an auction will be required to sign a bidder agreement that acknowledges its rights and responsibilities in the auction, including that its bids are legally binding commitments to pay the amount bid if it wins (i.e., if its application is approved), and to enter into the prescribed registry agreement with ICANN— together with a specified penalty for defaulting on payment of its winning bid or failing to enter into the required registry agreement.

The winning bidder in any auction will be required to pay the full amount of the final price within 20 business days of the end of the auction. Payment is to be made by wire transfer to the same international bank account as the bidding deposit, and the applicant’s bidding deposit will be credited toward the final price.

In the event that a bidder anticipates that it would require a longer payment period than 20 business days due to verifiable government-imposed currency restrictions, the bidder may advise ICANN well in advance of the auction and ICANN will consider applying a longer payment period to all bidders within the same contention set.
Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is not received within 20 business days of the end of an auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that receipt of full payment is imminent.

Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is received within 20 business days of the end of an auction retains the obligation to execute the required registry agreement within 90 days of the end of auction. Such winning bidder who does not execute the agreement within 90 days of the end of the auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that execution of the registry agreement is imminent.

4.3.3 Post-Default Procedures

Once declared in default, any winning bidder is subject to immediate forfeiture of its position in the auction and assessment of default penalties. After a winning bidder is declared in default, the remaining bidders will receive an offer to have their applications accepted, one at a time, in descending order of their exit bids. In this way, the next bidder would be declared the winner subject to payment of its last bid price. The same default procedures and penalties are in place for any runner-up bidder receiving such an offer.

Each bidder that is offered the relevant gTLD will be given a specified period—typically, four business days—to respond as to whether it wants the gTLD. A bidder who responds in the affirmative will have 20 business days to submit its full payment. A bidder who declines such an offer cannot revert on that statement, has no further obligations in this context and will not be considered in default.

The penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will equal 10% of the defaulting bid. Default penalties will be charged against any defaulting applicant’s bidding deposit before the associated bidding deposit is returned.

2 If bidders were given the option of making a specified deposit that provided them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application and if the winning bidder utilized this option, then the penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will be the lesser of the following: (1) 10% of the defaulting bid, or (2) the specified deposit amount that provided the bidder with unlimited bidding authority.
4.4 Contention Resolution and Contract Execution

An applicant that has been declared the winner of a contention resolution process will proceed by entering into the contract execution step. (Refer to section 5.1 of Module 5.)

If a winner of the contention resolution procedure has not executed a contract within 90 calendar days of the decision, ICANN has the right to deny that application and extend an offer to the runner-up applicant, if any, to proceed with its application. For example, in an auction, another applicant who would be considered the runner-up applicant might proceed toward delegation. This offer is at ICANN’s option only. The runner-up applicant in a contention resolution process has no automatic right to an applied-for gTLD string if the first place winner does not execute a contract within a specified time. If the winning applicant can demonstrate that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successful completion of the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement, ICANN may extend the 90-day period at its discretion. Runner-up applicants have no claim of priority over the winning application, even after what might be an extended period of negotiation.
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Module 5
Transition to Delegation

This module describes the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.

5.1 Registry Agreement

All applicants that have successfully completed the evaluation process—including, if necessary, the dispute resolution and string contention processes—are required to enter into a registry agreement with ICANN before proceeding to delegation.

After the close of each stage in the process, ICANN will send a notification to those successful applicants that are eligible for execution of a registry agreement at that time.

To proceed, applicants will be asked to provide specified information for purposes of executing the registry agreement:

1. Documentation of the applicant’s continued operations instrument (see Specification 8 to the agreement).
2. Confirmation of contact information and signatory to the agreement.
3. Notice of any material changes requested to the terms of the agreement.
4. The applicant must report: (i) any ownership interest it holds in any registrar or reseller of registered names, (ii) if known, any ownership interest that a registrar or reseller of registered names holds in the applicant, and (iii) if the applicant controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with any registrar or reseller of registered names. ICANN retains the right to refer an application to a competition authority prior to entry into the registry agreement if it is determined that the registry-registrar cross-ownership
arrangements might raise competition issues. For this purpose “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

To ensure that an applicant continues to be a going concern in good legal standing, ICANN reserves the right to ask the applicant to submit additional updated documentation and information before entering into the registry agreement.

ICANN will begin processing registry agreements one month after the date of the notification to successful applicants. Requests will be handled in the order the complete information is received.

Generally, the process will include formal approval of the agreement without requiring additional Board review, so long as: the application passed all evaluation criteria; there are no material changes in circumstances; and there are no material changes to the base agreement. There may be other cases where the Board requests review of an application.

Eligible applicants are expected to have executed the registry agreement within nine (9) months of the notification date. Failure to do so may result in loss of eligibility, at ICANN’s discretion. An applicant may request an extension of this time period for up to an additional nine (9) months if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement.

The registry agreement can be reviewed in the attachment to this module. Certain provisions in the agreement are labeled as applicable to governmental and intergovernmental entities only. Private entities, even if supported by a government or IGO, would not ordinarily be eligible for these special provisions.

All successful applicants are expected to enter into the agreement substantially as written. Applicants may request and negotiate terms by exception; however, this extends
the time involved in executing the agreement. In the event that material changes to the agreement are requested, these must first be approved by the ICANN Board of Directors before execution of the agreement.

ICANN’s Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program. The Board reserves the right to individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community. Under exceptional circumstances, the Board may individually consider a gTLD application. For example, the Board might individually consider an application as a result of GAC Advice on New gTLDs or of the use of an ICANN accountability mechanism.

5.2  Pre-Delegation Testing

Each applicant will be required to complete pre-delegation technical testing as a prerequisite to delegation into the root zone. This pre-delegation test must be completed within the time period specified in the registry agreement.

The purpose of the pre-delegation technical test is to verify that the applicant has met its commitment to establish registry operations in accordance with the technical and operational criteria described in Module 2.

The test is also intended to indicate that the applicant can operate the gTLD in a stable and secure manner. All applicants will be tested on a pass/fail basis according to the requirements that follow.

The test elements cover both the DNS server operational infrastructure and registry system operations. In many cases the applicant will perform the test elements as instructed and provide documentation of the results to ICANN to demonstrate satisfactory performance. At ICANN’s discretion, aspects of the applicant’s self-certification documentation can be audited either on-site at the services delivery point of the registry or elsewhere as determined by ICANN.

5.2.1  Testing Procedures

The applicant may initiate the pre-delegation test by submitting to ICANN the Pre-Delegation form and accompanying documents containing all of the following information:
- All name server names and IPv4/IPv6 addresses to be used in serving the new TLD data;
- If using anycast, the list of names and IPv4/IPv6 unicast addresses allowing the identification of each individual server in the anycast sets;
- If IDN is supported, the complete IDN tables used in the registry system;
- A test zone for the new TLD must be signed at test time and the valid key-set to be used at the time of testing must be provided to ICANN in the documentation, as well as the TLD DNSSEC Policy Statement (DPS);
- The executed agreement between the selected escrow agent and the applicant; and
- Self-certification documentation as described below for each test item.

ICANN will review the material submitted and in some cases perform tests in addition to those conducted by the applicant. After testing, ICANN will assemble a report with the outcome of the tests and provide that report to the applicant.

Any clarification request, additional information request, or other request generated in the process will be highlighted and listed in the report sent to the applicant.

ICANN may request the applicant to complete load tests considering an aggregated load where a single entity is performing registry services for multiple TLDs.

Once an applicant has met all of the pre-delegation testing requirements, it is eligible to request delegation of its applied-for gTLD.

If an applicant does not complete the pre-delegation steps within the time period specified in the registry agreement, ICANN reserves the right to terminate the registry agreement.
5.2.2 Test Elements: DNS Infrastructure

The first set of test elements concerns the DNS infrastructure of the new gTLD. In all tests of the DNS infrastructure, all requirements are independent of whether IPv4 or IPv6 is used. All tests shall be done both over IPv4 and IPv6, with reports providing results according to both protocols.

**UDP Support** -- The DNS infrastructure to which these tests apply comprises the complete set of servers and network infrastructure to be used by the chosen providers to deliver DNS service for the new gTLD to the Internet. The documentation provided by the applicant must include the results from a system performance test indicating available network and server capacity and an estimate of expected capacity during normal operation to ensure stable service as well as to adequately address Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries responded against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads of UDP-based queries that will cause up to 10% query loss against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. Responses must either contain zone data or be NXDOMAIN or NODATA responses to be considered valid.

Query latency shall be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing information on the transit and peering arrangements for the DNS server locations, listing the AS numbers of the transit providers or peers at each point of presence and available bandwidth at those points of presence.

**TCP Support** -- TCP transport service for DNS queries and responses must be enabled and provisioned for expected load. ICANN will review the capacity self-certification documentation provided by the applicant and will perform TCP reachability and transaction capability tests across a
randomly selected subset of the name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and external network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries that generated a valid (zone data, NODATA, or NXDOMAIN) response against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the name servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads that will cause up to 10% query loss (either due to connection timeout or connection reset) against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure.

Query latency will be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing records of TCP-based DNS queries from nodes external to the network hosting the servers. These locations may be the same as those used for measuring latency above.

**DNSSEC support** -- Applicant must demonstrate support for EDNS(0) in its server infrastructure, the ability to return correct DNSSEC-related resource records such as DNSKEY, RRSIG, and NSEC/NSEC3 for the signed zone, and the ability to accept and publish DS resource records from second-level domain administrators. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of KSK and ZSK keys. ICANN will review the self-certification materials as well as test the reachability, response sizes, and DNS transaction capacity for DNS queries using the EDNS(0) protocol extension with the “DNSSEC OK” bit set for a randomly selected subset of all name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Load capacity, query latency, and reachability shall be documented as for UDP and TCP above.
5.2.3 Test Elements: Registry Systems

As documented in the registry agreement, registries must provide support for EPP within their Shared Registration System, and provide Whois service both via port 43 and a web interface, in addition to support for the DNS. This section details the requirements for testing these registry systems.

**System performance** -- The registry system must scale to meet the performance requirements described in Specification 10 of the registry agreement and ICANN will require self-certification of compliance. ICANN will review the self-certification documentation provided by the applicant to verify adherence to these minimum requirements.

**Whois support** -- Applicant must provision Whois services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify that Whois data is accessible over IPv4 and IPv6 via both TCP port 43 and via a web interface and review self-certification documentation regarding Whois transaction capacity. Response format according to Specification 4 of the registry agreement and access to Whois (both port 43 and via web) will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet over both IPv4 and IPv6.

Self-certification documents shall describe the maximum number of queries per second successfully handled by both the port 43 servers as well as the web interface, together with an applicant-provided load expectation.

Additionally, a description of deployed control functions to detect and mitigate data mining of the Whois database shall be documented.

**EPP Support** -- As part of a shared registration service, applicant must provision EPP services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify conformance to appropriate RFCs (including EPP extensions for DNSSEC). ICANN will also review self-certification documentation regarding EPP transaction capacity.

Documentation shall provide a maximum Transaction per Second rate for the EPP interface with 10 data points corresponding to registry database sizes from 0 (empty) to the expected size after one year of operation, as determined by applicant.
Documentation shall also describe measures taken to handle load during initial registry operations, such as a land-rush period.

IPv6 support -- The ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing IPv6 DNS records supplied by registrants will be tested by ICANN. If the registry supports EPP access via IPv6, this will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet.

DNSSEC support -- ICANN will review the ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing DNSSEC-related resource records as well as the registry’s overall key management procedures. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of key changes for child domains. Inter-operation of the applicant’s secure communication channels with the IANA for trust anchor material exchange will be verified.

The practice and policy document (also known as the DNSSEC Policy Statement or DPS), describing key material storage, access and usage for its own keys is also reviewed as part of this step.

IDN support -- ICANN will verify the complete IDN table(s) used in the registry system. The table(s) must comply with the guidelines in http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

Requirements related to IDN for Whois are being developed. After these requirements are developed, prospective registries will be expected to comply with published IDN-related Whois requirements as part of pre-delegation testing.

Escrow deposit -- The applicant-provided samples of data deposit that include both a full and an incremental deposit showing correct type and formatting of content will be reviewed. Special attention will be given to the agreement with the escrow provider to ensure that escrowed data can be released within 24 hours should it be necessary. ICANN may, at its option, ask an independent third party to demonstrate the reconstitutability of the registry from escrowed data. ICANN may elect to test the data release process with the escrow agent.
5.3 Delegation Process

Upon notice of successful completion of the ICANN pre-delegation testing, applicants may initiate the process for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone database. This will include provision of additional information and completion of additional technical steps required for delegation. Information about the delegation process is available at http://iana.org/domains/root/.

5.4 Ongoing Operations

An applicant that is successfully delegated a gTLD will become a “Registry Operator.” In being delegated the role of operating part of the Internet’s domain name system, the applicant will be assuming a number of significant responsibilities. ICANN will hold all new gTLD operators accountable for the performance of their obligations under the registry agreement, and it is important that all applicants understand these responsibilities.

5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator

The registry agreement defines the obligations of gTLD registry operators. A breach of the registry operator’s obligations may result in ICANN compliance actions up to and including termination of the registry agreement. Prospective applicants are encouraged to review the following brief description of some of these responsibilities.

Note that this is a non-exhaustive list provided to potential applicants as an introduction to the responsibilities of a registry operator. For the complete and authoritative text, please refer to the registry agreement.

A registry operator is obligated to:

**Operate the TLD in a stable and secure manner.** The registry operator is responsible for the entire technical operation of the TLD. As noted in RFC 1591:

“The designated manager must do a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain. That is, the actual management of the assigning of domain names, delegating subdomains and operating nameservers must be done with technical competence. This includes keeping

---

1 See http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt
the central IR\(^2\) (in the case of top-level domains) or other higher-level domain manager advised of the status of the domain, responding to requests in a timely manner, and operating the database with accuracy, robustness, and resilience.”

The registry operator is required to comply with relevant technical standards in the form of RFCs and other guidelines. Additionally, the registry operator must meet performance specifications in areas such as system downtime and system response times (see Specifications 6 and 10 of the registry agreement).

**Comply with consensus policies and temporary policies.**

gTLD registry operators are required to comply with consensus policies. Consensus policies may relate to a range of topics such as issues affecting interoperability of the DNS, registry functional and performance specifications, database security and stability, or resolution of disputes over registration of domain names.

To be adopted as a consensus policy, a policy must be developed by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)\(^3\) following the process in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws.\(^4\) The policy development process involves deliberation and collaboration by the various stakeholder groups participating in the process, with multiple opportunities for input and comment by the public, and can take significant time.

Examples of existing consensus policies are the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (governing transfers of domain names between registrars), and the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (establishing a review of proposed new registry services for security and stability or competition concerns), although there are several more, as found at [http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm).

gTLD registry operators are obligated to comply with both existing consensus policies and those that are developed in the future. Once a consensus policy has been formally adopted, ICANN will provide gTLD registry operators with notice of the requirement to implement the new policy and the effective date.

---

\(^2\) IR is a historical reference to “Internet Registry,” a function now performed by ICANN.

\(^3\) [http://gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org)

In addition, the ICANN Board may, when required by circumstances, establish a temporary policy necessary to maintain the stability or security of registry services or the DNS. In such a case, all gTLD registry operators will be required to comply with the temporary policy for the designated period of time.

For more information, see Specification 1 of the registry agreement.

**Implement start-up rights protection measures.** The registry operator must implement, at a minimum, a Sunrise period and a Trademark Claims service during the start-up phases for registration in the TLD, as provided in the registry agreement. These mechanisms will be supported by the established Trademark Clearinghouse as indicated by ICANN.

The Sunrise period allows eligible rightsholders an early opportunity to register names in the TLD.

The Trademark Claims service provides notice to potential registrants of existing trademark rights, as well as notice to rightsholders of relevant names registered. Registry operators may continue offering the Trademark Claims service after the relevant start-up phases have concluded.

For more information, see Specification 7 of the registry agreement and the Trademark Clearinghouse model accompanying this module.

**Implement post-launch rights protection measures.** The registry operator is required to implement decisions made under the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure, including suspension of specific domain names within the registry. The registry operator is also required to comply with and implement decisions made according to the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Policy (PDDRP).

The required measures are described fully in the URS and PDDRP procedures accompanying this module. Registry operators may introduce additional rights protection measures relevant to the particular gTLD.

**Implement measures for protection of country and territory names in the new gTLD.** All new gTLD registry operators are required to provide certain minimum protections for country and territory names, including an initial reservation requirement and establishment of applicable rules and
procedures for release of these names. The rules for release can be developed or agreed to by governments, the GAC, and/or approved by ICANN after a community discussion. Registry operators are encouraged to implement measures for protection of geographical names in addition to those required by the agreement, according to the needs and interests of each gTLD’s particular circumstances. (See Specification 5 of the registry agreement).

**Pay recurring fees to ICANN.** In addition to supporting expenditures made to accomplish the objectives set out in ICANN’s mission statement, these funds enable the support required for new gTLDs, including: contractual compliance, registry liaison, increased registrar accreditations, and other registry support activities. The fees include both a fixed component (USD 25,000 annually) and, where the TLD exceeds a transaction volume, a variable fee based on transaction volume. See Article 6 of the registry agreement.

**Regularly deposit data into escrow.** This serves an important role in registrant protection and continuity for certain instances where the registry or one aspect of the registry operations experiences a system failure or loss of data. (See Specification 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Deliver monthly reports in a timely manner.** A registry operator must submit a report to ICANN on a monthly basis. The report includes registrar transactions for the month and is used by ICANN for calculation of registrar fees. (See Specification 3 of the registry agreement.)

**Provide Whois service.** A registry operator must provide a publicly available Whois service for registered domain names in the TLD. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain partnerships with ICANN-accredited registrars.** A registry operator creates a Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) to define requirements for its registrars. This must include certain terms that are specified in the Registry Agreement, and may include additional terms specific to the TLD. A registry operator must provide non-discriminatory access to its registry services to all ICANN-accredited registrars with whom it has entered into an RRA, and who are in compliance with the requirements. This includes providing advance notice of pricing changes to all
registrars, in compliance with the time frames specified in the agreement. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain an abuse point of contact.** A registry operator must maintain and publish on its website a single point of contact responsible for addressing matters requiring expedited attention and providing a timely response to abuse complaints concerning all names registered in the TLD through all registrars of record, including those involving a reseller. A registry operator must also take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement, governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. (See Article 2 and Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

**Cooperate with contractual compliance audits.** To maintain a level playing field and a consistent operating environment, ICANN staff performs periodic audits to assess contractual compliance and address any resulting problems. A registry operator must provide documents and information requested by ICANN that are necessary to perform such audits. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain a Continued Operations Instrument.** A registry operator must, at the time of the agreement, have in place a continued operations instrument sufficient to fund basic registry operations for a period of three (3) years. This requirement remains in place for five (5) years after delegation of the TLD, after which time the registry operator is no longer required to maintain the continued operations instrument. (See Specification 8 to the registry agreement.)

**Maintain community-based policies and procedures.** If the registry operator designated its application as community-based at the time of the application, the registry operator has requirements in its registry agreement to maintain the community-based policies and procedures it specified in its application. The registry operator is bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure with respect to disputes regarding execution of its community-based policies and procedures. (See Article 2 to the registry agreement.)

**Have continuity and transition plans in place.** This includes performing failover testing on a regular basis. In the event that a transition to a new registry operator becomes necessary, the registry operator is expected to cooperate
by consulting with ICANN on the appropriate successor, providing the data required to enable a smooth transition, and complying with the applicable registry transition procedures. (See Articles 2 and 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Make TLD zone files available via a standardized process.** This includes provision of access to the registry’s zone file to credentialed users, according to established access, file, and format standards. The registry operator will enter into a standardized form of agreement with zone file users and will accept credential information for users via a clearinghouse. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Implement DNSSEC.** The registry operator is required to sign the TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC) in accordance with the relevant technical standards. The registry must accept public key material from registrars for domain names registered in the TLD, and publish a DNSSEC Policy Statement describing key material storage, access, and usage for the registry’s keys. (See Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

### 5.4.2 What is Expected of ICANN

ICANN will continue to provide support for gTLD registry operators as they launch and maintain registry operations. ICANN’s gTLD registry liaison function provides a point of contact for gTLD registry operators for assistance on a continuing basis.

ICANN’s contractual compliance function will perform audits on a regular basis to ensure that gTLD registry operators remain in compliance with agreement obligations, as well as investigate any complaints from the community regarding the registry operator’s adherence to its contractual obligations. See [http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/](http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/) for more information on current contractual compliance activities.

ICANN’s Bylaws require ICANN to act in an open and transparent manner, and to provide equitable treatment among registry operators. ICANN is responsible for maintaining the security and stability of the global Internet, and looks forward to a constructive and cooperative relationship with future gTLD registry operators in furtherance of this goal.
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News & Views


ICANN today published three reports on the review of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process. The CPE Process Review was initiated at the request of the ICANN Board as part of the Board’s due diligence in the administration of the CPE process. The reports can be found at the link below.

- CPE Process Review Reports

CPE Process Review

The CPE Process Review was initiated at the request of the ICANN Board as part of the Board’s due diligence in the administration of the CPE process. The CPE Process Review was conducted by FTI Consulting Inc.’s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice, and consisted of three parts: (i) reviewing the process by which ICANN organization interacted with the CPE Provider related to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider (Scope 1); (ii) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report (Scope 2); and (iii) a compilation of the reference material relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such reference material exists for the eight evaluations which are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests that were pending at the time that ICANN initiated the CPE Process Review (Scope 3).

The corresponding reports for each of the Scopes described above can be found below:


Understanding CPE

Overview

Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) is a method to resolve string contention, described in full detail in section 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) (en/applicants/agb). It will only occur if a community application is both in contention and elects to pursue CPE. The evaluation itself is an independent analysis conducted by a panel from the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). The EIU was selected for this role because it offers premier business intelligence services, providing political, economic, and public policy analysis to businesses, governments, and organizations across the globe.

As part of its process, the EIU reviews and scores a community applicant that has elected CPE against the following four criteria: Community Establishment; Nexus between Proposed String and Community; Registration Policies, and Community Endorsement. An application must score at least 14 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation, a high bar because awarding priority eliminates all non-community applicants in the contention set.
as well as any other non-prevailing community applicants. For details regarding the EIU’s work with ICANN as well as its evaluation process, please see the resources below:

- [CPE Panel Process Document](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/panel-process-07aug14-en.pdf) [PDF, 314 KB] (also available along with additional information under CPE Resources below)

**CPE Eligibility**

Fulfillment of the CPE Eligibility criteria explained below permits an applicant to begin the CPE process and ensures that applications as well as contention sets are in stable, viable states, i.e., are not at risk of an open matter affecting whether they will proceed.

**Eligibility Requirements for Standard CPE Invitation**

Once an application is eligible for CPE, it will be invited to CPE and have up to 21 days to accept the invitation and pay the CPE fees. The invitations will be posted to this page in the CPE Status section. The evaluation will begin no sooner than 14 days after the invitation to allow for final submission of application comments and correspondence to ICANN regarding the application.

To be eligible to begin Standard CPE Processing, an application must:

- be a self-designated Community Application per section 1.2.3 of the AGB
- have an application status of "Active"
- be in an unresolved contention set (contention set status is either "Active" or "On-Hold" and at least one other application in the set has a status of either "Active" or "On-Hold"
- not have a pending change request
- not be in an active comment window for a recently approved changed request

Additionally, as per section 4.2 of the AGB, all remaining members of the contention set must have completed all previous stages of the process. All remaining applications in the contention set must:

- have completed evaluation
- have no pending objections
- have addressed all applicable GAC Advice
- not be classified in the "High Risk" category of the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework

**Eligibility Requirements for Accelerated Invitation to CPE**

Once a community application has met the requirements listed below, ICANN will notify them of the option to request an Accelerated Invitation to CPE. An applicant is able to request an Accelerated Invitation to CPE when outstanding eligibility criteria do not have the potential to impact the community applicant’s membership in a contention set and/or when the contention set as a whole may not have met all eligibility requirements for the standard CPE Invitation process.

After an Applicant has requested the Accelerated Invitation, the standard CPE Invitation process will commence, including posting on this web page.

To be eligible for an Accelerated Invitation to CPE, an application must:

- be a self-designated Community Application per section 1.2.3 of the AGB
- have a status of "Active" or "On-Hold"
- be in an unresolved contention set (contention set status is either "Active" or "On-Hold" and at least one other application in the set has a status of either "Active" or "On-Hold")
- not have a pending change request
- not be in an active application comment window for an approved changed request
- have addressed all applicable GAC Advice

Additionally, as per section 4.2 of the AGB, all remaining members of the contention set must have completed all previous stages of the process. All remaining applications in the contention set must:

- have completed evaluation
- have no pending objections
- not be classified in the "High Risk" category of the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework
CPE Resources


The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Process documentation for Community Priority Evaluation is posted for informational purposes to provide transparency of the panel’s evaluation process. On 14 March 2016, in an effort to provide greater transparency on the CPE process, the Panel submitted correspondance (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/abruzzosa-to-weinstein-14mar16-en.pdf) [PDF, 52 KB] with additional information regarding the process for verifying letters of support and opposition.


ICANN has published the CPE Guidelines produced by the Economist Intelligence Unit after considering ICANN community feedback on the first draft. The Guidelines are an accompanying document to the AGB, and are meant to provide additional clarity around the scoring principles outlined in the AGB. The Guidelines are intended to increase transparency, fairness and consistency in the evaluation process.

- Updated CPE Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) (en/applicants/cpe/faqs-10sep14-en.pdf) [PDF, 377 KB] (10 SEPT 2014)

This document contains answers to common questions about CPE from applicants and other interested community members. The update from 19 September 2014 includes revisions to existing answers based on changes put forth in the "Update on Application Status and Contention Sets" Advisory (en/applicants/advisories/application-contention-set-14mar14-en).

- CPE Processing Timeline (en/applicants/cpe/timeline-10sep14-en.pdf) [PDF, 54 KB] (10 SEPT 2014)

The timeline has been updated to reflect changes made in the FAQ revision from 13 Aug 2014.

CPE Status

ICANN began inviting applicants to elect the CPE process on 9 October 2013. The invitation date and evaluation results are represented in the table below. Important: application comments and letters of support or opposition must be submitted within 14 days of the CPE Invitation Date in order to be considered by the CPE Panel. Access the Application Comments page (https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/viewcomments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>String</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>CPE Invitation Date</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1723-69677</td>
<td>TENNIS</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>TENNIS AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>06 November 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluated Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://newgld.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
<th>Evaluation Status</th>
<th>Evaluation Report Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1888-47714</td>
<td>MLS</td>
<td>The Canadian Real Estate Association</td>
<td>11 December 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1273-63351</td>
<td>GMBH</td>
<td>TLDDOT GmbH</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-880-17627</td>
<td>LLC</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-880-35979</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-880-35508</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1083-39123</td>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>European Broadcasting Union (EBU)</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1032-95136</td>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution Process</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1675-51302</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>EFLUX.ART, LLC</td>
<td>19 February 2014</td>
<td>10 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1097-20833</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dadotart, Inc.</td>
<td>20 February 2014</td>
<td>10 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-912-59314</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Big Room Inc.</td>
<td>12 March 2014</td>
<td>7 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1309-46695</td>
<td>KIDS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DotKids Foundation Limited</td>
<td>27 October 2015</td>
<td>8 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1713-23699</td>
<td>GAY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>dotgay llc</td>
<td>23 April 2014</td>
<td>7 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1713-23699</td>
<td>GAY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>dotgay llc</td>
<td>26 January 2015</td>
<td>8 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-959-51046</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.music LLC</td>
<td>18 June 2014</td>
<td>7 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-890-52063</td>
<td>SHOP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GMO Registry, Inc.</td>
<td>8 October 2014</td>
<td>13 March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1192-28569</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>HEXAP SAS</td>
<td>3 February 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1911-56672</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>American Institute of Certified Public Accountants</td>
<td>8 April 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>(3 September 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1744-1971</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>CPA AUSTRALIA LTD</td>
<td>8 April 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>(3 September 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1702-73085</td>
<td>MERCK</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>Merck Registry Holdings, Inc.</td>
<td>25 March 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>(10 August 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-980-7217</td>
<td>MERCK</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Merck KGaA</td>
<td>25 March 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation Complete</td>
<td>(10 August 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1033-22887</td>
<td>WEBS</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>Vistaprint Limited</td>
<td>28 March 2016</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPE Archive

News & Views Archive

Below find archival materials documenting milestones in the formation and implementation of Community Priority Evaluation, listed in reverse chronological order.

1 September 2017 – Update on the Review of the New gTLD Community Priority Evaluation Process

As a follow-up to the update provided on 2 June 2017 ([https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/process-review-update-02jun17-en.pdf](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/process-review-update-02jun17-en.pdf)) [PDF, 405 KB], ICANN has published a subsequent update regarding the review of the CPE process. Please find the links to the announcement and update below.


2 June 2017 – Update on the Review of the New gTLD Community Priority Evaluation Process


10 August 2016 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 2 applications, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results ([en/applicants/cpe#invitations])

8 April 2016 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results ([en/applicants/cpe#invitations])

10 February 2016 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results ([en/applicants/cpe#invitations])

8 October 2015 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results ([en/applicants/cpe#invitations])

3 September 2015 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 2 applications, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe
22 July 2015 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (en/applicants/cpe#invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

21 May 2015 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (en/applicants/cpe#invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

13 March 2015 – Additional CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (en/applicants/cpe#invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

7 October 2014 – CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 3 applications, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (en/applicants/cpe#invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

10 September 2014 – CPE Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 3 applications, and updated application and contention set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (en/applicants/cpe#invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

10 September 2014 – CPE Eligibility Criteria, FAQs and Timeline Updated

ICANN has made minor revisions to the CPE eligibility criteria for both a standard invitation and an accelerated invitation to align with recent changes put forth in the "Update on Application Status and Contention Sets" Advisory (en/applicants/advisories/application-contention-set-14mar14-en). These revisions reflect the current definitions of “active” and “on-hold” for both applications and contention sets. For more details, please see the updated eligibility criteria (en/applicants/cpe#eligibility) below. The corresponding questions and answers on the FAQ page (en/applicants/cpe/faqs-10sep14-en.pdf) [PDF, 377 KB] have also been updated, and the timeline has also been updated to reflect changes made in the last FAQ revision.

13 August 2014 – CPE Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Updated

ICANN has updated the CPE FAQs. The update includes revisions to existing answers based on lessons learned over the past nine months of CPE operations as well as the addition of answers to questions regarding Accelerated Invitation to CPE.

- View CPE FAQs (en/applicants/cpe/faqs-13aug14-en.pdf) [PDF, 119 KB]

7 August 2014 – Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Panel Process Document Released

ICANN has published the Economist Intelligence Unit’s (EIU) process documents for Community Priority Evaluation (CPE). This document provides detail of the process the EIU employs to perform the CPE.
30 July 2014 – Additional Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Result Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 1 application, and updated application and contentious set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (/en/applicants/cpe/invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

12 June 2014 – Additional Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results Released

ICANN has published the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results for 5 applications, and updated application and contentious set statuses accordingly.

- View CPE results (/en/applicants/cpe/invitations)
- View Contention Set Status (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus)

28 May 2014 – Accelerated Invitation to Elect CPE

In effort to maintain program momentum, ICANN has enhanced the CPE invitation process to allow for community applicants to begin the CPE process earlier. The new process provides the community applicant the ability to Opt-in to a CPE invite sooner than the standard Eligibility Criteria. If they qualify, the community applicant can request an invitation to elect CPE. This would allow them to initiate the CPE process sooner than current requirements allow. Select the following link for more information about the process

- View Eligibility Criteria for Accelerated Invitation to Elect CPE

18 March 2014 – First Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Results Released

ICANN has published the first four results of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process.

- View CPE results

25 October 2013 – Additional Community Priority Evaluation Resources Available

Community Priority Evaluation FAQs and a CPE processing timeline are now available.

- View Resources

09 October 2013 – CPE Invitations Sent to Eligible Applicants

Find out which applicants have been invited and where their applications are in the process. This information will be updated regularly as invitations are sent and evaluations are performed and completed.

- Read the Announcement (/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-27sep13-en)
- View CPE Invitations

27 September 2013 – Final Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines Published

The Economist Intelligence Unit finalized its CPE Guidelines after considering ICANN community feedback. The Guidelines have been made public to ensure quality, consistency and transparency in the evaluation process.

- Read the Announcement (/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-27sep13-en)

10 September 2013 – CPE Teleconference Content Available

ICANN holds a teleconference to discuss the details of Community Priority Evaluation with applicants.

- Teleconference Recording (http://audio.icann.org/new-gtlds/cpe-10sep13-en.mp3) [MP3, 15.2 MB]

09 September 2013 – Feedback on Draft CPE Guidelines

Applicants respond to ICANN’s call for input on the Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines created by panel firm EIU.

- Community Feedback (/en/applicants/cpe#guidelines)
16 August 2013 – CPE Draft Guidelines & Community Review
EIU, the CPE panel firm, develops a set of guidelines based on the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook to be used in the evaluation process. Applicants and community members are invited to provide feedback.


16 August 2013 – CPE Resources
ICANN publishes a set of resources to guide eligible applicants through the Community Priority Evaluation process.

- Community Priority Evaluation Resources ([en/applicants/cpe/resources](/en/applicants/cpe/resources))

14 June 2013 – Community Priority Evaluation Early Election
ICANN offers a means for applicants to indicate their intent to elect for Community Priority Evaluation prior to the launch of CPE operations.


CPE Resources Archive

  Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), the firm selected to manage Community Priority Evaluation, published a set of draft Guidelines that panelists will use to score Community applicants. Before finalizing, applicants and the community were invited to review and provide feedback.
- Community Feedback on Draft CPE Guidelines is available for review below:
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
PREPARING EVALUATORS FOR THE NEW gTLD APPLICATION PROCESS

by Michael Salazar | 22 November 2011

The names of the global firms that will serve as the evaluation panels for new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications were recently announced during the ICANN 42 Dakar meeting.

As Program Director for the New gTLD Program (http://newgtlds.icann.org/) responsible for the design and deployment of the New gTLD Application Processing Program and managing the process as it takes flight, I am extremely proud of the selections we have made. All of the organizations chosen are highly qualified, global, and are respected experts in the areas for which they have been selected.

Whom did we select?

We followed a thorough, fair, detailed process to select the evaluation panels. The process, which is described on our website under “Call for Applicant Evaluation Panel Expressions of Interest (http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-25feb09-en.htm)” began in February of 2009. When I came on board in July 2009 I quickly understood the heightened level of interest in providing services for this relatively new Program. In all, twelve global firms formally submitted responses. Out of that pool, we selected: The Economist Intelligence Unit (http://www.eiu.com), Ernst & Young (http://www.ey.com), InterConnect Communications (http://www.icc-uk.com) (partnering with the University College London (http://www.ucl.ac.uk)), Interisle Consulting Group (http://www.interisle.net), JAS Global Advisors (https://www.jasadvisors.com), and KPMG (http://www.kpmg.com).

These firms will work together in various combinations to evaluate applications during the process as follows:

String Reviews

- String Similarity - InterConnect Communications/University College London
- DNS Stability - Interisle Consulting Group
- Geographic Names - The Economist Intelligence Unit and InterConnect Communications/University College London

Applicant Reviews

- Technical and Operational - Ernst & Young, JAS Global Advisors, and KPMG
- Financial Capability - Ernst & Young, JAS Global Advisors, and KPMG
- Registry Services - Interisle Consulting Group
- Community Priority - The Economist Intelligence Unit and InterConnect Communications

Why is there more than one firm for each of the evaluation types? Three reasons:

- To provide sufficient bandwidth to conduct the number of necessary evaluations,
- To provide an alternate channel to avoid conflicts of interest,
- To provide for continued competition among service providers to ensure quality and value going forward.

All of the firms exhibit characteristics that are important to the integrity of this process. For example, KPMG and Ernst & Young both have large global footprints and can effectively scale to ensure timely and culturally sensitive processing of applications. Their strong and long history in providing audit, tax, and advisory services makes them well suited to serve as the panels for financial and technical/operational evaluations. JAS Global Advisors has a decade of experience in due diligence, Internet security, and global IT operations as well as an intimate knowledge of ICANN. The Economist Intelligence Unit, the sister organization of The Economist, incorporates a solid understanding of global corporate and government processes. InterConnect Communications, in conjunction with the University College London
London brings an internationally recognized and diverse linguistics resources offering an abundance of subject matter expertise. And finally, Interisle Consulting Group has a very specific, excellent subject matter expertise in the DNS.

How are we ensuring an effective and efficient evaluation effort?

Ensuring that we have an effective and efficient evaluation effort is one of the most important aspects of building this program - and this starts with how we are preparing the evaluation panels.

The first step begins with simulation exercises. Currently, my team is conducting simulation exercises using mock applications. The simulation exercises have been instrumental in testing the evaluation process, understanding the level of effort to review an application, and equally as important, to calibrate the analysis across the firms.

The next step is building and implementing a robust training program. We are finalizing a training program that all evaluators are required to complete before performing an evaluation. Any individual serving on a panel will need to complete the training program prior to starting. The training program seeks to ensure consistency across all processes and scoring methods so that all applications are evaluated equally.

Finally, we are implementing a Quality Control program to ensure that applications have followed the same evaluation process and have been evaluated consistently. I strongly believe that the Quality Control function is a paramount component of the Program. In addition to performing the critical task of ensuring consistency, Quality Control will enable us to identify areas for improvement. These will in turn create initiatives that will bring enhanced effectiveness to the overall program as well as improvements in costs as we consider future rounds.

How will ICANN address any conflicts of interest?

Conflict of interest is an area that ICANN takes very seriously as it impacts the integrity of the Program. In fact, our processes are built to avoid and adequately deal with potential conflicts of interest. For example, where feasible, we have multiple firms providing services making sure that no evaluators have a conflict with a particular application.

I helped craft applicable language in the Applicant Guidebook and have made the topic the subject of contract negotiations with each firm reinforcing the importance of avoiding conflict of interest (inherent or perceived). There is also a code of conduct that we have asked each firm to abide. Some of the guidelines under the code of conduct restrict the evaluators from speaking at meetings or conferences on the topic of New gTLDs and interacting with entities or individuals that have identified themselves as potential applicants of the New gTLD Program. See Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/agb) (Section 2.4.3 Code of Conduct Guidelines for Panelists) for more information on the Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines.

The New gTLD Application Program is a major undertaking for ICANN and the global Internet community. We are very excited to get this program underway. Stay tuned for additional announcements as we continue to prepare for launch on 12 January 2012.

If you have any questions about the gTLD Program, the evaluation process or the evaluation firms selected, please send your questions to:

newgtld@icann.org (mailto:newgtld@icann.org)
COMMUNITY PRIORITY EVALUATION PANEL AND ITS PROCESSES

Overview
At the time of submitting the new gTLD application, applicants had the opportunity to designate themselves as a community-based application, as prescribed in the section 1.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB).

Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) is defined in section 4.2 of the AGB, and allows a community based-application to undergo an evaluation against the criteria as defined in section 4.2.3 of the AGB, to determine if the application warrants the minimum score of 14 points (out of a maximum of 16 points) to earn priority and thus win the contention set.

Only community-based applicants are eligible to participate in a community priority evaluation. A determination by a community priority panel, appointed by ICANN, must be made before a community name is awarded to an applicant. This determination will be based on the string and the completeness and validity of supporting documentation.

There are two possible outcomes to a Community Priority Evaluation:
- Determination that the application met the CPE requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook (Section 4.2.2) to receive priority over other applications for the same or confusingly similar string = Prevailed.
- Determination that the application did not meet the CPE requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook (Section 4.2.2) to receive priority over other applications for the same or confusingly similar string = Did not prevail.

Section 4.2.2 of the AGB prescribes that the Community Priority Evaluations will be conducted by an independent panel. ICANN selected the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) as the panel firm for Community Priority Evaluations.

The Economist Intelligence Unit

The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) was selected as a Panel Firm for the gTLD evaluation process. The EIU is the business information arm of The Economist Group, publisher of The Economist. Through a global network of more than 500 analysts and contributors, the EIU continuously assesses political, economic, and business conditions in more than 200 countries. As the world’s leading provider of country intelligence, the EIU helps executives, governments, and institutions by providing timely, reliable, and impartial analysis.

The evaluation process respects the principles of fairness, transparency, avoidance of potential conflicts of interest, and non-discrimination. Consistency of approach in scoring applications is of particular importance. In this regard, the Economist Intelligence Unit has more than six decades of experience building evaluative frameworks and benchmarking models for its clients, including governments, corporations, academic institutions and NGOs. Applying scoring systems to complex questions is a core competence.
EIU evaluators and core team

The Community Priority Evaluation panel comprises a core team, in addition to several independent evaluators. The core team comprises a Project Manager, who oversees the Community Priority Evaluation project, a Project Coordinator, who is in charge of the day-to-day management of the project and provides guidance to the independent evaluators, and other senior staff members, including The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Executive Editor and Global Director of Public Policy. Together, this team assesses the evaluation results. Each application is assessed by seven individuals: two independent evaluators, and the core team, which comprises five people.

The following principles characterize the EIU evaluation process for gTLD applications:

• All EIU evaluators, including the core team, have ensured that no conflicts of interest exist.
• All EIU evaluators undergo regular training to ensure full understanding of all CPE requirements as listed in the Applicant Guidebook, as well as to ensure consistent judgment. This process included a pilot training process, which has been followed by regular training sessions to ensure that all evaluators have the same understanding of the evaluation process and procedures.
• EIU evaluators are highly qualified, they speak several languages and have expertise in applying criteria and standardized methodologies across a broad variety of issues in a consistent and systematic manner.
• Language skills and knowledge of specific regions are also considered in the selection of evaluators and the assignment of specific applications.

CPE Evaluation Process

The EIU evaluates applications for gTLDs once they become eligible for review under CPE. The evaluation process as described in section 4.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook and discussed in the CPE Guidelines document is described below:

• The Panel Firm’s Project Manager is notified by ICANN that an application for a gTLD is ready for CPE, and the application ID and public comments are delivered to the EIU. The EIU is responsible for gathering the application materials and other documentation, including letter(s) of support and relevant correspondence, from the public ICANN website. The EIU Project Manager reviews the application and associated materials, in conjunction with the EIU Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator assigns the application to each of two evaluators, who work independently to assess and score the application.
• Each evaluator reviews the application and accompanying documentation, such as letter(s) of support and opposition. Based on this information and additional independent research, the evaluators assign scores to the four CPE criteria as defined in the Applicant Guidebook.
• As part of this process, one of the two evaluators assigned to assess the same string is asked to verify the letters of support and opposition. (Please see “Verification of letter(s) of support and opposition” section for further details.)
• When evaluating an application the CPE Panel also considers the public application comments. The public comments are provided to EIU by ICANN following the close of the 14-day window associated with the CPE invitation. For every comment of support/opposition received, the designated evaluator assesses the relevance of the organization of the poster along with the content of the comment. A separate verification of the comment author is not performed as the Application Comments

1 The term “independent” means that the evaluators do not have any conflict of interest with CPE applicants. It also means that the evaluators sit outside the core EIU team; they provide individual evaluation results based on their assessment of the AGB criteria, application materials, and secondary research without any influence from core team members.
system requires that users register themselves with an active email account before they are allowed to post any comments. However, the evaluator will check the affiliated website to ascertain if the person sending the comment(s) is at that entity/organization named, unless the comment has been sent in an individual capacity.

- Once the two evaluators have completed this process, the evaluation results are reviewed by the Project Coordinator, who checks them for completeness and consistency with the procedures of the Applicant Guidebook.
- If the two evaluators disagree on one or more of the scores, the Project Coordinator mediates and works to achieve consensus, where possible.
- The Project Director and Project Coordinator, along with other members of the core team, meet to discuss the evaluators’ results and to verify compliance with the Applicant Guidebook. Justifications for the scores are further refined and articulated in this phase.
- If the core team so decides, additional research may be carried out to answer questions that arise during the review, especially as they pertain to the qualitative aspects of the Applicant Guidebook scoring procedures.
- If the core team so decides, the EIU may provide a clarifying question (CQ) to be issued via ICANN to the applicant to clarify statements in the application materials and/or to inform the applicant that letter(s) of support could not be verified.
- When the core team achieves consensus on the scores for each application, an explanation, or justification, for each score is prepared. A final document with all scores and justifications for a given application, including a determination of whether the application earned the requisite 14 points for prevailing, is presented to ICANN.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit works with ICANN when questions arise or when additional process information may be required to evaluate an application.
- The Panel Firm exercises consistent judgment in making its evaluations in order to reach conclusions that are compelling and defensible, and documents the way in which it has done so in each case.
Verification of letter(s) of support and opposition

As part of this CPE evaluation process, one of the two evaluators assigned to assess the same string verifies the letters of support and opposition. This process is outlined below:

- On a regular basis, the EIU reviews ICANN’s public correspondence page (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/correspondence) for recently received correspondence to assess whether it is relevant to an ongoing evaluation. If it is relevant, the public correspondence is provided to the evaluators assigned to the evaluation for review.
- For every letter of support/opposition received, the designated evaluator assesses both the relevance of the organization and the validity of the documentation. Only one of the two evaluators is responsible for the letter verification process.
- With few exceptions, verification emails are sent to every entity that has sent a letter(s) of support or opposition to validate their identity and authority.
- The exceptions noted above regarding sending verification letter(s) include but may not be limited to:
  - If there are no contact details included in the letter(s). However, the evaluator will attempt to obtain this information through independent research.
  - If the person sending the letters(s) does not represent an organization. However, if the content of the letter(s) suggests that the individual sending a letter has sent this letter(s) on behalf of an organization/entity the evaluator will attempt to validate this affiliation.
- The verification email for letter(s) of support/opposition requests the following information from the author of the letter:
  - Confirmation of the authenticity of the organization(s) letter.
  - Confirmation that the sender of the letter has the authority to indicate the organization(s) support/opposition for the application.
  - In instances where the letter(s) of support do not clearly and explicitly endorse the applicant, the verification email asks for confirmation as to whether or not the organization(s) explicitly supports the community based application.
- To provide every opportunity for a response, the evaluator regularly contacts the organization for a response by email and phone for a period of at least a month.
- A verbal acknowledgement is not sufficient. The contacted individual must send an email to the EIU acknowledging that the letter is authentic.
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Provides Update on Review of the Community Priority Evaluation Process

LOS ANGELES  1 September 2017  The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) today issued an update (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe) on the review of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process

Community Priority Evaluation is a method to resolve string contention, described in full detail in section 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb). The evaluation determines if the community based application qualifies to earn priority and eliminate all non-community applicants in the contention set as well as any other non-prevailing community applicants. In CPE, the application is evaluated against the following four criteria: Community Establishment; Nexus between Proposed String and Community; Registration Policies, and Community Endorsement. The evaluations were conducted by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). The EIU was selected for this role because it offers premier business intelligence services, providing political, economic, and public policy analysis to businesses, governments, and organizations across the globe.

At various times in the implementation of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board has considered aspects of CPE process, including certain concerns that some applicants have raised regarding the process. On 17 September 2016 (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en), the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board directed the President and CEO, or his designees, to undertake a review of the process by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has interacted with the CPE provider. In his letter of 26 April 2017 to concerned parties (/en/system/files/correspondence/disspain-letter-review-new-gtld-cpe-
process-26apr17-en.pdf) [PDF, 405 KB], Chris Disspain, the Chair of the Board Governance Committee, provided additional information about the scope and status of the review. Below is additional information about the review, as well as the current status of the CPE process review. On 2 June 2017 (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/process-review-update-02jun17-en.pdf), the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization published an update on the Review.

Below is the current status of the Review since the last update

Current Status of the Review

The 2 June 2017 update (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/process-review-update-02jun17-en.pdf) made clear that the Review is being conducted in two parallel tracks by FTI Consulting Inc.’s (FTI) (http://www.fticonsulting.com/) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice. The work of the first track, which focuses on gathering information and materials from the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization, has been completed. The work of the second track, which focuses on gathering information and materials from the CPE provider, is still ongoing. The interview process of the CPE provider personnel that had involvement in CPEs has been completed. FTI is also working with the CPE provider to obtain the reference materials for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests (/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en). The CPE provider has been producing documents on a rolling basis. FTI is currently evaluating whether the CPE provider’s production is complete. Once the underlying information and data collection is complete, FTI anticipates that it will be able to inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of its findings within two weeks.

Recently, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization have received numerous inquiries for documentation and information about the Review. These inquiries have been and will continue to be addressed through ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), and are published on the DIDP page at
The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board recognizes the desire by many to conclude this Review and proceed with the process. The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board also looks forward to concluding the Review and proceeding as appropriate.


More Announcements

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Receives Letter from California Attorney General Regarding .ORG Change of Control (/news/announcement-2020-01-30-en)


ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Launches Dr. Tarek Kamel Award and Opens Nomination for ICANN Community Excellence Award (/news/announcement-2-2020-01-27-en)

Register Now to Participate in the 7th Middle East DNS Forum (/news/announcement-2020-01-27-en)
APPLICATION DETAILS

View Application Update History (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:viewapplicationchangehistory/1562?ac=1562)

Please Note: The information on this page relating to the applicant, including contact information, reflects the information provided during the application phase of the New gTLD Program. Contact information is not maintained for withdrawn applications. Additionally, the information for TLDs that have contracted with ICANN may no longer be current as this information is not maintained on this page post delegation and does not necessarily reflect the current Registry information. For a current list of Registries and Registry contact information, please visit https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/registries/registries-agreements-en (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/registries/registries-agreements-en) and https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/listing-2012-02-25-en (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/listing-2012-02-25-en), respectively.

Application ID: 1-1032-95136

String: HOTEL (download public portion of application (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadapplication/1562?ac=1562))

Applicant: HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l

Prioritization Number: 1751

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Web Site: http://www.dotelhotel.info

Primary Contact: Philipp Grabensee

Phone Number: Contact Information Redacted

Email: Contact Information Redacted

Attachments (13):

Caution: these files were prepared and submitted by a party other than ICANN, and ICANN is not responsible for the content. The files could contain scripts or embedded links that might execute or open automatically. You should make sure your operating system and applications (including antivirus definitions if applicable) are fully updated. Proceed at your own risk.

- 20f(Q20f_HOTEL_support-AHLA-USA.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/106390?ac=1562)
- 20f(Q20f_HOTEL_support-CHA-China.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/106392?ac=1562)
- 20f(Q20f_HOTEL_support-GHA-Global_Luxury_Hoteis.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/106393?ac=1562)
- 20f(Q20f_HOTEL_support-IHRA-Global-Association.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/106399?ac=1562)
- 20f(Q20f_HOTEL_support_HOTREC_Europe.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/106391?ac=1562)
- 25.25_EPP.pdf (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/24713?ac=1562)
- 25.25a_XML_Request_Response.pdf (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/73122?ac=1562)
- 25.25b-INFO_EPP_RFC_QTE_criteria_v1-5-1.pdf (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/73123?ac=1562)
Application Details

- 27 (27_Registration_Lifecycle.pdf) (/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadattachment/24899?t:ac=1562)

Application Status: On-hold


GAC EW: [GAC EW](https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Early+Warnings)

Contention Resolution Status: On Hold ([applicationstatus/applicationdetails:viewcontentionsetimage?t:ac=1562])
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
CONTENTION SET ON-HOLD 
PENDING ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM

1-1032-95136 [HOTEL], HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.r.l. prevailed in Community Priority Evaluation.
This determination removes string contention.

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-1032-95136 
DolcHotel Inc.

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-1500-98803 
Spring McCook, LLC

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-1181-77853 
dot Hotel Limited

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-1249-36668 
Despegar Online SRL

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-927-35198 
Top Level Domain Holdings Limited

Will Not Proceed 
Community Priority Evaluation

HOTEL 1-1913-57874 
Fegistry, LLC

November 21, 2014
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l

Application Downloaded On: 17 Jun 2016

String: hotel

Application ID: 1-1032-95136

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l

2. Address of the principal place of business
   Contact Information Redacted

3. Phone number
   Contact Information Redacted

4. Fax number
   Contact Information Redacted

5. If applicable, website or URL
   http://www.dothotel.info

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Philipp Grabensee

6(b). Title
   Managing Director

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
John Kane

7(b). Title
Vice President, Corporate Services

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
Societe a responsabilite limitee (S.a.r.l.)

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).

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.
Not Applicable. / Not Applicable.

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Not Applicable.
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>Philipp Grabensee</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afilias PLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL Top-Level-Domain GmbH</td>
<td>Not Applicable</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.

hotel

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.

Hotel Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l. 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
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APPLICATION UPDATE HISTORY

Application ID: 1-1032-95136

String: HOTEL

Applicant: HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.à.r.l.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posting Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 June 2016</td>
<td>Updates were made to application question 6. These updates were made as a result of ICANN approving an application change request submitted by the applicant. Updates are reflected in the HTML file posted to the right. These corresponding updates will not be available for public comment.</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (<a href="/applicationstatus/applications/status/applicationchangehistory/download#document/40512_caef4d7e-732d-42c6-92e8-2d7f3f29a4b9&amp;ac=1562">pdf</a>)</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (<a href="/applicationstatus/applications/status/applicationchangehistory/download#document/40512_caef4d7e-732d-42c6-92e8-2d7f3f29a4b9&amp;ac=1562">pdf</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting Date</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 December 2014</td>
<td>Updates were made to application question 11.</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (v2-applicationstatus/applicationchangehistory/downloaddocument/442c22c44c22b4c43bcb-120e8d97ca2d&amp;ac=1562)</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (v2-applicationstatus/applicationchangehistory/downloaddocument/442c22c44c22b4c43bcb-120e8d97ca2d&amp;ac=1562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 2013</td>
<td>Updates were made to application question 2.</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (v2-applicationstatus/applicationchangehistory/downloaddocument/24772_cerf=442c13bc-d4cb-49b6-89cb-120e8d97ca2d&amp;ac=1562)</td>
<td>1-1032-95136_HOTEL.html (v2-applicationstatus/applicationchangehistory/downloaddocument/24772_cerf=442c13bc-d4cb-49b6-89cb-120e8d97ca2d&amp;ac=1562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 August 2013</td>
<td>Updates were made to confidential portions of the application and therefore specific details are not being posted. These updates are available for public comment for 30 days, beginning on the posting date.</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R-15

RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
Reconsideration Request Form
Version of 11 April 2013

ICANN's Board Governance Committee is responsible for receiving requests for reconsideration from any person or entity that has been materially affected by any ICANN staff action or inaction if such affected person or entity believes the action contradicts established ICANN policies, or by actions or inactions of the Board that such affected person or entity believes has been taken without consideration of material information. Note: This is a brief summary of the relevant Bylaws provisions. For more information about ICANN’s reconsideration process, please visit http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#IV and http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/.

This form is provided to assist a requester in submitting a Reconsideration Request, and identifies all required information needed for a complete Reconsideration Request. This template includes terms and conditions that shall be signed prior to submission of the Reconsideration Request.

Requesters may submit all facts necessary to demonstrate why the action/inaction should be reconsidered. However, argument shall be limited to 25 pages, double-spaced and in 12 point font.

For all fields in this template calling for a narrative discussion, the text field will wrap and will not be limited.

Please submit completed form to reconsideration@icann.org.

1. **Requester Information**

1. **Name:** Despegar Online SRL,
   **Address:** Contact Information Redacted
   Contact Information Redacted
   **Email:** Contact Information Redacted

AND

2. **Name:** DotHotel Inc.,
   **Address:** Contact Information Redacted
   Contact Information Redacted
   **Email:** Contact Information Redacted
AND

3 Name: dot Hotel Limited,
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

AND

4. Name: Fegistry, LLC,
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

AND

5. Name: Spring McCook, LLC,
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

AND

6. Name: Top Level Domain Holdings Limited,
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted
(Requester, herein)

(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):
   ___ Board action/inaction
   ___ Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.

   Requester was notified by public posting at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations on or about 12 June 2014 that the application for the new gTLD .hotel (1-1032-95136) by HOTEL Top-Level-Domain s.a.r.l had prevailed in an award of community priority after Community Priority Evaluation. Requester seeks to have that decision by the Community Priority Evaluation panel reconsidered.

4. Date of action/inaction:

   The date of the CPE panel is 11 June 2014; the date of its public posting is approximately 12 June 2014.

5. On what date did you become aware of the action or that action would not be taken?

   Requester became aware of the action on or about 13 June 2014

6. Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:

   Requester is a group of applicants in a contention set with other applicants for .hotel. If the decision to award community priority to application 1-1032-95136 stands, it will require Requesters’ standard (non-community) applications to be abandoned or withdrawn. The Applicant Guidebook (“AGB”) states at page 4-9:

   “It should be noted that a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be.”

   “Qualified” in this context means that the application has been awarded community priority status. The elimination of Requester’s applications will cause Requester to lose its current investment of
time, money and other resources in its applications, notwithstanding the availability of a small application fee refund. More significantly, it deprives Requester of the opportunity to run the .Hotel TLD, which represent loss of a financial and business opportunity to Requestor.

7. **Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.**

The purpose behind the community application is expressly to fend off legitimate competition from business operators in competition with the standard hotel booking model. Community applicants are required to file evidence of support from their so-called community. This applicant has filed support from commercial trade associations dependent on maintaining the current commercial model.

The Applicant’s principal supporter is the IH&RA (International Hotel and Restaurant Association). The IH &RA said, in its supporting letter:

*We fully support dotHOTEL’s Eligibility Criteria as defined in ISO 18513 to establish a verified and secure domain name space exclusively for the hotel industry. Thus, .hotel domain names will help to increase direct bookings by which profit margins of hotels rise and to reduce dependency from OTAs.*

The Hotrec association (a trade association supporting both the restaurant and hotel trades in Europe) said this:

“... hotels all over Europe are concerned to lose more and more control over their rates, distribution channels and the hotel product itself to the so-called Online Travel Agencies or OTAs. With dotHOTEL’s Eligibility Criteria for a verified and secure domain name space exclusively for the hotel industry as defined in ISO 18513, .hotel domain names will help to increase direct bookings by which profit margins of hotels rise and to reduce dependency from OTAs.”

The Global Hotel Alliance said:

“....hotels all over the union are concerned to lose more and more control over their rates, distribution channels and the hotel product itself to the so called Other Travel Agencies or OTAs. With dotHotel’s eligibility criteria for a verified and secure domain name space exclusively for the hotel industry as defined in ISO 18313 .hotel domain names will help to increase direct bookings by which profit margins of hotels rise and to reduce dependency on OTAs.”

The application is plainly a purely commercial move by heavily invested commercial entities to increase their profits, and to head off competition from developing threats to their market, presented by the growth of the OTA business model.

Other parties affected by the decision therefore include all of the world’s OTAs, and all of the
world's customers of hotel products that will be deprived of competitive business opportunities in relation to hotel bookings.

8. **Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information**

**Introduction**

Requester submits that the Community Priority Evaluation Panel ("Panel") failed to properly perform its functions as set out in the AGB.

Before describing the failures of the Panel, Requester makes two procedural comments.

First, there is no doubt that ICANN’s Reconsideration process applies to the decisions of external providers such as the Panel. As noted by the Board Governance Committee ("BGC") in the recent .tennis decision:

"ICANN has previously determined that the reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges to expert determinations rendered by panels formed by third party service providers, such as the EIU, where it can be stated that the Panel failed to follow established policies or processes in reaching its determination, or that staff failed to follow its policies or processes in accepting that determination."

Second, the Requester appreciates that on Reconsideration by the BGC, the Requester bears the burden of proving that the Panel has failed to follow some policy or process that it should have done, and is not a challenge to the accuracy or validity of any of the Panel’s conclusions. The Requester apprehends the BGC position that disagreeing with the conclusion of the Panel is not sufficient grounds for reconsideration. As the BGC noted in the .tennis Decision on reconsideration:

"In challenging the Panel’s Report, the Requester does not identify any process or policy or standard that the Panel misapplied in scoring element 2-A. Instead, the Requester simply objects to the Panel’s substantive conclusion, arguing that “[t]he community as defined [in the Application] specifically includes the global tennis community.” (Request at 4.) Such substantive disagreement with the Panel’s findings is not a proper basis for reconsideration."

In this case, however, there are 3 instances where the Panel has not followed the AGB policy and processes for conducting CPE.

Further, the Panel, and ICANN staff have breached more general ICANN policies and procedures in the conduct of this CPE.

**Breaches of the AGB rules on Community Priority Evaluation.**

---


1. Failure to identify a “Community”.

The AGB sets out at para 4.2.3 the rules for community priority. In doing so, the drafting practice has been to set out a rule, in this criteria for awarding points, then to provide definitions of the terms used in the criteria, and then guidelines on how to apply the definitions and interpret the criteria. The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) published further “guidelines” in August 2013, to which we will refer.

The AGB set out 4 criteria, worth a score of 4 points each. These criteria were divided into subparts carrying various scores. An applicant was required to score 14 points out of the possible 16 to prevail in this evaluation.

Criterion 1 is entitled “Community establishment”, and is divided into 2 components A -“Delineation” and B - Extension”. The criteria for these are set out at page 4-10, and then the definition section follows. The very first definition that is required to be understood and applied to the criterion is whether or not there is a community involved in the application. That definition comes first, and logically is a pre-requisite to the later steps of seeing how well delineated that community is, or how old it is, etc. The first question that has to be asked is “Is there a community that meets the definition of “community” under these rules”? If there is not, then the rest of the analysis is unnecessary, as the applicant should fail at the first hurdle.

The Panel did not attempt this analysis, in breach of the requirements of the policy and process for CPE.

The definition of community begins by noting that it means more than its Latin origins in “communitas” meaning fellowship, but observing that it still implies “more of cohesion than a mere commonality of interest”. Not testing whether there was a community at all under this definition is critical, as it is readily apparent from the evidence and the application text that a “mere commonality of interest” is precisely what links the applicant and its supporters, without any of the “cohesion” that a true community under this definition must have. This is not a disagreement about a finding by the Panel on this topic; the Panel did not consider this definition, nor apply the test for “community” required.

The definitions of “community” go on to refer to 3 further conditions that must be satisfied for a finding that a community existed.

They are:

(2) an awareness and recognition of a community among its members;
(3) some understanding of the community’s existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed); and
(4) extended tenure or longevity—non-transience—into the future.

The Panel did refer to these definitions, but failed to consider the first and vital question of whether there was first a cohesive community, bound together by more than a mere commonality of interest. Had it considered the matter, it would have appreciated that the applicants definition, rather than showing cohesion, depended instead on coercion; every hotelier is deemed a member of this community, even though they have never heard of it, and would not chose to join it if asked, but are nevertheless deemed to be a member of it. Compulsory membership, and deemed memberships seem to be the opposite of the kind of community that is worth of the protection and reward of the
CPE process. However, as the Panel has simply omitted to consider cohesiveness, the matter can be reconsidered.

**Failure to consider self-awareness and recognition of the community**

The Panel report begins with the Panel being confused or mistaken about the criteria for the first criterion – Delineation. It says:

"**Delineation**
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear, straightforward membership definition, and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members."

In fact, the requirements of delineation are (in summary) that it must (1) be clearly delineated, (2) be organized, and (3) be pre-existing before 2007. The Panel got one out of the three requirements correct.

It will be observed that the Panel has imported the test for determining whether there is a "community" – self-awareness that the group is a community - into the test for "delineation". With respect, that is an error of process that further invalidates the findings.

Even if it were not, and self-awareness and recognition are considered with Delineation, the actual response given under that enquiry about "self-awareness and recognition" shows that the Panel does not understand the test that is to be applied. The response given by the Panel: "This is because the community is defined in terms of its association with the hotel industry and the provision of specific hotel services." is a response directed only at the delineation issue, which is how the Panel posed the question, not as part of the "self-awareness" and "beyond mere commonality of interest" tests that goes into the definition of community. The Panel has not considered, and has therefore not concluded that the community has the requisite self-awareness and self-recognition to be a community for the purposes of CPE.

We observe, for the record, that the above quote is an almost meaningless statement even in the context of discussing delineation. The phrase is substantially repeated in relation to community longevity, where it is equally meaningless.

What is required is a showing by evidence that members of the alleged community regard themselves as members of a defined community, which is recognised as such by the members, and by people outside the community. Simply operating a hotel anywhere in the world might make one a member of the same trade, having a similar common interest. Once cannot declare that even hoteliers who have never heard of the associations supporting this applicant, operating in different countries from where these associations operate, are nevertheless members of a community with them, simply because they are in the same trade, and because there is an ISO definition of what a hotel is.
This is a very important issue for the AGB itself, which noted in its Guidelines: 
*All (referring to possible types of communities) are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both Delineation and Extension*

We invite the BGC to find that this is a failure to consider the issue of self-awareness and recognition, which does not arise from “association with the hotel industry” or “provision of hotel services” at all. That is, there has not been a consideration of the issue of self-awareness and recognition, if the response is on an entirely separate and distinct matter.

It is important to note that the Panel finds that the alleged community is clearly delineated, because there is an ISO definition of “hotel”, and because every hotel is a member of the alleged community. The Panel says: *The string “Hotel” is an internationally agreed word that has a clear definition of its meaning: According to DIN EN ISO 18513:2003, “A hotel is an establishment with services and additional facilities where accommodation and in most cases meals are available.”* ¹

The Panel then proceeds through the proper requirements of Delineation, which it names accurately – organisation and existence before 2007.

**Failure to apply test for Uniqueness**

The next major consideration is that of Nexus— the link between the string and the purported Community. This is broken down in 2 parts: Nexus, worth 3 points and Uniqueness worth one point. To get 3 points under Nexus an applicant has to show that the string is either

(a) an exact match of the community name, or

(b) a well know short form of the community name, or

(c) is an abbreviation of the community name.

An applicant who cannot score 3 points under those options, can score 2 points if it can show that the string “identifies” the community — but in a way that does not equate with the 3 conditions above. “Identify” is defined in the AGB as meaning “...that the applied for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community”.

The AGB Guidelines say on this: *“With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string is commonly known by others as the identification / name of the community.”*

**Uniqueness is defined in the AGB as where the “String has no other significant meaning beyond**

---

¹ There is some confusion in the Application itself, which defines hotels by reference to the ISO definition then appears to hold that the “establishments” themselves are members of the Community. For present purposes we proceed on the basis that while a hotel may be a defined establishment, the alleged community is made up of the people and enterprises that run the hotels, and also the associations that such people form among themselves.
identifying the community described in the application."

The Panel reports that the Applicant scored 2 points on Nexus, as the string "identifies" the community. It explained itself thus: "The string nexus (sic) closely describes the community, without overreaching substantially beyond the community. The string identifies the name of the core community members (i.e. hotels and associations representing hotels)."

We observe that there is no evidence put forward for this claim, which remains an unsupported assertion by the Applicant, and that no web searches are reported, as recommended by the EIU to explore the issue. In particular, no evidence is given of how non-members of the community regard the string, and whether or not they associate the string "hotel" with the community of hoteliers seeking the TLD. It is manifestly obvious that it is also wrong in fact; the word "hotel" describes a place for obtaining lodging, not the hoteliers (Marriott, Sheraton, Crowne Plaza) and not their trade associations (IH&RA, HotRec, GHA).

The Panel then considered "Uniqueness".
It held: "The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the string has no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application."

We remind the BGC that the Panel has itself already cited, and relied upon a definition of the string that has a meaning significantly different than the one just quoted. In determining that there was a delineated community, the Panel relied on the ISO definition of "hotel" — namely: "The string "Hotel" is an internationally agreed word that has a clear definition of its meaning: According to DIN EN ISO 18513:2003, "A hotel is an establishment with services and additional facilities where accommodation and in most cases meals are available."

Patently, the word "hotel" has another "significant meaning" apart from identifying a community — it means a place where a customer can purchase lodgings.

The Panel has not followed ICANN policy or process in arriving at the conclusion that the string has "no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community" because it has itself cited a significant other meaning, and relied on that other meaning (that the word means "an establishment with services and additional facilities where accommodation and in most cases meals are available") in order to measure and find Delineation.

This is not a disagreement about a conclusion — this is a demonstration of a failure of process by the Panel. It cannot use the significant meaning of "hotel" under an ISO definition for one purpose (a finding under delineation), then deny that meaning and say there is "no other significant meaning" for the purposes of finding Uniqueness.

The point is an obvious one. There is no demonstrated "community", merely a business association of traders from the developed world with a common business interest. They wish to defeat the kind of competition and innovation that the ICANN program was intended to stimulate. The word
“hotel” means to most of the world what the ISO definition says it means - a place for lodging and meals. To assert that it means to most people the association of business enterprises that run the hotels is unsubstantiated and absurd.

Breaches of other ICANN Principles

Under Article 7 of the Affirmation of Commitments “ICANN commits to provide a thorough and reasoned explanation of decisions taken, the rationale thereof and the sources of data and information on which ICANN relied.”

Under Article 1, Mission and Core Values of the ICANN Bylaws (11 Apr. 2013) at Clause 2.8 ICANN commits to the core value of “Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”

Under Article III, Section 1 of the Bylaws ICANN commits: “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 Article IV, Clause 2.20, the purpose of Reconsideration is to: “...to ensure that all persons materially affected by ICANN decisions have meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.”

Requestor submits that various aspects of the CPE process breach, or risk breaching, these fundamental provisions. All of the members of the Requestor group (and there are others) are competing applicants for the .hotel TLD. CPE is a process by which all were “materially affected” but in which a number of elements of basic fairness seem to be lacking. Although CPE is not set up as an inter partes contest, there are a number of features which are prejudicial to standard applicants, including:

(a) Insufficient material was made available to them as to who the Panelist was, and their qualifications. Several instances of possible conflict of interest involving Dispute Resolution Providers have arisen during the course of the new gTLD rollout to date. The way to ensure there is no criticism of the process, and to prevent actual conflicts is to ensure full notification of all details is provided to affected parties.

(b) There is no publication of the materials to be examined by the Panel. It is possible for the Panel to request further information during CPE, but it is not clear whether any, and if so what, material was sought and what was provided. Communications made between the Applicant and the CPE panel during the evaluation process should be made public. In relation to any such material, standard applicants should have some way of providing counter balancing material for the panel’s consideration.

(c) Insufficient analysis and reasons were given on how the Panelist reached their decision in the CPE report: (http://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/tlds/hotel/hotel-cpe-1-1032-95136-en.pdf). By way of example, a crucial issue in CPE is the whether or not there is a self-aware, well recognized
“hotel community” entitled to the special privileges that the AGB provides.

Far from providing the “thorough and reasoned explanation of decisions taken, the rationale thereof and the sources of data and information on which ICANN relied.” On this crucial issue the Panel says only this:

“This is because the community is defined in terms of its association with the hotel industry and the provision of specific hotel services.”

This is relatively nonsensical in the context of an allegedly global community. No evidence for the existence of this community was provided at all. Given the importance of this finding, and the impact on the affected parties, a thorough rationale should be provided, with the sources of data and information relied upon spelled out.

While the BGC takes the apparent view that the quality of decision-making is not available for reconsideration, the parties are denied “…meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.” Simply noting that the Panel has asked the question that the AGB requires, without regard to whether the answer has any relevance to the question posed is not reconsideration, and is not a fair assessment of whether ICANN polices and processes have been applied neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.

9. What are you asking ICANN to do now?

Requester requests that the current finding that the Applicant has prevailed in CPE should be set aside. The Application should be remitted to the Panel for re-examination, with the Panel directed to have regard to the matters raised in the reconsideration request, and any further direction from the BGC. [JN: Should we ask for the necessary information here or do a separate info request?]

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.

Requestor is a group of applicants in ICANN new gTLD program. Each of the members of the group is affected by the finding in CPE of which Reconsideration is sought.

11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

___ X Yes

___ No

11a. If yes, Is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties?
The parties are members of the same content set, all being applicants for a .hotel TLD

Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?

No

Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar.

The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious.

Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing.

The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC.

The ICANN Board of Director’s decision on the BGC’s reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

[Signature]

6/28/2014

Date
Reconsideration Request
Regarding Action Contrary to Established ICANN Policies
Pertaining to Community Objections to New gTLD Applications

Introductory Summary

i. The Requestors identified below, as parties “adversely affected by” an “ICANN action ... that contradict[s] established ICANN policy,” respectfully submit this request for reconsideration (“Request”) to the Board Governance Committee (“BGC”). Bylaws Art. IV § 2.2(a). Requestors ask the BGC to reconsider action by ICANN staff denying a request for production of documents (“RFP”) made by Requestors pursuant to ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”). The DIDP serves to implement ICANN’s charge to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner … consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness,” id. Art. III § 1, and its refusal to honor the RFP betrays that founding principle.

ii. The RFP seeks information pertaining to a report (“Report”) by an unidentified panel which performed a Community Priority Evaluation (“CPE”) concerning a community-based application (“Application”), by HOTEL Top-Level-Domain s.a.r.l. (“Hotel TLD”), for the new generic top-level domain <.HOTEL> (the “String”). In its Report, the CPE panel concluded that the Application had satisfied the CPE criteria sufficiently to earn community priority. As a consequence, Requestors – each of which also had applied for the String – became excluded from competing for it.

iii. Dismayed by this result, Requestors undertook by their RFP to ascertain the identity and qualifications of the CPE panel, information regarding panelist selection, and the panelists’ communications among themselves and/or with Hotel TLD or ICANN relating to or having any material bearing upon the Report. The RFP would determine, among other things, whether the anomalous CPE ruling resulted from improper selection or training of, or influence upon, the panel. Notwithstanding its commitment to transparency, fairness, independence and non-discrimination, ICANN attempts to shield
this important information from scrutiny by those directly and adversely affected by the 
CPE panel’s decision. Reconsideration properly lies to remedy ICANN’s obstinacy as 
contrary to its own documented policies.

1. Requestor Information

a. Name: Despegar Online SRL
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

b. Name: Radix FZC
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

c. Name: Famous Four Media Limited
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

d. Name: Registry, LLC
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

e. Name: Donuts Inc.
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted

f. Name: Minds + Machines
   Address: Contact Information Redacted
   Email: Contact Information Redacted
The foregoing are referred to collectively herein as “Requestors.” This Request is submitted on behalf of Requestors by:

Counsel: John M. Genga, Don C. Moody
The IP and Technology Legal Group, P.C.
dba New gTLD Disputes

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Email: Contact Information Redacted

2. Request for Reconsideration of:
   _____ Board action/inaction
   __X__ Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.
   3.1. Requestors seek reconsideration of ICANN’s denial of the RFP. As a “principal element of ICANN’s approach to transparency and information disclosure,” the DIDP is “intended to ensure that information contained in documents concerning ICANN’s operational activities … is made available to the public unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality.” See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-2012-02-25-en. ICANN’s refusal to provide documents responsive to the RFP violates this policy and the transparency touted as a “core value” established to guide its actions. Bylaws Art. I § 7, Art. III § 1.

   3.2. ICANN provided for reconsideration to remedy “staff actions” that so “contradict” such “established ICANN policies.” Id. Art. IV § 2.2(a). It becomes acutely important where, as here, enforcing the transparency principle would reveal whether ICANN or its agents have violated other policies, such as:
      • “[S]ustain[ing] … and promoting competition,” id. Art. I §§ 5, 6;
      • “Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness,” id. Art. I § 8;
      • “Remaining accountable to the Internet community,” id. Art. I § 10; and
- Not “apply[ing] its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or singl[ing] out any particular party for disparate treatment,” *id.* Art. II § 3.

Requestors urge the BGC to act to assure compliance with these critical policies by reconsidering ICANN’s response to the RFP and directing that it produce all documents responsive to it.

4. **Date of action:**

ICANN’s RFP response (the “Response”) bears the date of 3 September 2014.

5. **On what date did you become aware of the action?**


6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action:**

6.1. Under the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook” or “AGB”), “a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be.” AGB § 4.2.3 at 4-9. “Qualified” in this context means an application that attains community status as a result of CPE. *Id.*

Because Hotel TLD prevailed in CPE, Requestors can no longer compete for the String.


6.3. Requestors also at that time claimed breach of other ICANN principles from the Bylaws and other governing documents, including ICANN’s commitments to:

- “provide a … reasoned explanation of decisions,”
• make decisions “by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively,” and
• “operate … in an open and transparent manner.”

Id. at 10, citing ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments Art. 7 and Bylaws Arts. I § 2.8 and III § 1. The CPE process violated these tenets by (i) not making available the identities or qualifications of the panelists, (ii) not disclosing all materials considered by the panel, and (iii) not giving sufficient analysis and reasons for the panel’s decision. Id. at 10-11.

6.4. The BGC construed Requestors’ position in that prior matter as contesting the substance of the panel’s determination, which it held insufficient for reconsideration. See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/determination-despegar-online-et-al-22aug14-en.pdf at 7, 8, 9. It also ruled that the Guidebook does not require the panel to reveal the information that Requestors had sought, so that it did not violate any “established policy” of ICANN in not making such disclosures. Id. at 10-11.

6.5. Meanwhile, Requestors attempted to determine by their RFP whether the qualifications, selection, training and potential influence over the panel may have violated established ICANN policies pertaining, for example, to non-discrimination, neutrality, accountability and objective, fair application of documented policies. ICANN’s refusal to provide the requested information obstructs Requestors’ efforts to determine if it or the panel overstepped such policies, which would give them a basis for reconsideration or other review that this Tribunal previously had found lacking.

6.6. The overarching principle of transparency exists to ensure that ICANN and its agents comply with its other policies. Parties prevented from making such inquiries cannot enforce rights that they do not know they have or obtain remedies for violations they do not know have occurred. ICANN’s sweeping rejection of the RFP has adversely affected Requestors in this material respect, entitling them to reconsideration here.
7. Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.

7.1. Without true transparency and accountability, the Internet community, for whose benefit ICANN operates,\(^1\) can have no confidence that the organization with which it has entrusted the stewardship of the DNS in fact adheres to the principles upon which that trust rests. The DIDP process enables ICANN’s multiple stakeholders to verify such compliance, and to correct transgressions and their consequences if and when they occur.

7.2. The underlying CPE determination has wiped out six capable competitors for a highly sought-after piece of Internet “real estate.” Particularly when ICANN opens new swaths of the namespace, preferring a single party over another – or, as in this case, many others – not only restricts competition in that single instance, but also can discourage it in the future.

7.3. Also, a number of applicants have filed on a community basis and have gone through or await invitation to CPE. Similar results can occur and parties should have the ability – and ostensibly do, through DIDP – to discover whether the processes affecting them took place in accordance with ICANN’s own foundational principles.

7.4. Nor does this concern stop with CPE or even the new gTLD program as a whole. It can arise in connection with any ICANN action or inaction that impacts any of its constituency. All such affected parties may suffer if lapses in transparency go unchecked. The potential for recurrence further supports reconsideration now.

8. Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information

Staff Action: Refusal to produce documents responsive to the RFP, which contravenes ICANN’s transparency doctrine and may mask other potential policy violations. Pertinent facts and procedural history appear in the “Detailed Explanation”

---

\(^1\) See ICANN Articles of Incorporation § 4.
portion of this section. The policy abuses constituting grounds for reconsideration are
discussed at greater length in Section 10, *infra*.

**Board action:** Not applicable; Requestors do not seek reconsideration of any
Board action of which they are aware.

**Provide the Required Detailed Explanation here:**

8.1. Requestors all submitted standard applications for the String, and Hotel
TLD applied for it as an asserted community. [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-
result/applicationstatus/viewstatus](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus). Hotel TLD thereafter received and accepted an

8.2. According to the just-cited webpage, “application comments and letters of
support or opposition must be submitted within 14 days of the CPE Invitation Date in
order to be considered by the CPE Panel.” *Id.* Opposing statements are published.
See [https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/viewcomments](https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/viewcomments). Several
Requestors, voicing concerns shared by all of them, filed oppositions to awarding Hotel
TLD community priority.2

8.3. Hotel TLD posted a public response to the various opposition comments.
[https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/commentdetails/12399](https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/commentdetails/12399). Requestors
do not know if Hotel TLD had any other communications, *ex parte* or otherwise, with
ICANN, the CPE panel or anyone else involved in the CPE process.

8.4. Nor do Requestors have any information as to who served on the panel,
what qualifications they had, how they got selected, and what communications they had
internally or with ICANN, Hotel TLD or any other person concerning their evaluation.
The panel issued its Report dated 11 June 2014, posted 12 June, finding that the Hotel
TLD Application had satisfied the Guidebook-prescribed community criteria sufficiently

2 See, e.g., [https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/commentdetails/12391](https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/commentdetails/12391);
to gain community priority. See Annex A hereto. This determination removed all of Requestors’ applications from the .HOTEL contention set, AGB at 4-9, and left Hotel TLD a completely unencumbered path to delegation of the String.

8.5. As stated above, Requestors sought reconsideration of the Report as contrary to certain ICANN policies. The BGC did not agree, and denied the request. Links to the request and ruling, dated 28 June and 22 August 2014, respectively, appear in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.4, supra.

8.6. Requestors sent their 4 August 2014 RFP, Annex B, to didp@icann.org, the email address specified by ICANN for service of such requests. It sought documents identified verbatim as follows:

8.6.1. All correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication ("Communications") between individual member [sic] of ICANN’s Board or any member of ICANN Staff and the Economist Intelligence Unit3 or any other organization or third party involved in the selection or organisations of the CPE Panel for the Report, relating to the appointment of the Panel that produced the Report, and dated with the 12 month period preceding the date of the Report;

8.6.2. The curriculum vitaes ("CVs") of the members appointed to the CPE Panel;

8.6.3. All Communications (as defined above) between the CPE Panel and/or ICANN, directly related to the creation of the Report; and

8.6.4. All Communications (as defined above) between the CPE Panel and/or Hotel TLD or any other party prior with a material bearing on the creation of the Report.

3 The EIU is the third party organization selected by and contracted with ICANN to evaluate all community-based applications invited to CPE.
ld. at 1. The RFP further outlined how the information requested above, defined as the “Requested Information” in the RFP,4 “does not meet any of the defined conditions under the DIDP for non-disclosure ....” ld. at 1-2.

8.7. ICANN’s 3 September 2014 Response to the RFP, Annex C, posted on its website on 4 September, stated that ICANN did not have certain of the documents requested, yet admitted it had others but would not produce them due to claimed protections against disclosure specified in the DIDP. More specifically:

8.7.1. Claiming that, for the sake of “independence of the process and evaluation, ICANN … is not involved with the selection … of … individual evaluators” and does not have “information about who the evaluators on any individual panel may be,” the Response represents that ICANN “does not have any CVs for the CPE Panel … [or] … regarding the appointment of the specific CPE Panel for the .HOTEL CPE,” responsive to the requests reproduced above in paragraphs 8.6.1 and 8.6.2. App. C at 2. However, the Response admits that ICANN does have “documentation with the EIU for the performance of its role … as it relates to the .HOTEL CPE,” but asserts that those documents satisfy “certain of the Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure set forth in the DIDP.” ld.

8.7.2. Requestors do not agree with ICANN’s asserted bars to disclosure. ICANN should not interpose such obstacles to access without providing a factual basis to determine if its claimed privileges have any merit. At minimum, the BGC should review the asserted protections and independently determine if they have any supportable grounds. Regardless, it should order production for the reasons set forth in Section 10 below.

8.7.3. With regard to the third item of the RFP, repeated at paragraph 8.6.3 above, ICANN represents that it “does not have any communications …

4 Requestors define other capitalized herein, such as “Report” and “Hotel TLD,” to have the same meanings as in the RFP.
with the evaluators that identify the scoring for any individual CPE ..., [so] does not have documents of this type.” Requestors do not dispute that ICANN cannot produce what it does not have. However, again, ICANN does concede that it has some documents responsive to this RFP – namely, ”communications with persons from EIU who are not involved in the scoring of a CPE, but otherwise assist in a particular CPE ...” Requestors should have access to such documentation, but ICANN again refuses to produce it on grounds stated in the DIDP but not established in the Response.

8.7.4. ICANN states that it also has documents responsive to the fourth category of the RFP, paragraph 8.6.4 above, constituting “Communications between the CPE Panel and Hotel TLD or any other party bearing on the creation of the Report.” Specifically, while ICANN claims to have “limited the ability for requesters or other interested parties to initiate direct contact with the panels,” it does concede that “the CPE Panel goes through a validation process regarding letters of support or opposition” as a matter of “direct communications,” and that “from time to time ICANN is cc’d on the CPE Panel’s verification emails.” The Requestors properly seek those direct communications. The “verification process” could conclude that such communications are not appropriate, but could also reveal that the panel accepts certain communications that it should not. Even rejected communications, if reviewed, could potentially influence the panel or expose some policy violation.

As argued more fully below, transparency demands production of the Requested Information. Without it, ICANN has no accountability to its stakeholders or the public, and offers no assurance of compliance with its own policies on which its constituents rely in maintaining ICANN’s role overseeing the DNS.
9. **What are you asking ICANN to do now?**
   
   Applicant respectfully requests that the BGC:
   
   9.1. Independently evaluate the legitimacy of ICANN's claimed grounds for withholding the Requested Information;
   
   9.2. Regardless of whether certain protections against disclosure arguably exist, find that production of the Requested Information would serve policy interests that override any claimed basis for non-disclosure; and
   
   9.3. Order ICANN to produce the Requested Information, subject to a protective order if the BGC deems it appropriate to facilitate production while preserving any potential confidentiality concerns.

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.**
   
   10.1. Requestors have been adversely affected by the actions of ICANN staff in refusing to comply with the RFP. They have both procedural standing to make this Request and the substantive right to have it granted.
   
   a) **Requestors have standing to make this Request.**
   
   10.2. Requestors have been "adversely affected by ... one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy ...." This fact gives it standing within the meaning of Bylaws Art. IV § 2.2(a).
   
   10.3. According to the form reconsideration request used here, a requestor must "demonstrate material harm and adverse impact" by the following measures:
   
   10.3.1. **A loss or injury, financial or non-financial.** Requestors have described this in Section 6, *supra*. Namely, they have shown that ICANN's refusal to produce the Requested information has deprived them of the ability to determine if the underlying CPE process for the Application violated established ICANN policies that would provide a basis for challenging the process and either (i) redoing it with a properly constituted, trained, neutral and independent panel
free from undue influence, or (ii) reversing the result altogether as unsupported and resulting from improper conduct (if that is found to be the case).

10.3.2. A direct and causal connection between the loss or injury and the staff action or inaction that is the basis of the Request. Staff’s rejection of the RFP has directly caused the injury. Without the Requested Information, Requestors cannot determine if they have a basis for review of the CPE under Article IV of the Bylaws.

10.3.3. The relief requested must be capable of reversing the harm alleged. Ordering disclosure directly reverses the harm stemming from nondisclosure.

By all measures, Requestors have standing to make this Request. They satisfy the procedural threshold of “material” and “adverse” impact in the form of specific injury, causation of that injury by ICANN staff action, and the ability of this proceeding to remedy that harm.

b) ICANN’s obstinate Response to the RFP violates its own transparency policy and potentially conceals transgressions of other established policies.

10.4. As part of its “core values,” ICANN provides for “[e]mploying open and transparent policy development mechanisms that … promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice ….” Bylaws Art. I § 7. The Bylaws devote the entirety of their Article III to the subject of transparency.

10.5. As Article I, section 7 expressly acknowledges, transparency has as a key purpose the promotion of well-informed decisions. Requestors do not find the decision of the CPE panel in the underlying case well-informed, could only communicate their opposition to community priority in a public forum, and now know by ICANN’s Response to the RFP that certain non-public communications did occur involving it, the EIU, the panel and other parties pertaining to the panel’s role and its Report.
10.6. What do those communications show? Only ICANN and the other parties to them know. Requestors certainly do not. Nor does the public, which needs ICANN to act transparently to assure itself that ICANN is faithfully discharging its duties to:

- Promote competition, Bylaws Art. I §§ 2.5, 2.6;
- Apply polices documented in the AGB for the introduction of new TLDs and the determination of community priority neutrally, objectively and fairly, id. §§ 2.7, 2.8, Articles § 3;
- Apply controlling standards equitably, without singling out anyone for disparate and adverse treatment, Bylaws Art. II § 3;
- Act without bias, Bylaws Art. IV § 3.4.a, c; and
- Operate for the benefit of and remain accountable to the Internet community as a whole, Articles § 4, Bylaws Art. I § 10.

Transparency helps assure adherence as much as possible to all polices relevant to a particular situation, and the correction of lapses in such observances if and to the extent they occur.

10.7. Regardless of what the Requested Information may show, it should be disclosed. If it reveals anything from a “hiccup” to a “smoking gun,” accountability dictates that Requestors have the opportunity to use that information to obtain whatever relief it may make available. If it establishes the Report and process leading up to it as “squeaky clean,” transparency will have served the purpose of maintaining the parties’ and others’ confidence in ICANN and its systems.

10.8. Given the essential function of transparency and the many other policies implicated by it, this matter meets the substantive standards for reconsideration. The Response to the RFP as it stands now does not satisfy that threshold policy, making this Request proper and remedial action appropriate as set forth in Section 9 above.
11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

__X__ Yes

_____ No

11a. If yes, is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties? Explain.

Yes; all have lost the opportunity to compete for the String, and ICANN’s withholding of information – which could reveal a policy violation giving them a basis for review of the CPE determination – harms them all equally.

**Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests**

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar.

The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious.

Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing.

The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC.
The ICANN Board of Director's decision on the BGC's reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

DATED: September 19, 2014 Respectfully submitted,

THE IP and TECHNOLOGY LEGAL GROUP
dba New gTLD Disputes

By: ____________________________
John M. Genga
Attorneys for Requestors

Documents Attached

Annex A: 11 June 2014 CPE Report re .HOTEL
Annex B: 4 August 2014 DIDP Request to ICANN
Annex C: 3 September 2014 ICANN Response to DIDP Request
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
10 Mar 2016

1. Consent Agenda:
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes
   b. Appointment of F-Root Server Operator Representative to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)
      Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.02
   c. Appointment of Independent Auditors
      Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.03
   d. Investment Policy Update
      Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.04
   e. Next Steps for the Internationalized Registration Data (WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is": not an acronym)))
      Final Report
      Rationale for Resolutions 2016.03.10.05 – 2016.03.10.07
   f. Board Member Mentorship Program
      Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.08
g. **USG IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority)**
   Stewardship Transition – Additional FY16 Expenses and Funding
   
   *Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.09*

h. **Thank You to Local Host of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting**

i. **Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting**

j. **Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting**

2. **Main Agenda:**

   a. **Consideration of .ECO and .HOTEL IRP Declaration**
   
   *Rationale for Resolutions 2016.03.10.10 – 2016.03.10.11*

   b. **IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition Proposal from ICG (IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group)**
   
   *Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.12 – 2016.03.10.15*

   c. **Proposal from CCWG on Enhancing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Accountability**
   
   *Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.16 – 2016.03.10.19*

   d. **Thank You to Staff**

1. **Consent Agenda:**

   a. **Approval of Board Meeting Minutes**

   Resolved (2016.03.10.01), the Board approves the minutes of the 3 February 2016 Regular Meeting of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.
b. Appointment of F-Root Server Operator Representative to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)

Whereas, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws call for the establishment of a Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)) with the role to advise the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Root Server System of the Internet.

Whereas, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws call for appointment by the Board of Directors of RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) members based on recommendations from the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) Co-Chairs.

Whereas, the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) Co-Chairs recommended for consideration by the Board of Directors the appointment of a representative from the F-root server operator to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee).

Resolved (2016.03.10.02), the Board of Directors appoints to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) the representative from F-root server operator, Brian Reid, through 31 December 2018.

Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.02

In May 2013, the root server operators (RSO) agreed to an initial membership of RSO representatives for RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee), and each RSO nominated an individual. The Board of Directors approved the initial membership of RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) in July 2013 with staggered terms.

Jim Martin, the F-root server operator representative, served an initial two-year term, which expired on 31 December 2015. On
2 December 2015, the Board of Directors re-appointed him to a full, three-year term expiring on 31 December 2018.

The F-root server operator, Internet Systems Consortium, has requested to change its representative from Jim Martin to Brian Reid for the remainder of the term.

The appointment of this RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) member is not anticipated to have any fiscal impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), though there are budgeted resources necessary for ongoing support of the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee).

This resolution is an organizational administrative function for which no public comment is required. The appointment of RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) members contributes to the commitment of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to strengthening the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System).

c. Appointment of Independent Auditors

Whereas, Article XVI of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws (http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm) requires that after the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) must be audited by certified public accountants, which shall be appointed by the Board.

Whereas, the Board Audit Committee has discussed the engagement of the independent auditor for the fiscal year ending 30 June 2016, and has recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms.

Resolved (2016.03.10.03), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms as the auditors for
the financial statements for the fiscal year ending 30 June 2016.

Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.03

The audit firm BDO LLP and BDO member firms were engaged for the annual independent audits of the fiscal year ending 30 June 2014 and the fiscal year ending 30 June 2015. Based on the report from staff and the Audit Committee’s evaluation of the work performed, the committee has unanimously recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to engage BDO LLP and BDO member firms as ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s annual independent auditor for the fiscal year ended 30 June 2016 for any annual independent audit requirements in any jurisdiction.

The engagement of an independent auditor is in fulfillment of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s obligations to undertake an audit of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s financial statements. This furthers ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s accountability to its Bylaws and processes, and the results of the independent auditors work will be publicly available. There is a fiscal impact to the engagement that has already been budgeted. There is no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS (Domain Name System) as a result of this appointment.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

d. Investment Policy Update

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee requested that an outside expert review the Investment Policy to ensure it is appropriate for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Whereas, the outside expert completed a review of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
Investment Policy and concluded that overall the Investment Policy continues to support well the conservative philosophy of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s investment strategy.

Whereas, the outside expert recommends that a few modifications be made to the Investment Policy to enhance and clarify some provisions, but do not change the overall investment strategy.

Resolved (2016.03.10.04), the Board endorses and adopts the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Investment Policy as revised.

Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.04

In furtherance of its due diligence in regards to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Investment Policy ("Policy"), the Board Finance Committee (BFC) requested staff to engage an investment consulting firm to review the Policy. For this purpose, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) used the services of Bridgebay Investment Consultant Services ("Bridgebay"), which had also performed the previous review of the Policy in 2011 and 2014. As a result of its review process, Bridgebay recommended a few modifications to the Policy, intended to: (i) clarify the description of the Policy's risk profile; (ii) add low-risk allowable assets (money market funds); and (iii) clarify the flexible approach, for rebalancing the assets in accordance with the strategic allocation, and extended the range of allowable investment to enable the manager to increase fixed income for defensive purposes. Bridgebay also made additional suggested revisions to language, including items such as: clarification of required securities grades and update of the accounting standard name for fair value measurements. Bridgebay presented comments, analysis and the suggested changes to the Policy to the BFC during its meeting of 2 February 2016. These limited Policy modifications will enable the investment manager to optimize its asset allocation strategy for ICANN (Internet Corporation for...
Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Reserve Fund in a conservative, risk-controlled manner.

Adopting the suggested modifications is expected to be in the best interest of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community in that it is meant to enhance and clarify certain aspects of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s investment strategy. This action is not expected to have any fiscal impact, or any impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

e. Next Steps for the Internationalized Registration Data (WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Final Report

Whereas, in 2012, the Board adopted (/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-08nov12-en.htm#1.a) an Action Plan (/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-08nov12-en.pdf) [PDF, 265 KB] to address the recommendations of the first WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team, calling for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to (i) continue to fully enforce existing consensus policy and contractual conditions relating to WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)), and (ii) create an expert working group to determine the fundamental purpose and objectives of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registration data, to serve as a foundation for a Board-initiated GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy development process (PDP (Policy Development Process)).

 Whereas, the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Policy Review Team, in the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)). RT Final Report (/en/system/files/files/final-report-11may12-en.pdf), [PDF, 1.44
MB] highlighted the need to define requirements and develop data models with the following recommendations:

"ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) should task a working group..., to determine appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements and evaluate available solutions; at a minimum, the data requirements should apply to all new gTLDs, and the working group should consider ways to encourage consistency of approach across the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) and (on a voluntary basis) ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) space..."

And

"The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in the relevant Registrar and Registry agreements ...

Whereas, to address these WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team recommendations, the Action Plan (/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-08nov12-en.pdf) [PDF, 265 KB] called for a series of activities aimed at developing policies and a technical data model and framework for internationalizing WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)), including,

i. Convening of an expert working group (known as the IRD Working Group) to determine the requirements for the submission and display of internationalized registration data.

ii. A GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process (PDP (Policy Development Process)) to determine whether translation or transliteration of contact information is needed.

Whereas, in September 2015, the Board approved (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#1.b) a
new consensus policy developed by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) related to the translation and transliteration of WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) contact data, for which the implementation planning is currently underway.

Whereas the IRD Working Group produced the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] that includes the Data Model requested by the Board, and principles and requirements for internationalizing registration data (such as WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)).

Resolved (2016.03.10.05), the Board hereby receives the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] and thanks the IRD Working Group for the significant effort and work exerted that produced the proposed data model for internationalizing registration data as reflected in the IRD Final Report.

Resolved (2016.03.10.06), the Board requests that the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council review the broader policy implications of the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] as they relate to other GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy development work on WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) issues, and, at a minimum, forward the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] as an input to the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) PDP (Policy Development Process) on the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) that is currently underway.

Resolved (2016.03.10.07), the President and CEO, or his designee(s), is directed to work with the implementation review team for the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration to consider the IRD Working Group’s data model and requirements and incorporate them, where appropriate, to
the extent that the IRD's recommendations are consistent with, and facilitate the implementation of the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration.

**Rationale for Resolutions 2016.03.10.05 – 2016.03.10.07**

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**

This resolution continues the Board's attention to the implementation of the Action Plan ([/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-08nov12-en.pdf] [PDF, 265 KB] adopted by the Board in response to the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team's recommendations ([/en/system/files/files/final-report-11may12-en.pdf]). [PDF, 1.44 MB] This resolution arises out of a series of efforts identified in the Action Plan commenced at the Board's request with the aim of internationalizing WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) contact data. It also facilitates the implementation of the recently adopted and related consensus policy on translation and transliteration of WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) data approved ([/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#1.b]) by the Board on 28 September 2015.

**What is the proposal being considered?**

Under the Affirmation of Commitments (AoS), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is committed to enforcing its existing policy relating to WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) (subject to applicable laws), which "requires that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) implement measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) information..." The AoC obligates ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to organize no less frequently than every three years a community review of WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) policy and its implementation to assess the extent to which WHOIS...
WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym) policy is effective and its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust. Under this timeline, the second WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team is to be convened in late 2016.

In 2012, the first WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team recommended in its Final Report (/en/system/files/files/final-report-11may12-en.pdf) [PDF, 1.44 MB] that the Board take measures to improve WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)). Its findings state: "work needs to proceed with priority in coordination with other relevant work beyond ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s ambit, to make internationalized domain name registration data accessible." In response, the Board adopted a two-prong approach that simultaneously directed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to (1) implement improvements to the current WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) system based on the Action Plan (/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-08nov12-en.pdf) [PDF, 265 KB] that was based on the recommendations of the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) Review Team, and (2) launch a new effort, achieved through the creation of the Expert Working Group, to focus on the purpose and provision of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) directory services, to serve as PDP (Policy Development Process) on the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) commenced in January 2016 with a call for volunteers (/news/announcement-2016-01-04-en).

The effect of the Board's action today, i.e. forwarding the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] to the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) for appropriate follow-up policy work, is aimed at internationalizing WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) contact data, as part of the Action Plan (/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-1-08nov12-en.pdf). [PDF, 265 KB] in order to improve WHOIS (WHOIS
(pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) and enable non US-ASCII script to be included in WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) records. At a minimum, the PDP (Policy Development Process) on the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) should take into account the IRD Final Report recommendations.

Today's action also instructs the President and CEO to consider the IRD's technical data model & non-policy related requirements, as appropriate, as part of the implementation of the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration of registration data, to the extent that its findings are consistent with the new consensus policy, and facilitate its implementation.

**What factors did the Board find to be significant?**

Internationalization of the Internet's identifiers is a key ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) priority. Much of the currently accessible domain name registration data (DNRD) (previously referred to as WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) data) is encoded in free form US-ASCII script. This legacy condition is convenient for WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) service users who are sufficiently familiar with languages that can be submitted and displayed in US-ASCII to be able to use US-ASCII script to submit registration data, make and receive queries using that script. However, this data is less useful to the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) service users who are only familiar with languages that require script support other than US-ASCII for correct submission or display.

The data model recommended by in the IRD Final Report (https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/ird-expert-wg-final-23sep15-en.pdf) [PDF, 268 KB] creates a standard framework for submitting and displaying internalized registration data and facilitates the implementation of the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration of contact data.
What significant materials did the Board review?


Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

The work to improve and internationalize WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) is not expected to require additional resources beyond those included in the Board-approved FY16 Operating Plan and Budget, and the FY17 Operating Plan and Budget, when adopted.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

This action is not expected to have an immediate impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System), though the outcomes of this work may result in positive impacts, since improvements in the accessibility of WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) in multiple scripts and dialogues may enable the resolution of technical issues affecting the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System).

Is public comment required prior to Board action?

As this is a continuation of prior Board actions, this is an Organizational Administrative Action, for which public comment is not necessary prior to adoption.

f. Board Member Mentorship Program

Whereas, on 3 February 2016, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board approved the initial set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure the Board Performance and Improvement efforts as per the

Whereas, the initial set of KPIs encompasses, among other things, the measurement of the effectiveness and success of a New Board Mentorship Program.

Whereas, the Board is engaged in an ongoing process to develop comprehensive and holistic practices to enhance its performance and measure its effectiveness and improvement efforts over time.

Whereas, the Board recognizes the importance of establishing programs aiming at guiding and supporting the Board members' on-boarding and development processes to improve the Board members’ individual skills set and the Board's collegial performance.

Whereas the Board Mentorship Program will ease new Board members into the culture of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), as well as into the specifics of their roles.

Whereas the Board Governance Committee (BGC) has recommended that the Board adopt the New Board Mentorship Program as a voluntary-basis program.

Resolved (2016.03.10.08), the Board adopts the New Board Mentorship Program set forth in Attachment A to the Reference Materials to this Board Paper, and agrees with the BGC that the Board Mentorship Program should be assessed, evaluated and reviewed to adapt to the need of the Board to consistently improve its performance over time.

**Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.08**

Team (ATRT2) began in June 2014, shortly after the Board accepted the recommendations.

Since then, the Board Governance Committee, as per Section I.A of the its charter (see https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/charter-06-2012-02-25-en/(resources/pages/charter-06-2012-02-25-en)) has been tasked to review comprehensively the Board's performance and to develop relevant and substantive programs and practices to support the individual and the collegial improvement efforts and to measure their effectiveness over time.

Mentoring programs are globally recognized as useful practices to enhance productivity and performance and to facilitate the settlement of new recruits into the Organization. Additionally, the mentorship enables experienced, highly competent people to pass their expertise on to others who need to acquire specified skills, in particular, mentoring encourages the development of leadership competencies that are highly desirable at Board level.

Adopting this new Board Mentorship Program will have no direct fiscal impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the community, and will not have an impact of the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organization Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

g. USG IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition – Additional FY16 Expenses and Funding

Whereas, the Board has approved an expense budget envelopes to support the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition Project ("Project") during FY15 and FY16, and all approved budget envelopes will have been used after the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Meeting 55 in Marrakech.
Whereas, a Project Cost Support Team is being implemented to produce Project expense estimates for the remainder of FY16 and for FY17 for the Project.

Whereas, it is projected that further Project expenses of up to approximately US$1.5 million will be incurred while the Project Cost Support Team is producing cost estimates.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee met on 3 March 2016 and has approved to recommend to the Board to approve an additional Project expense budget envelope of up US$1.5 million to cover Project expenses while the Project Cost Support Team is working to produce estimates.

Resolved (2016.03.10.09), the Board approves a budget envelope of up to US$1.5 million, as an interim measure, to cover the costs of the Project to be incurred until the first estimate is produced, to be funded through a fund release from the Reserve Fund.

**Rationale for Resolution 2016.03.10.09**

The IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition is a major initiative to which the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Community as a whole is dedicating a significant amount of time and resources. ICANN's support for the community's work towards a successful completion of the Project (including both the USG IANA Stewardship transition proposal development and the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability's work) is critical for ICANN's work.

Considering its exceptional nature and the significant amount of costs anticipated to be incurred, the funding of this Project could not be provided through the Operating Fund. Accordingly, when the Board approved the FY15 and FY16 Operating Plans and Budgets, it included the anticipated funding of the transition
initiative costs through a corresponding withdrawal from the Reserve Fund.

The Board previously approved the FY16 Operating Plan and Budget, which included an estimated budget envelope of US$7 million for the USG IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition ("The Project") to be funded by the Reserve Fund. As the Project used this entire budget envelope by the end of November 2015, the Board approved additional funding of US$4.5 million on 2 February 2016 to allow the project to be funded through the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Meeting 55 in Marrakech.

The Board reiterates its 25 June 2015 statement that the Board is "committed to supporting the community in obtaining the advice it needs in developing recommendations in support of the transition process, and also notes the importance of making sure that the funds entrusted to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) by the community are used in responsible and efficient ways. Assuring the continuation of cost-control measures over the future work of the independent counsel is encouraged." (See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-06-25-en#2.c (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-06-25-en#2.c).).

As the community work relative to the accountability track of the Project is expected to continue, further expenses are expected through the remainder of FY16 and during FY17. The implementation planning for other parts of the Project will also continue. Separately, in order to improve visibility on and control of the expenses for this type of project in partnership with the community, a Project Costs Support Team is being formed to produce costs estimates for future work.

The Board Finance Committee has determined that an additional budget envelope of approximately US$1.5 million needs to be approved by Board to allow ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to incur further Project expenses for a short period of time after the end of the
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting. This will give the necessary time to the project cost support team to produce estimates. These estimates will then be used by the Board to consider and approve a budget envelope for a longer period of time forward.

As this initiative's expenses and funding are approved by the Board, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board is now approving as an additional interim measure a budget envelope of up to US$1.5 million to be funded through a release from the Reserve Fund to cover the estimated costs to be incurred after the end of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 meeting until such time a cost estimate will be ready. The Board will be asked to approve an additional expense budget envelope for the remainder of FY16, on the basis of the estimated future expenses produced by the Project Cost Support Team.

This action will not have a direct impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

h. Thank You to Local Host of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to the local host organizer, ANRT, for its support.

i. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting

The Board wishes to thank the following sponsors: Verisign, Inc., Nominet UK, NCC Group, PDR Solutions FZC, China Internet Network Information Center (CNNIC), Public Interest Registry, CentralNic, Afilias plc, Radix FZC, Rightside, dotistanbul, fmai, .MA and Office National Des Aeroports.
j. Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 55 Meeting

The Board expresses its deepest appreciation to the scribes, interpreters, audiovisual team, technical teams, and the entire ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff for their efforts in facilitating the smooth operation of the meeting.

The Board would also like to thank the management and staff of the Palmeraie Conference Center and Hotels for providing a wonderful facility to hold this event. Special thanks are extended to Patrick Lebufno, Director General Delegue, Palmeraie Conference Center and Hotels; Boubker Bernoussi, Director of Convention Services for Palmeraie Conference Center and Hotels; Loubna El Mekkaoui, Sales Manager for Palmeraie Conference Center and Hotels; Mohamed Aziz, Director, Food and Beverage; Hassan Agouzoul, Executive Chef; Hafsa Aitouhan, Event Manager; and Jamal Drifi, Banquet Director.

2. Main Agenda:

a. Consideration of .ECO and .HOTEL IRP Declaration

Whereas, on 12 February 2016, an Independent Review Process (IRP) Panel (Panel) issued its Final Declaration in the IRPs relating to .HOTEL and .ECO.

Whereas, the Panel declared ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to be the prevailing party in both IRPs, and, among other things, declared that the Board's actions or inactions did not in any way violate ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. (See Final Declaration, ¶¶ 151-156, https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-despegar-online-et-al-final-declaration-12feb16-en.pdf (/en/system/files/files/irp-despegar-online-et-al-final-declaration-12feb16-en.pdf).) [PDF, 2.16 MB]
Whereas, while the Panel declared ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to be the prevailing party in both the .HOTEL and .ECO IRPs, the Panel also suggested that: (1) the Board consider additional measures be added in the future to increase the consistency and predictability of the CPE process and third-party provider evaluations; (2) the Board encourage ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to be as specific and detailed as possible in responding to requests made pursuant to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP); (3) the Board affirm, when appropriate, that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities are conducted through open and transparent processes in conformance with Article IV of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation; and (4) the Board respond to a letter from the .HOTEL Claimants regarding the portal configuration issue as soon as feasible.

Whereas, in accordance with Article IV, section 3.21 of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Bylaws, the Board has considered the Panel's Final Declaration.

Resolved (2016.03.10.10), the Board accepts the following findings of the Panel's Final Declaration: (1) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, and Radix FZC v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) IRP; (2) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the Little Birch, LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) IRP; (3) the IRP Panel's analysis is limited to declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (4) the Board (including the Board Governance Committee) acted consistently with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (5) the parties shall each bear their
own expenses including legal fees; and (6) the IRP costs shall be divided between the parties in a 50% (claimants) / 50% (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) proportion.

Resolved (2016.03.10.11), the Board notes the Panel's suggestions, and: (1) directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to ensure that the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program Reviews take into consideration the issues raised by the Panel as they relate to the consistency and predictability of the CPE process and third-party provider evaluations; (2) encourages ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to be as specific and detailed as possible in responding to DIDP requests, particularly when not disclosing requested documents; (3) affirms that, as appropriate, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will continue to ensure that its activities are conducted through open and transparent processes in conformance with Article IV of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation; and (4) directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to complete the investigation of the issues alleged by the .HOTEL Claimants regarding the portal configuration as soon as feasible and to provide a report to the Board for consideration following the completion of that investigation.

Rationale for Resolutions 2016.03.10.10 – 2016.03.10.11

Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, and Radix FZC (collectively, ".HOTEL Claimants") filed a request for an Independent Review Process (IRP) challenging the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Panel Report finding that the one community application for .HOTEL prevailed in CPE (the ".HOTEL IRP"). Specifically, the .HOTEL Claimants filed Reconsideration Request 14-34 seeking reconsideration of the CPE Panel Report, and Reconsideration Request 14-39 seeking reconsideration of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff's determination, pursuant to the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), that certain documents
related to the CPE Panel Report were not appropriate for disclosure under the DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure. The Board Governance Committee (BGC) denied Reconsideration Requests 14-34 and 14-39, finding that the .HOTEL Claimants had not stated proper grounds for reconsideration. The .HOTEL IRP challenged the denial of Reconsideration Requests 14-34 and 14-39, and argued that the Board should have take further action with respect to the CPE Panel Report.

Little Birch LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited (collectively, ".ECO Claimants") filed an IRP Request challenging the CPE Panel Report finding that the one community application for .ECO prevailed in CPE (the ".ECO IRP"). Specifically, the .ECO Claimants filed Reconsideration Request 14-46, seeking reconsideration of the CPE Panel Report. The BGC denied Reconsideration Request 14-46, finding that the .ECO Claimants had not stated proper grounds for reconsideration. The .ECO IRP challenged the denial of Reconsideration Request 14-46, and alleged that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) "has failed to act with due diligence and failed to exercise independent judgment" in "adopting" the CPE Panel Report, and requested that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) be "required to overturn the CPE in relation to .eco and allow the .ECO Claimants' applications to proceed on their own merits."

On 12 May 2015, the .HOTEL and the .ECO IRPs were consolidated under a single IRP Panel (Panel). The Panel held a telephonic hearing on 7 December 2015. On 12 February 2016, the three-member Panel issued its Final Declaration. After consideration and discussion, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3.21 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, the Board adopts the findings of the Panel, which are summarized below, and can be found in full at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-despegar-online-et-al-final-declaration-12feb16-en.pdf (/en/system/files/files/irp-despegar-online-et-al-final-declaration-12feb16-en.pdf). [PDF, 2.16 MB]
The Panel found that the "analysis, which the Panel is charged with carrying out in this IRP, is one of comparing the actions of the Board with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws." (Final Declaration at ¶ 58.)

Using the applicable standard of review, the Panel found that:
(1) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, and Radix FZC v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) IRP; (2) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the Little Birch, LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) IRP; (3) the Board (including the Board Governance Committee) acted consistently with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (4) the parties shall each bear their own expenses including legal fees; and (5) the IRP costs shall be divided between the parties in a 50% (claimants) / 50% (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) proportion. (See Final Declaration at ¶¶ 151, 154-156, 160.)

More specifically, the Panel found that the .HOTEL IRP "was always going to fail given the clear and thorough reasoning adopted by the BGC in its denial" of Reconsideration Requests 14-34 and 14-39. (Final Declaration at ¶ 155.) And, "[a]s for the .eco IRP, it is clear that the Reconsideration Request [14-46] was misconceived and was little more than an attempt to appeal the CPE decision. Again, therefore, the .eco IRP was always going to fail." (Final Declaration at ¶ 156.)

It should be noted that, while ruling in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s favor and denying both IRPs, the Panel did make some observations and suggestions for the Board's consideration. In particular, while recognizing that the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program is near its end "and there is little or nothing that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) can do now," the Panel suggested that a system be
put in place to ensure that CPE evaluations are conducted "on a consistent and predictable basis by different individual evaluators," and to ensure that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s core values "flow through... to entities such as the EIU." (Id. at ¶¶ 147, 150.) The Panel also noted that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff could have better explained its determination that certain requested documents were subject to the Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure in the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP). (Id. at ¶ 110.) The Panel also suggested that "to the extent possible, and compatible with the circumstances and the objects to be achieved by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)" in taking a particular decision (Id. at ¶ 145), the Board affirm that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) carries out its activities "through open and transparent processes" pursuant to Article IV of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation. In addition, the Panel encouraged ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to respond to a letter from the .HOTEL Claimants regarding the portal configuration issue as soon as feasible. (Id. at ¶ 134.)

The Board acknowledges the foregoing suggestions by the Panel. The Board has considered the suggestions and notes that it will ensure that the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program Reviews take into consideration the issues raised by the Panel as they relate to the consistency and predictability of the CPE process and third-party provider evaluations. The Board also affirms that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), as appropriate, will continue to ensure that its activities are conducted through open and transparent processes in conformance with Article IV of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation. The Board also encourages ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to be as specific and detailed as possible in responding to DIDP requests, particularly when determining that requested documents will not be disclosed. In this regard, the Board notes that the Cross
Community Working Group (CCWG) on Enhancing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Accountability has identified that reviewing and enhancing the DIDP is one of the topics that it will address in Workstream 2. This work, which will be further framed starting at the ICANN55 meeting in Marrakech, is likely to include review of the scope of the DIDP Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure.

Finally, with respect to the Panel's recommendation that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) respond to a letter from the .HOTEL Claimants regarding the portal configuration issue as soon as feasible, the Board notes that staff has informed the Board that it is nearing the end of its investigation of this matter. The Board is recently in receipt of two letters from Claimants regarding the portal configuration issue, dated 1 March 2016 and 8 March 2016, respectively. Staff has provided the Board with an update of its investigation into the issues set forth in the letters. The Board has directed the President and CEO, or his designee(s) to complete its investigation into this matter as soon as feasible. The Board notes that out of a matter of equity and fairness, the investigation should include the opportunity for all relevant parties to be heard. The Board expects the staff will prepare a report for the Board following the completion of its investigation, at which time the Board will consider the .HOTEL Claimants request for cancellation of HOTEL Top-Level Domain S.a.r.l.'s application for .HOTEL.

As required, the Board has considered the Final Declaration. As this Board has previously indicated, the Board takes very seriously the results of one of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s long-standing accountability mechanisms. Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth in this Resolution and Rationale, the Board has accepted the Panel's Final Declaration as indicated above. Adopting the Panel's Final Declaration will have no direct financial impact on the organization and no direct impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant and GDD Portal Update

This page is available in:

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) temporarily took its New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant and GDD portals offline on 27 February 2015 to investigate a reported security issue. Access to, and data in, these portals is limited to New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program applicants and New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators. Under certain circumstances an authenticated portal user could potentially view data of, or related to, other users.

There is currently no indication that this issue resulted in any actual exposure of data to an unauthorized party. There is also no indication that anyone other than those authorized to access the portal did so.

We are working to implement a solution to the reported issue and bring the portals back online. We are also continuing to investigate whether any data was exposed to an unauthorized user.

More Announcements


ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Launches Dr. Tarek Kamel Award and Opens Nomination for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Community Excellence Award (/news/announcement-2-2020-01-27-en)

Register Now to Participate in the 7th Middle East DNS (Domain Name System) Forum (/news/announcement-2020-01-27-en)
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
New gTLD Applicant and GDD Portal Issue:
Questions & Answers / Information for RySG

INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE REGISTRY
STAKEHOLDER GROUP
(Discussed on 10 June 2015 at 20:00 UTC Registry Stakeholder Call)

Reporting and Communications

Q1: When did ICANN become aware of the incidents?
A1: As previously reported, a user notified us on 27 February.

Q2: How did ICANN become aware of the incidents?
A2: As previously reported, a user notified us on 27 February.

Q3: Did ICANN report the incidents to any government or law enforcement agency? If so, when and to whom?
A3: Not at this time. However, ICANN reserves all of its rights with respect to the portal issue. By reserving its rights, ICANN is leaving the door open to various actions that may be taken with respect to any unauthorized access.

Q4: Why did ICANN take so long to inform the affected Applicants and Registry Operators?
A4: ICANN used the time period between 30 April 2015 and 27 May 2015 to afford users whose login credentials were used to view data belonging to other portal users ample time to provide a fulsome account of their activities and to provide certifications. We also used this time to verify that access was authorized in certain instances.

Q5: ICANN correspondence to Applicants and Registry Operators was marked “CONFIDENTIAL”. Yet, in some cases, letters were sent to outdated contact person or entity. Why? What was ICANN’s intent?
A5: The letters were marked “confidential” as they were communications from ICANN to the primary contact for the applicant or registry operator. Primary contact information is maintained by the applicants and contracted parties. This is the information we used to identify the primary contact.

Q6: Would ICANN provide a detailed chronology (including (a),(b),(c), (d) above) for all major security incidents or technical glitches that have affected TAS, CZDS, RADAR and any other ICANN core systems and “lessons learned” from those incidents?
A6: Please refer to the following links for information on the chronology of recent events:

- TAS, April 2012:
Product Testing and Launch and Management Oversight

Q7: What were the acceptance testing procedures for the two portals (the New gTLD Applicant and the GDD Portal customized from Salesforce software) before they were rolled out?

A7: Applicant Portal: This was developed by a third-party. At that time ICANN did not have a QA team, so all unit, functional and integration testing was conducted by the contractor. The users conducted functional user-acceptance tests in conjunction with the partner prior to rollout. ICANN IT was not directly involved in any development or testing; it supported data migration only. Data validity was confirmed by ICANN IT.

GDD Portal: This was developed by a third-party leveraging the existing framework from the Applicant Portal. At that stage, ICANN did have a QA team that was transitioning from the third-party to ICANN staff. Testing at that time was focused on functionality and data-integrity only. Full user-acceptance testing was performed by ICANN users prior to roll-out.

Q8: Who (ICANN staff/executive) signed off before they went live?

A8: ICANN staff, including members of the Global Domains Division executive team, approved the launch of the portals.

Q9: How does ICANN Management ensure proper oversight over its systems and data security obligations?

A9: ICANN has procedures in place and is accelerating its efforts to harden its systems. For more specific information, please refer to the blog published at https://www.icann.org/news/blog/hardening-icann-s-it-and-digital-services.

Q10: For future IT related RFPs, would ICANN consider a public comment period or other mechanisms to give the community an opportunity to provide comment or input to ensure their design and functionality are cost-effective and meet the need of users.

A10: ICANN follows its published Procurement Guidelines, which are intended to ensure that products and services are purchased with the correct specifications, at the appropriate level of quality and for the appropriate value. For more information on the methodology and related information including Request for Proposals, please refer to ICANN’s procurement guidelines published at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/procurement-guidelines-21feb10-en.pdf.
ICANN Investigation and Findings

Q11: How can ICANN be sure that other systems were unaffected, and that only specific data records were accessed? Are findings to date based upon audit logs or other WORM data recording mechanisms?
A11: The systems that house this application are isolated physically and logically from other systems. There is no shared network, data or authentication with any other system. For additional information, please refer to the 27 May 2015 announcement published at https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-05-27-en.

Q12: Would ICANN provide a more detailed description of the methodology used by those who analyzed the data?
A12: At this point we are not providing this level of detail.

ICANN Enterprise Risk Management and Data/ Systems Security

Q13: When was the last enterprise risk audit carried out on ICANN’ IT systems before the incident?
A13: An audit was conducted in June-July 2014 by a third-party. This resulted in a 16-project roadmap for FY15 and part of FY16. Our most recent annual audit was conducted by a third-party this in May-June 2015. For more information, please visit:

Q14: Did any audits prior or after the incident identify security vulnerability of these two portals? If so, what has been done to mitigate? When was the last enterprise risk audit carried out on ICANN’ IT systems before the incident?
A14: As noted above, ICANN engaged a third-party to assess its systems in June-July 2014. We took the individual recommendations and sorted them in many ways. This resulted in a 16-project roadmap for FY15 and part of FY16. Our most recent audit by a third-party was conducted in May-June 2015.

On a concurrent but separate track, ICANN recently engaged the services of an expert-knowledge firm to review our Salesforce.com implementation. The review highlighted several areas where we could harden our platform. We have since released multiple software patches to address these issues. We expect to complete all work no later than the end of calendar year 2015. For more information, please visit:
Q15: Was the decision to outsource IT services to one vendor resulted from a recommendation by an enterprise risk audit?
A15: No. It was a business decision to reduce complexity and enhance management control. We consolidated services from eleven different vendors into a single vendor.
   • “IT Services Outsourcing RFP” issued on 11 August 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/rfps-en.

Q16: What measures and processes have been put in place as safeguards against unauthorized access to or use of personal data or sensitive business information and to ensure coordination between internal staff/functions and outsourced IT service providers with clear roles and responsibilities? How will they be reviewed and updated to stay “ahead of the game”?  
A16: ICANN sincerely regrets this incident. We continue to deploy security-based updates on a regular basis. Enhancing the security controls and privacy of the ICANN portals is part of a broader, multi-year effort to harden all of ICANN’s digital services. For additional information, read the blog post published at https://www.icann.org/news/blog/hardening-icann-s-it-and-digital-services.

Q17: How does ICANN plan to continually monitor the integrity of its systems going forward?  
A17: As indicated above, we continue to deploy security-based updates on a regular basis. Enhancing the security controls and privacy of the ICANN portals is part of a broader, multi-year effort to harden all of ICANN’s digital services. For additional information, read the blog post published at https://www.icann.org/news/blog/hardening-icann-s-it-and-digital-services.

Q18: What remedies might be available to affected Applicants or Registry Operators?  
A18: Our ultimate goal is to provide the ICANN community with flawless services. We have started work to achieve this goal by baselining everything we have – services, platforms, security, people, processes etc. ICANN is committed to improving our performance continually, and to reporting on our progress periodically. An example of this is the blog post published at https://www.icann.org/news/blog/hardening-icann-s-it-and-digital-services.

NEW GTLD APPLICANT AND GDD PORTAL ISSUE QUESTIONS & ANSWERS  (Published 2 March 2015)

Q1: What is the nature of this issue?  
A1: An issue was reported that could potentially affect users of the New gTLD Applicant and GDD (Global Domains Division) portals. Under certain circumstances, an authenticated portal user could potentially view data of, or related to, other users. Access to, and data in, these portals is limited to New gTLD Program applicants and New gTLD registry operators.

Q2: How was the issue addressed?  
A2: The configuration was updated to address the reported issue.
Q3: Was any data exposed to an unauthorized party?
A3: There is currently no indication that this issue resulted in any actual exposure of data to an unauthorized party. We are continuing to investigate.

Q4: Did an unauthorized party access the portals?
A4: There is no indication, at this time, that anyone other than those authorized to access the portals did so.

Q5: What type of information is in these portals?
A5: These portals contain information from applicants to ICANN’s New gTLD Program and New gTLD registry operators such as attachments to new gTLD applications or other forms submitted by applicants and/or registry operators.

Q6: What are the New gTLD Applicant and GDD portals?
A6: They make up a system that can be accessed only by New gTLD Program applicants and ICANN’s New gTLD registry operators. It is not a system that is open and available to the general public. Authenticated applicants use the portals to carry out evaluation and contracting processes.

Q7: Why did you take the portals offline?
A7: An authorized user notified us about the issue on 27 February 2015. Upon notification, the team confirmed the reported issue and took the portals offline to address the issue.

Q8: What is the current status of the system?
A8: Access to the New gTLD Applicant and GDD portals was restored on 2 March 2015.

Q9: When will you give us additional information?
A9: We will provide updates as the investigation continues.

Q10: What if I have further questions?
A10: If you have further questions, please send an email to customerservice@icann.org. Updates will be published at https://www.icann.org/news and http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/latest.
Announcement: New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant and GDD Portals Update

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) today provided an update on its investigation into a data exposure issue in the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant and GDD (Global Domains Division) portals, first reported on 1 March 2015 (/news/announcement-2015-03-01-en).

In its 30 April announcement (/news/announcement-2015-04-30-en), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) noted its intention to disclose to affected users the identity of any user(s) that viewed their information without authorization by 27 May 2015. This activity has been completed. Specifically, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):

- Notified the users whose credentials were used to access information that did not appear to belong to them;
- Requested these users provide an explanation of their activity; and
- Requested these users certify that they will delete or destroy all information obtained and that they have not used and will not use the information or convey it to any third party.

In addition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has provided the affected parties with the name(s) of the user(s) whose credentials were used to view their information without
their authorization or by individuals that were not officially designated by their organization to access certain data.

Investigation Results

Based on the information that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has collected to date our investigation leads us to believe that over 60 searches, resulting in the unauthorized access of more than 200 records, were conducted using a limited set of user credentials.

The remaining user credentials, representing the majority of users who viewed data, were either used to:

- Access information pertaining to another user through mere inadvertence and the users do not appear to have acted intentionally to obtain such information. These users have all confirmed that they either did not use or were not aware of having access to the information. Also, they have all confirmed that they will not use any such information for any purpose or convey it to any third party; or

- Access information of an organization with which they were affiliated. At the time of the access, they may not have been designated by that organization as an authorized user to access the information.

We will continue to provide information and respond to questions from affected parties as we continue our investigation.

Additional Information

The New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant and GDD portals contain information from applicants to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program and new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators. No other systems were affected by this issue.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) sincerely regrets this incident. We continue to deploy security-based updates on a regular basis. Enhancing the security controls and privacy
of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) portals is part of a broader, multi year effort to harden all of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s digital services

About ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission is to ensure a stable, secure and unified global Internet. To reach another person on the Internet you have to type an address into your computer - a name or a number. That address has to be unique so computers know where to find each other. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) coordinates these unique identifiers across the world. Without that coordination we wouldn't have one global Internet. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) was formed in 1998. It is a not-for-profit public-benefit corporation with participants from all over the world dedicated to keeping the Internet secure, stable and interoperable. It promotes competition and develops policy on the Internet's unique identifiers. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) doesn't control content on the Internet. It cannot stop spam and it doesn't deal with access to the Internet. But through its coordination role of the Internet's naming system, it does have an important impact on the expansion and evolution of the Internet. For more information please visit: www.icann.org (l).
ICANN66 Fellowship Program
Post-Meeting Report Now Available
(/news/announcement-2020-01-28-en)

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Launches Dr. Tarek Kamel Award and Opens Nomination for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Community Excellence Award
(/news/announcement-2020-01-27-en)

Register Now to Participate in the 7th Middle East DNS (Domain Name System) Forum (/news/announcement-2020-01-27-en)

Second Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)), Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency), and Resiliency (Security Stability & Resiliency (SSR)) (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report
(/news/announcement-2020-01-24-en)
Response to Documentary Information Disclosure Policy Request

To: Flip Petillion

Date: 5 July 2015

Re: Request No. 20150605-1

Thank you for your request dated 5 June 2015 (the “Request”), which was submitted pursuant to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) on behalf of Travel Reservations SRL (formerly, Despegar Online SRL), Donuts, Inc. (and its subsidiary applicant Spring McCook, LLC), Minds + Machines Group Limited (formerly, Top Level Domain Holdings Limited) and Radix FZC (and its subsidiary applicant DotHotel Inc.). For reference, a copy of your Request is attached to the email forwarding this Response.

**Items Requested**

Your Request seeks the disclosure of the following information regarding the data exposure issue in the New gTLD Applicant and GDD (Global Domains Division) portals first reported on 1 March 2015:

1. What was the precise nature of the security issue?
2. When did the security issue occur?
3. How could the security issue occur?
4. How could the security issue have been avoided?
5. How was the security issue discovered?
6. Who raised the security issue?
7. How did the security issue come to ICANN’s attention?
8. What actions did ICANN take after being informed of the security issue?
9. How does ICANN enforce the portal’s terms and conditions in case of obvious breach?
10. What are the concrete actions that ICANN took vis-à-vis D. Krischenowski?

You also requested a copy of the terms and conditions to which D. Krischenowski agreed and the correspondence with D. Krischenowski and his legal counsel.
Response


On 27 February 2015, ICANN received notice of a potential security issue affecting the New gTLD Applicant and GDD (Global Domains Division) portals. Upon notification, ICANN confirmed the reported issue and immediately took the portals offline to address the issue. (See https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-03-01-en.) Under certain circumstances, an authenticated portal user could potentially view data of, or related to, other users. Access to, and data in, these portals is limited to New gTLD Program applicants and New gTLD registry operators. These portals contain information from applicants to ICANN's New gTLD Program and new gTLD registry operators. No other systems were affected. The portals’ configuration was updated to the address the issue and the portals were restored on 2 March 2015. (See https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2015-03-02-en.)

ICANN conducted an in depth forensic investigation into whether any data was exposed to an unauthorized user. Two consulting firms reviewed and analyzed all log data going back to the activation of the New gTLD Applicant portal on 17 April 2013 and the activation of the GDD portal on 17 March 2014. The results of the investigation indicate that the portal users were able to view data that was not their own. Based on the investigation to date, the unauthorized access resulted from advanced searches conducted using the login credentials of 17 users, which exposed 330 advanced search result records, pertaining to 96 applicants and 21 registry operators. These records may have included attachment(s). These advanced searches occurred during 36 user sessions out of a total of nearly 595,000 user sessions since April 2013. Based on the information that ICANN has collected to date, our investigation leads us to believe that over 60 searches, resulting in the unauthorized access of more than 200 records, were conducted using a limited set of user credentials. The remaining user credentials, representing the majority of users who viewed data, were either used to:

- Access information pertaining to another user through mere inadvertence and the users do not appear to have acted intentionally to obtain such information. These users have all confirmed that they either did not use or were not aware of having access to the information. Also, they have all confirmed that they will not use any such information for any purpose or convey it to any third party; or
Access information of an organization with which they were affiliated. At the time of the access, they may not have been designated by that organization as an authorized user to access the information.


Following the conclusion of the first phase of its forensics investigation, ICANN contacted the users who appear to have viewed information that was not their own and required that they provide an explanation of their activity. ICANN also asked them to certify that they will delete or destroy all information obtained and to certify that they have not and will not use the data or convey it to any third party. (See https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-04-30-en.) ICANN also informed the parties whose data was viewed and provided them with information regarding the date(s) and time(s) of access and what portion(s) of their data was seen. (See id.)

On 27 May 2015, ICANN additionally provided the affected parties with the name(s) of the user(s) whose credentials were used to view their information without their authorization or by individuals that were not officially designated by their organization to access certain data and any explanation(s) and/or certification(s) that the user(s) provided to ICANN regarding the unauthorized access. (See https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-05-27-en.)


All GDD portal users are subject to the attached Authorized User Terms and Conditions that appear when the user logs in to the portal for the first time.
With respect to your request for correspondence with D. Krischenowski and his legal
counsel, this request calls for documents that are subject to the following DIDP Defined
Conditions of Nondisclosure:

- 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 provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or
  would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial
  interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to
  ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision
  within an agreement.

- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts,
  emails, or any other forms of communication.

- 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.

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, which is contained within
the ICANN Accountability & Transparency: Framework and Principles please see
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.
ICANN GDD Portal

AUTHORIZED USER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Portal Account

To access this portal and the services it provides (the “Portal”), a point of contact will be designated as the “Authorized User” and provided login credentials (user name and password). The Authorized User will be the individual previously designated by you as your point of contact, and ICANN will use that information to create the profile and login credentials for the Authorized User. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the entity for which the Authorized User represents is and remains responsible for all activity that takes place within the Portal. If at any time or for any reason it is desired or required to change the Authorized User, it is your responsibility to promptly notify ICANN of the change. You are responsible for keeping your account information and password confidential and are responsible for all activity that occurs under your Portal account. The Portal requires Authorized Users to sign in each time, and to acknowledge they accept these “Authorized User Terms and Conditions” (“Terms and Conditions”). On the first instance of access for any individual Authorized User (i.e., an individual under unique login credentials), the Authorized User will be required to read, acknowledge and expressly accept these Terms and Conditions. This information will be tracked. In the event the Terms and Conditions change, or in the event a new Authorize User accesses the Portal, acceptance of the Terms and Conditions will again be required. Failure to do so will prevent Authorized User access to the Portal.

Authorized User Provided Content

Authorized Users may post, upload and/or otherwise provide information, data or content (“User Content”) through the Portal. You are solely responsible for any User Content you provide and for any consequences thereof. You represent that you have the right to post any User Content which you post to the Portal, and that such User Content, or its use by us as contemplated, does not violate these terms and conditions, applicable law, or the intellectual property, publicity or privacy rights of others and is provided only with express written consent from any individual or entity of which the information relates. Except to the extent ICANN may review User Context for thoroughness and/or completeness, ICANN does not otherwise monitor, review, or edit User Content except to the extent expressly requested by you. ICANN reserves the right to remove or disable access to any User Content for any or no reason, including, but not limited to, User Content that, in ICANN’s sole discretion, violates these terms and conditions. ICANN may take these actions without prior notification to you. Removal or disabling of access to User Content shall be at our sole discretion, and we do not promise to remove or disable access to any specific User Content.

Personal Information

ICANN will use the User Content for the purposes for which it was voluntarily provided to us by you, and/or otherwise in accordance with its privacy policy. Do not provide sensitive information through the Portal. Click here for our Privacy Policy. By using this Portal, you consent to such processing and you warrant that all User Content provided by you is accurate.

Disclaimer of Warranties; Limitation of Liability
YOU EXPRESSLY AGREE THAT YOUR USE OF THE PORTAL AND ITS SERVICES IS AT YOUR OWN RISK, AND IS PROVIDED ON AN "AS IS" AND "AS AVAILABLE" BASIS. TO THE FULL EXTENT PERMISSIBLE BY APPLICABLE LAW, ICANN MAKES NO, AND HEREBY DISCLAIMS ALL, REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE AVAILABILITY, OPERATION AND USE OF THE PORTAL OR ANY REPORTS, INFORMATION, CONTENT, MATERIALS OR SERVICES ON OR ACCESSED VIA THE PORTAL, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, TITLE, NON-INFRINGEMENT, AND IMPLIED WARRANTIES ARISING FROM COURSE OF DEALING OR COURSE OF PERFORMANCE. IN ADDITION, ICANN DOES NOT REPRESENT OR WARRANT THAT THE INFORMATION ACCESSIBLE VIA THE PORTAL IS ACCURATE, COMPLETE OR CURRENT, AND ICANN IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS THEREIN OR FOR ANY ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES RESULTING FROM YOUR RELIANCE ON SUCH INFORMATION OR ANY OTHER ASPECT OF THE PORTAL. FURTHER, ICANN MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES THAT THE PORTAL WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED, SECURE, OR FREE OF ERRORS, VIRUSES, OR OTHER HARMFUL COMPONENTS.

IN NO EVENT SHALL ICANN OR ANY OF ITS AFFILIATES OR LICENSORS OR THE MEMBERS, DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AGENTS OR REPRESENTATIVES OF ICANN AND ITS AFFILIATES AND LICENSORS (ICANN AND ALL SUCH PERSONS, COLLECTIVELY, THE "ICANN PARTIES") BE LIABLE TO YOU OR ANY THIRD PARTY FOR DAMAGES OF ANY KIND ARISING OUT OF THE USE OF, ACCESS TO, RELIANCE ON, INABILITY TO USE OR IMPROPER USE OF THE PORTAL OR ANY USER CONTENT (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, SPECIAL, PUNITIVE, INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES OR DAMAGES FOR LOSS OF PROFITS, GOODWILL OR REVENUE, BUSINESS INTERRUPTION, OR LOSS OF DATA), EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES, AND REGARDLESS OF THE FORM OF ACTION, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, TORT, OR OTHERWISE.

CERTAIN STATE LAWS DO NOT PERMIT LIMITATIONS ON IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR THE EXCLUSION OR LIMITATION OF CERTAIN TYPES OF DAMAGES, AND THEREFORE SOME OR ALL OF THE DISCLAIMERS, EXCLUSIONS OR LIMITATIONS ABOVE MAY NOT APPLY TO YOU.

Indemnification

You agree to indemnify and hold the ICANN Parties harmless from and against any and all damages, liabilities, actions, causes of action, suits, claims, demands, losses, costs and expenses of any nature whatsoever (including without limitation reasonable attorneys' fees, disbursements and court costs) arising from or in connection with (i) your use of the Portal, or any reports, content, information, materials or services contained, displayed or available therein; (ii) your violation of these Terms and conditions; (iii) your violation of any rights of any third party; and/or (iv) ICANN's reliance upon the User Content provided.

Modification or Discontinuance of the Portal by ICANN

At any time, without notice to you, and for any or no reason, ICANN may modify or discontinue the Portal or any content or aspect thereof. ICANN shall in no way be held liable for any consequence that results from ICANN’s decision to modify or discontinue providing the Portal or any content or aspect thereof.

Governing Law
The laws of the State of California will govern these terms and conditions and your use of the Portal, without giving effect to any principles of conflicts of laws. You agree that any action arising out of these terms and conditions or your use of the Portal shall be brought in state or federal court in Los Angeles, California, and you consent to the jurisdiction of such courts.

**Miscellaneous**

If any portion of these terms and conditions is deemed unlawful, void or unenforceable, that portion will be deemed severable and will not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining provisions. These terms and conditions set forth the entire understanding between you and ICANN with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersede any prior or contemporaneous communications, representations, or agreements, whether oral or written, between you and ICANN with respect to such subject matter.

**I have read this Agreement and agree to the terms and conditions.**
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
VIA E-MAIL

Contact Information Redacted

23 February 2016

Guillermo Luis Perrone
General Counsel
Decolar.com, Inc.

Re: New gTLD Applicant Portal

I am responding to your letter to me of 29 July 2015. As an initial matter, I apologize for the delayed response. As you know, ICANN responded to the 5 June 2015 Documentary Information Disclosure Policy Request submitted by Travel Reservations (formerly, Despegar Online SRL), Domits, Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, Minds+Machines Group Limited, and Fadix FZC (collectively the Requesters) which raised similar concerns that you raised in your 29 July 2015 letter; the Requesters did not seek reconsideration of that response. ICANN completed its investigation of the portal configuration issue on 19 November 2015, and is still considering the issues raised in your letter. In order for ICANN to do so, it would be helpful to have some further information from your client regarding the issues raised in your letter:

First, you state in your letter that Mr. Krischenowski has “readily apparent ties” to HOTEL Top-Level-Domain s.a.r.l. ("Hotel TLD"), a competing applicant for HOTEL. This statement is significant to the ultimate question of how to proceed, yet Mr. Krischenowski is not one of the listed contacts in Hotel TLD’s application for HOTEL ("Application"). You provide no evidence that Mr. Krischenowski is affiliated with Hotel TLD’s Application, other than noting that Mr. Krischenowski and the listed contacts in Hotel TLD’s Application collaborated together with respect to other new gTLD applications. It would be helpful if you could forward whatever evidence you have demonstrating the connection between Mr. Krischenowski and Hotel TLD.

Second, please forward any information demonstrating that your client has been competitively disadvantaged by the accessing of its confidential information. It does not appear that access to your client’s information could have had any effect on the Community Priority Evaluation ("CPE") panel’s determination that Hotel TLD’s Application met the requirements for community priority. The CPE for Hotel TLD’s Application began on 19 February 2014 and was completed on 12 June 2014. ICANN’s
investigation indicates that your client's application was accessed on 27 March 2014, after the CPE had already commenced. Hotel TLD did not submit a change request during CPE, nor did it submit any documentation that could have been considered by the CPE panel.

I thank you for your assistance and apologize again for our delayed response.

Regards,

Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
1. Main Agenda:
   a. President and CEO Review of New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Community Priority Evaluation Report Procedures

   *Rationale for Resolution 2016.09.17.01*

Whereas, the Board has discussed various aspects of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process, including some issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry LLC.
Whereas, the Board would like to have some additional information related to how ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff members interact with the CPE provider, and in particular with respect to the CPE provider's CPE reports.

Resolved (2016.09.17.01), the Board hereby directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to undertake an independent review of the process by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff interacted with the CPE provider, both generally and specifically with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider.

**Rationale for Resolution 2016.09.17.01**

Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) is a method to resolve string contention for New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applications. It occurs if a community application is both in contention and elects to pursue CPE. The evaluation is an independent analysis conducted by a panel from the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). As part of its process, the CPE provider reviews and scores a community applicant that has elected CPE against the following four criteria: Community Establishment; Nexus between Proposed String and Community; Registration Policies, and Community Endorsement. An application must score at least 14 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation.

At various points in the implementation of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, the Board (and the Board New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program Committee) have discussed various aspects of CPE. Recently, the Board has discussed some issues with the CPE process, including certain issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry LLC. The Board is taking action at this time to direct the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to undertake a review of the process by
which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff interacts with the CPE provider in issuing its CPE reports.

The review should include an overall evaluation of staff's interaction with the CPE provider, as well as any interaction staff may have with respect to the CPE provider preparing its CPE reports. The Board's action to initiate this review is intended to have a positive impact on the community as it will help to provide greater transparency into the CPE evaluation process. Additionally, by undertaking additional due diligence in the administration of the CPE process, the Board intends this review to help gather additional facts and information that may be helpful in addressing uncertainty about staff interaction with the CPE provider.

As part of its deliberations, the Board reviewed various materials, including, but not limited to, the following materials and documents:

- **New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant Guidebook**

- **Final Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines**

- **Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Panel Process Document**

There may be some minor fiscal impact depending on the method of review that the President and CEO chooses to undertake, but none that would be outside of the current budget for administering the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program.

Initiating a review of the process by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff interacts with the CPE provider is not anticipated to have any impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System).

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

Published on 20 September 2016
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
Minutes | Board Governance Committee (BGC) Meeting

18 Oct 2016

BGC Attendees: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Cherine Chalaby, Chris Disspain (Chair), and Bruce Tonkin

BGC Member Apologies: Erika Mann, Mike Silber, and Suzanne Woolf

Other Board member Attendees: Steve Crocker, and Göran Marby

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
Executive and Staff Attendees: Akram Atallah (President, Global Domains Division), Michelle Bright (Board Operations Content Manager), John Jeffrey (General Counsel and Secretary), Melissa King (VP, Board Operations), Vinciane Koenigsfeld (Board Operations Content Manager), Wendy Profit (Board Operations Specialist), Amy Stathos (Deputy General Counsel), and Christine Willett (VP of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Operations)

The following is a summary of discussions, actions taken, and actions identified:

1. Consideration of Presentation Request Regarding Reconsideration Request 16-11 – At the BGC’s request, it was provided an overview of Reconsideration Request 16-11 (Request 16-11), which seeks reconsideration of Board Resolutions 2016.08.09.14 – 2016.08.0-9.15 (determining that cancellation of Hotel Top-Level Domain S.a.r.l’s (HTLD’s) application for .HOTEL was not warranted, and directing that HTLD’s application for .HOTEL move forward). Request 16-11 also raises issues relating to alleged discrepancies between the Dot Registry IRP Panel Declaration and the Despegar (.HOTEL) IRP Panel Declaration. The BGC discussed that the Requesters have asked for the opportunity to make a presentation to the BGC regarding the Board Resolutions at issue in Request
16-11. The BGC noted that previous presentations allowed related to the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program have been presented by applicants that have failed to prevail in Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) and focused on the CPE report at issue. The BGC also discussed setting parameters and expectations regarding such presentations, both for the presenters and the BGC. The BGC discussed the request and agreed to allow the Requesters to make a presentation to the BGC regarding Request 16-11. The BGC asked that the Requesters be notified that the BGC has accepted their presentation request and explain that the presentation should be limited to the claims set forth in Request 16-11 and the reconsideration criteria. The BGC also asked for an overview of Request 16-11 and BGC response options in advance of the presentation, so that the BGC is able to review the materials in advance and ask any necessary questions during the presentation.

- **Actions:**
  - Notify the Requesters that the BGC has accepted their presentation request and explain that the presentation should be limited to the claims set forth in Request 16-11 and the reconsideration criteria.
  - Provide the BGC with overview of Request 16-11 and BGC response options in advance of the presentation.

2. **Next Steps Regarding Review of CPE Results (.GAY, Dot Registry Applications, Reconsideration Request Standard)** – The BGC discussed potential next steps regarding review of certain CPE results. The BGC noted that several complainants have alleged that certain of the CPE criteria have been applied inconsistently or unfairly across the various CPE reports. In addition, from a transparency standpoint, certain complainants have requested production of the evidence that the CPE panels used to form their decisions and, in particular, the independent research that the panels conducted. In evaluating the pending Reconsideration Requests, the BGC discussed ensuring that the results of the CPEs currently under review are reported respecting the principle of transparency. The BGC decided to request from the CPE provider the materials and research relied upon by the CPE panels.
in making their determinations with respect to certain pending CPE reports so that the BGC will be in a position to make determinations regarding certain recommendations or pending Reconsiderations Requests related to CPE (see https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en.)

- **Action:**
  - Request from the CPE provider the materials and research relied upon by the CPE panels in making their determinations with respect to the pending CPE reports.

3. **Board Committee Activity Reports** – The BGC discussed methods for handling the Board Committee Activity Reports that are submitted by the Board Committees twice per year. The BGC decided to recommend to the Board that the Board Committee Activity Reports be publicly posted.

- **Action:**
  - Prepare Board paper recommending that the Board Committee Activity Reports be publicly posted.

4. **Board Member Exit Questionnaire** – The BGC discussed methods for handling the Board member exit questionnaires and ways in which to use the information provided to improve Board work and operations. The BGC decided that, along with the exit questionnaires, departing Board members would be informed that their responses will be summarized and anonymously submitted to the Board for consideration.

5. **Committee Slating Update** – The Chair provided an update on Committee slating and indicated that the questionnaires seeking input from Committee members regarding the current Committee Chairs are nearly complete. The information in the questionnaires will be summarized and sent to the BGC for consideration in recommending a slate of Committee leadership for Board approval. The BGC also discussed options for determining Chair recommendations for each of the Board Committees, and decided to seek input from the individual Committees regarding the Chair recommendations.
6. **Any Other Business** – The BGC discussed aspects of the Reconsideration process under the new Bylaws and whether a separate Board Committee should be established to consider Reconsideration Requests. The BGC decided to continue the discussion at a later meeting and asked that a report be prepared regarding the Reconsideration process under the new Bylaws.

- **Action:**
  - Prepare report regarding the Reconsideration process under the new Bylaws for BGC’s consideration
26 April 2017

Re: Update on the Review of the New gTLD Community Priority Evaluation Process

Dear All Concerned:

At various times in the implementation of the New gTLD Program, the ICANN Board has considered aspects of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process. Recently, we discussed certain concerns that some applicants have raised with the CPE process, including issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry, LLC. The Board decided it would like to have some additional information related to how ICANN interacts with the CPE provider, and in particular with respect to the CPE provider's CPE reports. On 17 September 2016, we asked that the President and CEO, or his designee(s), undertake a review of the process by which ICANN has interacted with the CPE provider. (Resolution 2016.09.17.01)

Further, during our 18 October 2016 meeting, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) discussed potential next steps regarding the review of pending Reconsideration Requests pursuant to which some applicants are seeking reconsideration of CPE results. Among other things, the BGC noted that certain complainants have requested access to the documents that the CPE panels used to form their decisions and, in particular, the independent research that the panels conducted. The BGC decided to request from the CPE provider the materials and research relied upon by the CPE panels in making determinations with respect to certain pending CPEs. This will help inform the BGC’s determinations regarding certain recommendations or pending Reconsideration Requests related to CPE. This material is currently being collected as part of the President and CEO’s review and will be forwarded to the BGC in due course.

The review is currently underway. We recognize that ensuring we fulfill all of our obligations means taking more time, but we believe that this is the right approach. The review will complete as soon as practicable and once it is done, the BGC, and Board where appropriate, will promptly consider the relevant pending Reconsideration Requests.
Meanwhile, the BGC's consideration of the following Reconsideration Requests is on hold: 14-30 (.LLC), 14-32 (.INC), 14-33 (.LLP), 16-3 (.GAY), 16-5 (.MUSIC), 16-8 (.CPA), 16-11 (.HOTEL), and 16-12 (.MERCK).

For more information about CPE criteria, please see ICANN's Applicant Guidebook, which serves as basis for how all applications in the New gTLD Program have been evaluated. For more information regarding Reconsideration Requests, please see ICANN's Bylaws.

Sincerely,

Chris Disspain
Chair, ICANN Board Governance Committee
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COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN ICANN ORGANIZATION AND THE CPE PROVIDER

PREPARED FOR JONES DAY
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I. Introduction

On 17 September 2016, the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN organization) directed the President and CEO or his designees to undertake a review of the “process by which ICANN [organization] interacted with the [Community Priority Evaluation] CPE Provider, both generally and specifically with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider” as part of the New gTLD Program. The Board’s action was part of the ongoing discussions regarding various aspects of the CPE process, including some issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry, LLC.

On 18 October 2016, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) discussed potential next steps regarding the review of pending Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process. The BGC determined that, in addition to reviewing the process by which ICANN organization interacted with the CPE Provider related to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider (Scope 1), the review would also include: (i) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report (Scope 2); and (ii) a compilation of the reference material relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such reference material exists for the evaluations which are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests (Scope 3). Scopes 1, 2, and 3 are collectively referred to as the CPE Process Review. FTI Consulting, Inc.’s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice and Technology Practice were retained by Jones Day on behalf of its client ICANN organization in order to conduct the CPE Process Review.

On 26 April 2017, Chris Disspain, the Chair of the BGC, provided additional information about the scope and status of the CPE Process Review. Among other things, he

---

1 https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en#1.a.
2 Id.
4 Id.
identified eight Reconsideration Requests that would be on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed. On 2 June 2017, ICANN organization issued a status update. ICANN organization informed the community that the CPE Process Review was being conducted on two parallel tracks by FTI. The first track focused on gathering information and materials from ICANN organization, including interviewing relevant ICANN organization personnel and document collection. This work was completed in early March 2017. The second track focused on gathering information and materials from the CPE Provider, including interviewing relevant personnel. This work was still ongoing at the time ICANN issued the 2 June 2017 status update.

On 1 September 2017, ICANN organization issued a second update, advising that the interview process of the CPE Provider’s personnel that were involved in CPEs had been completed. The update further informed that FTI was working with the CPE Provider to obtain the CPE Provider’s communications and working papers, including the reference material cited in the CPE reports prepared by the CPE Provider for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests. On 4 October 2017, FTI completed its investigative process relating to the second track.

This report addresses Scope 1 of the CPE Process Review and specifically details FTI’s evaluation and findings regarding ICANN organization’s interactions with the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider as part of the New gTLD Program.

---


II. Executive Summary

FTI concludes that there is no evidence that ICANN organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process. This conclusion is based upon FTI’s review of the written communications and documents described in Section III below and FTI’s interviews with relevant personnel. While FTI understands that many communications between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider were verbal and not memorialized in writing, and thus FTI was not able to evaluate them, FTI observed nothing during its investigation and analysis that would indicate that any verbal communications amounted to undue influence or impropriety by ICANN organization.

III. Methodology

FTI followed the international investigative methodology, which is a methodology codified by the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), the largest and most prestigious anti-fraud organization globally and which grants certification to members who meet the ACFE’s standards of professionalism. This methodology is used by both law enforcement and private investigative companies worldwide. This methodology begins with the formation of an investigative plan which identifies documentation, communications, individuals and entities that may be potentially relevant to the investigation. The next step involves the collection and review of all potentially relevant materials and documentation. Then, investigators interview individuals who, based upon the preceding review of relevant documents, may have potentially relevant information. Investigators then analyze all the information collected to arrive at their conclusions.

Here, FTI did the following:

- Reviewed publicly available documents pertaining to CPE, including:

---

9 www.acfe.com. FTI’s investigative team, which includes published authors and frequent speakers on investigative best practices, holds this certification.
1. New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the entire Applicant Guidebook with particular attention to Module 4.2): https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb;

2. CPE page: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe;


7. CPE results and reports: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations;


12. Application Comments: https://gtldcomment.icann.org/applicationcomment/viewcomments;

13. External media: news articles on ICANN organization in general as well as the CPE process in particular;

14. BGC's comments on Recent Reconsideration Request: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/bgc-s-comments-on-recent-reconsideration-request;

15. Relevant Reconsideration Requests: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en;
16. CPE Archive Resources:
https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#archive-resources;

17. Relevant Independent Review Process Documents:
https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/irp-en;

18. New gTLD Program Implementation Review regarding CPE, section 4.1:

19. Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update:

20. Community Priority Evaluation Timeline:


22. Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update:

23. Board Governance Committee:
https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-committee-2014-03-21-en;

24. ICANN Bylaws:
https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en;

25. Relevant Correspondence related to CPE:
https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/correspondence;

26. Board Resolution 2016.09.17.01 and Rationale for Resolution:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en;

27. Minutes of 17 September 2016 Board Meeting:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2016-09-17-en;

28. BGC Minutes of the 18 October 2016 Meeting:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-bgc-2016-10-18-en;


31. Case 15-00110, In a matter of an Own Motion Investigation by the ICANN Ombudsman: https://omblog.icann.org/index.html%3Fm=201510.html.

- Requested, received, and reviewed the following from ICANN organization:
  1. Internal emails among relevant ICANN organization personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations (including email attachments); and
  2. External emails between relevant ICANN organization personnel and relevant CPE Provider personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations (including email attachments).

- Requested the following from the CPE Provider:
  1. Internal emails among relevant CPE Provider personnel, including evaluators, relating to the CPE process and evaluations (including email attachments);
  2. External emails between relevant CPE Provider personnel and relevant ICANN organization personnel related to the CPE process and evaluations (including email attachments); and
  3. The CPE Provider’s internal documents pertaining to the CPE process and evaluations, including working papers, draft reports, notes, and spreadsheets.

FTI did not receive documents from the CPE Provider in response to Items 1 or 2. FTI did receive and reviewed documents from ICANN organization that were responsive to the materials FTI requested from the CPE Provider in Item 2 (i.e., emails between relevant CPE Provider personnel and relevant ICANN organization personnel related to the CPE process and evaluations (including email attachments)). FTI received and reviewed documentation produced by the CPE Provider in response to Item 3.

- Interviewed relevant ICANN organization personnel
• Interviewed relevant CPE Provider personnel
• Compared the information obtained from both ICANN organization and the CPE Provider.

IV. Background on CPE

CPE is a contention resolution mechanism available to applicants that self-designated their applications as community applications.¹⁰ CPE is defined in Module 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and allows a community-based application to undergo an evaluation against the criteria as defined in section 4.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook, to determine if the application warrants the minimum score of 14 points (out of a maximum of 16 points) to earn priority and thus prevail over other applications in the contention set.¹¹ CPE will occur only if a community-based applicant selects to undergo CPE for its relevant application and after all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the new gTLD evaluation process. CPE is performed by an independent provider (CPE Provider).¹²

As noted, the standards governing CPE are set forth in Module 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook.¹³ In addition, the CPE Provider published the CPE Panel Process Document, explaining that the CPE Provider was selected to implement the Applicant Guidebook’s CPE provisions.¹⁴ The CPE Provider also published supplementary guidelines (CPE Guidelines) that provided more detailed scoring guidance, including scoring rubrics, definitions of key terms, and specific questions to be scored.¹⁵ The CPE Provider personnel interviewed by FTI stated that the CPE Guidelines were intended to increase transparency, fairness, and predictability around the assessment process.

¹² Id.
Based upon the materials reviewed and interviews with ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel, FTI learned that each evaluation began with a notice of commencement from ICANN organization to the CPE Provider via email. As part of the notice of commencement, ICANN organization identified the materials in scope, which included: application questions 1-30a, application comments, correspondence, objection outcomes, and outside research (as necessary). ICANN organization delivered to the CPE Provider the public comments available at the time of commencement of the CPE process. The CPE Provider was responsible for gathering the application materials, including letters of support and correspondence, from the public ICANN organization website.16

The CPE Provider personnel responsible for CPE consisted of a core team, a Project Director, a Project Coordinator, and independent evaluators. Before the CPE Provider commenced CPE, all evaluators, including members of the core team, confirmed that no conflicts of interest existed. In addition, all evaluators underwent regular training to ensure full understanding of all CPE requirements as listed in the Applicant Guidebook, as well as to ensure consistent judgment. This process included a pilot training process, which was followed by regular training sessions to ensure that all evaluators had the same understanding of the evaluation process and procedures.17

Two independent evaluators were assigned to each evaluation. The evaluators worked independently to assess and score the application in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook and CPE Guidelines. According to the CPE Provider interviewees, each evaluator separately presented his/her findings in a database and then discussed his/her findings with the Project Coordinator. Then, the Project Coordinator created a spreadsheet that included sections detailing the evaluators’ conclusions on each criterion and sub-criterion. The core team then met to review and discuss the evaluators’ work and scores. Following internal deliberations among the core team, the initial evaluation results were documented in the spreadsheet. The interviewees stated

17 Id.
that, at times, the evaluators came to different conclusions on a particular score or issue. In these circumstances, the core team evaluated each evaluator’s work and then referred to the Applicant Guidebook and CPE Guidelines in order to reach a conclusion as to scoring. Consistent with the CPE Panel Process Document, before the core team reached a conclusion, an evaluator may be asked to conduct additional research to answer questions that arose during the review. The core team would then deliberate and come up with a consensus as to scoring. FTI interviewed both ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel about the CPE process and interviewees from both organizations stated that ICANN organization played no role in whether or not the CPE Provider conducted research or accessed reference material in any of the evaluations. That ICANN organization was not involved in the CPE Provider’s research process was confirmed by FTI’s review of relevant email communications (including attachments) provided by ICANN organization, inasmuch as FTI observed no instance where ICANN organization suggested that the CPE Provider undertake (or not undertake) research. Instead, research was conducted at the discretion of the CPE Provider.

ICANN organization had no role in the evaluation process and no role in writing the initial draft CPE report. Once the CPE Provider completed an initial draft CPE report, the CPE Provider would send the draft report to ICANN organization. ICANN organization provided feedback to the CPE Provider in the form of comments exchanged via email or written on draft CPE reports as well as verbal comments during conference calls.

V. Analysis

FTI undertook its analysis after carefully studying the materials described above and evaluating the substance of the interviews conducted. The materials and interviews provided FTI with a solid understanding of CPE. The interviews in particular provided FTI with an understanding of the mechanics of the CPE process as well as the roles of the different parties involved.

19 See Applicant Guidebook §4.2.3 at 4-9 (“The panel may also perform independent research, if deemed necessary to reach informed scoring decisions.”).
undertaken both separately and together by ICANN organization personnel and the CPE Provider during the process.

FTI proceeded with its investigation in four parts, which are separately detailed below: (i) analysis of email communications among relevant ICANN organization personnel and between relevant ICANN organization personnel and the CPE Provider (including email attachments); (ii) interviews of relevant ICANN organization personnel; (iii) interviews of relevant CPE Provider personnel; and (iv) analysis of draft CPE reports.

A. ICANN Organization’s Email Communications (Including Attachments) Did Not Show Any Undue Influence Or Impropriety By ICANN Organization.

In an effort to ensure the comprehensive collection of relevant materials, FTI provided ICANN organization with a list of search terms and requested that ICANN organization deliver to FTI all email (including attachments) from relevant ICANN organization personnel that “hit” on a search term. The search terms were designed to be over-inclusive, meaning that FTI anticipated that many of the documents that resulted from the search would not be pertinent to FTI’s investigation. In FTI’s experience, it is a best practice to begin with a broader collection and then refine the search for relevant materials as the investigation progresses. As a result, the search terms were quite broad and included the names of ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel who were involved in the CPE process. The search terms also included other key words that are commonly used in the CPE process, as identified by a review of the Applicant Guidebook and other materials on the ICANN website. FTI’s Technology Practice worked with ICANN organization to ensure that the materials were collected in a forensically sound manner. In total, ICANN organization provided FTI with 100,701 emails, including attachments, in native format. The time period covered by the emails received dated from 2012 to March 2017.

An initial review of emails produced to FTI confirmed FTI’s expectation that the initial search terms were overbroad and returned a large number of emails that were not relevant to FTI’s investigation. As a result, FTI performed a targeted key word search to
identify emails pertinent to the CPE process and reduce the time and cost of examining irrelevant or repetitive documents. FTI developed and tested these additional terms using FTI Technology’s Ringtail eDiscovery platform, which employs conceptual analysis, duplicate detection, and interactive visualizations to assist in improving search results by grouping documents with similar content and highlighting those that are more likely to be relevant.

Based on FTI’s review of email communications provided by ICANN organization, FTI found no evidence that ICANN organization had any undue influence on the CPE reports or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process. FTI found that the vast majority of the emails were administrative in nature and did not concern the substance or the content of the CPE results. Of the small number of emails that did discuss substance, none suggested that ICANN acted improperly in the process.

1. The Vast Majority of the Communications Were Administrative in Nature.

The email communications that FTI reviewed and which were provided by ICANN organization were largely administrative in nature, meaning that they concerned the scheduling of telephone calls, CPE Provider staffing, timelines for completion, invoicing, and other similar logistical issues. Although FTI was not able to review the CPE Provider’s internal emails relating to this work, as indicated above, FTI did interview relevant CPE Provider personnel, and each confirmed that any internal email communications largely addressed administrative tasks.

2. The Email Communications that Addressed Substance did not Evidence any Undue Influence or Impropriety by ICANN Organization.

Of the email communications reviewed by FTI, only a small number discussed the substance of the CPE process and specific evaluations. These emails generally fell into three categories. First, ICANN organization’s emails with the CPE Provider reflected questions or suggestions made to clarify certain language reflected in the CPE Provider’s draft reports. In these communications, however, FTI observed no instances
where ICANN organization recommended, suggested, or otherwise interjected its own views on what specific conclusion should be reached. Instead, ICANN organization personnel asked the CPE Provider to clarify language contained in draft CPE reports in an effort to avoid misleading or ambiguous wording. In this regard, ICANN organization’s correspondence to the CPE Provider largely comprised suggestions on a particular word to be used to capture a concept clearly. FTI observed no instances where ICANN dictated or sought to require the CPE Provider to use specific wording or make specific scoring decisions.

Second, ICANN organization posed questions to the CPE Provider that reflected ICANN organization’s efforts to understand how the CPE Provider came to its conclusions on a specific evaluation. Based on a plain reading, ICANN organization’s questions were clearly intended to ensure that the CPE Provider had engaged in a robust discussion on each CPE criterion in the CPE report.

The third category comprised emails from the CPE Provider inquiring as to the scope of Clarifying Questions and specifically whether a proposed Clarifying Question was permissible under applicable guidelines.20

Across all three categories, FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider and ICANN organization engaged in a discussion about using the correct word to capture the CPE Provider’s reasoning. ICANN organization also advised the CPE Provider that the CPE Provider’s conclusions, as stated in draft reports, at times were not supported by sufficient reasoning, and suggested that additional explanation was needed. However, ICANN organization did not suggest that the CPE Provider make changes in final scoring or adjust the rationale set forth in the CPE report.

Throughout its review, FTI observed instances where ICANN organization and the CPE Provider agreed to discuss various issues telephonically. Emails would then follow

---

20 The CPE Provider may, at its discretion, provide a clarifying question (CQ) to be issued via ICANN organization to the applicant to clarify statements in the application materials and/or to inform the applicant that letter(s) of support could not be verified. See CPE Panel Process Document (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/panel-process-07aug14-en.pdf).
these telephone calls and note that the latest drafts reflected the telephone discussions that had occurred. FTI reviewed the drafts as noted in these communications and compared them with prior versions of the draft reports that were exchanged and confirmed that there was no evidence of undue influence or impropriety by ICANN organization, as described further below.

Ultimately, the vast majority of ICANN organization’s emails were administrative in nature. FTI found no email communications that indicated that ICANN organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE Process.

B. Interviews With ICANN Organization Personnel Confirmed That There Was No Undue Influence Or Impropriety By ICANN Organization.

In March 2017, FTI met with several ICANN organization employees in order to learn more about their interactions with the CPE Provider. FTI interviewed the following individuals who interacted with the CPE Provider over time regarding CPE.

- Chris Bare
- Steve Chan
- Jared Erwin
- Cristina Flores
- Russell Weinstein
- Christine Willett

Each of the ICANN organization personnel that FTI interviewed confirmed that the interactions between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider took place via email (including attachments which were primarily comprised of draft reports with comments in red line form) and conference calls.

The interviewees explained that the initial draft reports received from the CPE Provider (particularly for the first four reports) were not particularly detailed, and, as a result,
ICANN organization asked the CPE Provider a lot of “why” questions to ensure that the CPE Provider’s rationale was sufficiently conveyed. The interviewees stated that they emphasized to the CPE Provider the importance of remaining transparent and accountable to the community in the CPE reports. Based on a plain reading of ICANN organization’s comments to draft CPE reports, none of ICANN organization’s comments were mandatory, meaning that ICANN organization never dictated that the CPE Provider take a specific approach. FTI observed no instances where ICANN organization endeavored to change the scoring or outcome of any CPE. This was confirmed by both ICANN organization personnel and CPE Provider personnel in FTI’s interviews. If changes were made in response to ICANN organization’s comments, they usually took the form of the CPE Provider providing additional information to explain its scoring decisions and conclusions.

The CPE reports became more detailed over time. The ICANN organization personnel who were interviewed noted that, over time, the majority of communications took place via weekly conference calls. Most of ICANN organization’s interaction with the CPE Provider consisted of asking for supporting citations to the CPE Provider’s research or that more precise wording be used. ICANN organization personnel noted that they observed robust debate among CPE Provider personnel concerning various criteria, but that the CPE Provider strictly evaluated the applications against the criteria outlined in the Applicant Guidebook and the CPE Guidelines. The interviewees confirmed that ICANN organization never questioned or sought to alter the CPE Provider’s conclusions.

C. Interviews With CPE Provider Personnel Confirmed That There Was No Undue Influence Or Impropriety By ICANN Organization.

FTI asked to interview relevant CPE Provider personnel involved in the CPE process. The CPE Provider stated that only two CPE Provider staff members remained. In June 2017, FTI interviewed the two remaining staff members, who were members of the core team for all CPEs that were conducted. During the interview, in addition to understanding the CPE process described above, see section IV above, FTI
endeavored to understand the interactions between the CPE Provider and ICANN organization.

The interviewees confirmed that ICANN organization was not involved in scoring the criteria or the drafting of the initial reports, but rather the CPE Provider independently scored each criterion. The interviewees stated that they were strict constructionists and used the Applicant Guidebook as their “bible”. Further, the CPE Provider stated that it relied first and foremost on material provided by the applicant. The CPE Provider informed FTI that it only accessed reference material when the evaluators or core team decided that research was needed to address questions that arose during the review.

The CPE Provider also stated that ICANN organization provided guidance as to whether or not a particular report sufficiently detailed the CPE Provider’s reasoning. The CPE Provider stated that it never changed the scoring or the results based on ICANN organization’s comments. The only action the CPE Provider took in response to ICANN organization’s comments was to revise the manner in which its analysis and conclusions were presented (generally in the form of changing a word or adding additional explanation). The CPE Provider stated that it also received guidance from ICANN organization with respect to whether a proposed Clarifying Question was permissible under applicable guidelines.

In short, the CPE Provider confirmed that ICANN organization did not impact the CPE Provider’s scoring decisions.

D. FTI’s Review Of Draft CPE Reports Confirmed That There Was No Undue Influence Or Impropriety By ICANN Organization.

FTI requested and received from the CPE Provider all draft CPE reports, including any drafts that reflected feedback from ICANN organization. ICANN organization provided feedback in redline form. Some draft reports had very few or no comments, while others had up to 20 comments. In some drafts, the comments were just numbered and not attributed to a particular person. As such, at times it was difficult to discern which
comments were made by ICANN organization versus the CPE Provider. Of the comments that FTI can affirmatively attribute to ICANN organization, all related to word choice, style and grammar, or requests to provide examples to further explain the CPE Provider’s conclusions. This is consistent with the information provided by ICANN organization and the CPE Provider during their interviews and in the email communications provided by ICANN organization.

For example, FTI observed comments from ICANN organization personnel suggesting that the CPE Provider include more detailed explanation or explicitly cite resources for statements that did not appear to have sufficient factual or evidentiary support. In other instances, the draft reports reflected an exchange between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider in response to ICANN organization’s questions regarding the meaning the CPE Provider intended to convey. It is clear from the exchanges that ICANN organization was not advocating for a particular score or conclusion, but rather commenting on the clarity of reasoning behind assigning one score or another.

In general, it was not uncommon for the CPE Provider to make revisions in response to ICANN organization’s comments. As noted above, these revisions generally took the form of additional information to add further detail to the stated reasoning. However, none of these revisions affected the scoring or results. At other times, the CPE Provider did not make any revisions in response to ICANN organization’s comments.

Overall, ICANN organization’s comments generally were not substantive, but rather reflected ICANN organization’s suggestion that a revision could make the CPE report clearer. Based on FTI’s investigation, there is no evidence that ICANN organization ever suggested that the CPE Provider change its rationale, nor did ICANN organization dictate the scoring or CPE results.

---

21 Some comments to draft CPE reports followed verbal conversations between CPE Provider staff and ICANN organization; the CPE Provider stated that it did not possess notes documenting these conversations.
VI. Conclusion

Following a careful and comprehensive investigation, which included several interviews and an extensive review of available documentary materials, FTI found no evidence that ICANN organization attempted to influence the evaluation process, scoring or conclusions reached by the CPE Provider. As such, FTI concludes that there is no evidence that ICANN organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process.
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Organization Publishes Reports on the Review of the Community Priority Evaluation Process

This page is available in:

LOS ANGELES – 13 December 2017 – The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) today published three reports on the review of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process (the CPE Process Review). The CPE Process Review was initiated at the request of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board as part of the Board's due diligence in the administration of the CPE process. The CPE Process Review was conducted by FTI Consulting Inc.'s (FTI) (http://www.fticonsulting.com/) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice, and consisted of three parts: (i) reviewing the process by which the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization interacted with the CPE Provider related to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider (Scope 1); (ii) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report (Scope 2); and (iii) a compilation of the reference material relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such reference material exists for the eight evaluations which are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests that were
pending at the time that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) initiated the CPE Process Review (Scope 3).

FTI concluded that "there is no evidence that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process" (Scope 1) and that "the CPE Provider consistently applied the criteria set forth in the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant Guidebook [ ] and the CPE Guidelines throughout each CPE" (Scope 2). (See Scope 1 report (/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-1-communications-between-icann-cpe-provider-13dec17-en.pdf) [PDF, 159 KB], Pg. 3; Scope 2 report (/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-2-cpe-criteria-analysis-13dec17-en.pdf) [PDF, 312 KB], Pg. 3.)

For Scope 3, FTI observed that two of the eight relevant CPE reports included a citation in the report for each reference to research. In the remaining six reports, FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider referenced research but did not include the corresponding citations in the reports. Except for one evaluation, FTI observed that the working papers underlying the reports contained material that corresponded with the research referenced in the CPE reports. In one instance, FTI did not find that the working papers underlying the relevant report contained citation that corresponded with the research referenced in the CPE report. However, based on FTI's observations, it is possible that the research being referenced was cited in the CPE Provider's working papers underlying the first evaluation of that application. (See Scope 3 report (/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-3-cpe-provider-reference-material- compilation-redacted-13dec17-en.pdf) [PDF, 309 KB], Pg. 4.) The findings will be considered by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) when the BAMC reviews the remaining pending Reconsideration Requests as part of the Reconsideration process.

"The Board appreciates the community's patience during this detailed investigation, which has provided greater transparency into the CPE evaluation process," said Cherine Chalaby, Chairman of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.
"Further, this CPE Process Review and due diligence has provided additional facts and information that outline and document the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization's interaction with the CPE Provider."


More Announcements


ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Launches Dr. Tarek Kamel Award and Opens Nomination for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Community Excellence Award (/news/announcement-2-2020-01-27-en)

Register Now to Participate in the 7th Middle East DNS (Domain Name System) Forum (/news/announcement-2020-01-27-en)
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
1. Consent Agenda:
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes
   b. Outsource Service Provider Zensar Contract Approval
      Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.02 - 2018.03.15.03
   c. New GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Voting
      Thresholds to address post-transition roles and responsibilities of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community - Proposed Changes to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws
      Rationale for Resolution 2018.03.15.04
      Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.05 - 2018.03.15.06
   e. Transfer of the .TD (Chad) top-level domain to l'Agence de Développement des Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication (ADETIC)
      Rationale for Resolution 2018.03.15.07
f. Thank You to Local Host of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting

g. Thank you to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting

h. Thank you to Interpreters, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting

2. Main Agenda:
   a. Next Steps in Community Priority Evaluation Process Review
      Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 - 2018.03.15.11

      Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.12 - 2018.03.15.14

   c. Consideration of the Asia Green IT System Independent Review Process Final Declaration
      Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.15 - 2018.03.15.17

   d. Appointment of the Independent Auditor for the Fiscal Year Ending 30 June 2018
      Rationale for Resolution 2018.03.15.18

   e. AOB

1. Consent Agenda:
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes
      Resolved (2018.03.15.01), the Board approves the minutes of the 4 February 2018 Regular Meeting of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.

   b. Outsource Service Provider Zensar Contract Approval
Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization’s Engineering and Information Technology department has a need for continued third-party development, quality assurance and content management support.

Whereas, Zensar has provided good services in software engineering, quality assurance and content management over the last several years.

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org conducted a full request for proposal, the results of which led ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to determine that Zensar is still the preferred vendor.

Resolved (2018.03.15.02), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to enter into enter into, and make disbursement in furtherance of, a new Zensar contract for a term of 24 months with total cost not to exceed [REDACTED FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES]. These costs are based on the current Zensar RFP response and are under negotiation.

Resolved (2018.03.15.03), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article 3, Section 3.5(b) and (d) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.02 - 2018.03.15.03

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org’s Engineering & IT (E&IT) department has used Zensar to support development, quality assurance and content management needs since November 2014. This relationship has been beneficial to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org and, overall has been a success.

The current three-year contract expired in November 2017 and was extended through March 2018 to allow ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to perform a full request for proposal (RFP).

Eleven vendors were included in the RFP of which six responded. Of these, two were cheaper and three more expensive than Zensar.

The RFP identified that Zensar rates are on par with others that may be interested in supporting this project.

The RFP team estimated that transition costs to move to another vendor would be at least 25% for a period of six months. More expensive vendors were therefore eliminated.

Zensar and the two less expensive applicants were asked to present their proposals and answer questions from the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org team. During the presentations, it was identified that both other applicants did not have sufficient existing resources to support this project for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org and would need to engage additional staff if they were awarded the contract. Staffing up would take time, causing delays. Quality of new staff would be an unknown.

While the RFP was in progress, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org undertook the FY19 budget process and identified the need for reduction in the services contemplated in the RFP to meet future targets. This resulted in a reduction of 2/3 (43 to 15 people) of the outsource contract. This reduction changes ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org’s needs and hence the services that would be provided by the outsource provider. While Zensar, being the incumbent would accept these reductions, the changes would require additional negotiation with the other RFP responders.

Zensar has three years of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) knowledge. Retaining Zensar as the preferred provider ensures continuity in support.

Taking this step is in the fulfilment of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s mission and in the public
interest to ensure that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org is utilizing the right third party providers, and to ensure that it is maximizing available resources in a cost efficient and effective manner.

This action will have a fiscal impact on the organization, but that impact has already been anticipated and is covered in the FY18 and FY19 budget. This action will not impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

c. New GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Voting Thresholds to address post-transition roles and responsibilities of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community - Proposed Changes to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws

Whereas, during its meeting on 30 January 2018, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)) Council resolved (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+30+January+2018) to recommend that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board of Directors adopt proposed changes to section 11.3.i of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws to reflect new GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) voting thresholds which are different from the current threshold of a simple majority vote of each House (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/proposed-revisions-bylaws-article-11-gnso-redline-19jun17-en.pdf [PDF, 39 KB]).

Whereas, the addition of voting thresholds to section 11.3.i of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
Bylaws as proposed by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) would constitute a "Standard Bylaw Amendment" under Section 25.1 of the Bylaws (/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article25).

Whereas, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws requires that Standard Bylaw Amendments be published for public comment prior to the approval by the Board.

Whereas, after taking public comments into account, the Board will consider the proposed Bylaws changes for adoption.

Resolved (2018.03.15.04), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to post for public comment for a period of at least 40 days the Standard Bylaw Amendment reflecting proposed additions to section 11.3.i of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws to establish additional GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) voting thresholds. The proposed new voting thresholds are different from the current threshold of a simple majority vote of each House to address all the new or additional rights and responsibilities in relation to participation of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community.

Rationale for Resolution 2018.03.15.04

The action being approved today is to direct the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) President and CEO, or his designee, to initiate a public comment period on proposed changes to section 11.3.i of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws to reflect additional GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) voting thresholds. The revised voting thresholds are different from the current threshold of a simple majority vote of each House, which is the default GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council voting threshold. The revisions are made to address the new or additional rights and responsibilities in relation to participation of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. The Board's action is a first step to consider the
unanimous approval by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council of the proposed changes.

The Board's action to initiate a public comment period on this Standard Bylaw Amendment serves the public interest by helping to fulfill ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitment to operate through open and transparent processes. In particular, posting Bylaws amendments for public comment is necessary to ensure full transparency and opportunity for the broader community to comment on these proposed changes prior to consideration or adoption by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board. If the Board approves this Standard Bylaw Amendment after public comment period, the Empowered Community will have an opportunity to consider rejecting the Amendment in accordance with the Bylaws. This action is also consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission as it in support of one of the policy development bodies that help ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) serve its mission.

There is no anticipated fiscal impact from this decision, which would initiate the opening of public comments, and no fiscal impact from the proposed changes to the Bylaws, if adopted. Approval of the resolution will not impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name.

The interim action of posting the proposed Bylaws amendments for public comment is an Organizational Administrative Action not requiring public comment.


Whereas, Article 4, Section 4.4. of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws state that "[t]he Board "shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Council, each Advisory Committee
(Advisory Committee) (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)), and the Nominating Committee (as defined in Section 8.1) by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review."

Whereas, as part of the first Country Code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)) Review, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group submitted its Final Report to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board on 4 March 2011, and per Resolution 2017.09.23.05, the Board resolved to defer the second ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review until August 2018.

Resolved (2018.03.15.05), the Board hereby initiates the second ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review and directs ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization to post a Request for Proposal to procure an independent examiner to begin the review as soon as practically feasible.

Resolved (2018.03.15.06), the Board encourages the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) to prepare for an independent examiner to begin work on the second ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review in August 2018 by organizing a Review Working Party to serve as a liaison during the preparatory phase and throughout the review, and to conduct a self-assessment prior to August 2018.

Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.05 - 2018.03.15.06

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

This action is taken to provide a clear and consistent approach towards complying with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws' mandate to conduct reviews. Moreover, the Board is addressing this issue because the Bylaws stipulate organizational reviews take place every five years. Following an initial deferral due to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Stewardship Transition, the ICANN
Board had deferred the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)) Review in 2017 to commence in 2018. The Board is now initiating the second Review of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) to prepare for an independent examiner to begin work in August 2018.

**Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

No consultation took place as this action is in line with the guidelines and provisions contained in Article 4, Section 4.4 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, and Resolution 2017.09.23.05.

**Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org (strategic plan, operating plan, and budget); the community; and/or the public?**

Timely conduct of organizational reviews is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s strategic and operating plans. The budget for the second ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review has been approved as part of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s annual budget cycle and the funds allocated to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Review are managed by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization team responsible for these reviews. No additional budgetary requirements are foreseen at this time and separate consideration will be given to the budget impact of the implementation of recommendations that may result from the review.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?**

There are no security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System) as the result of this action.
This action is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission and serves the public interest by supporting the effectiveness and ongoing improvement of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s accountability and governance structures.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

e. Transfer of the .TD (Chad) top-level domain to l'Agence de Développement des Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication (ADETIC)

Resolved (2018.03.15.07), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) has reviewed and evaluated the request to transfer the .TD country-code top-level domain (ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain)) to l'Agence de Développement des Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication (ADETIC). The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

**Rationale for Resolution 2018.03.15.07**

**Why is the Board addressing this issue now?**

In accordance with the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, PTI has evaluated a request for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) transfer and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that the proper procedures were followed.

**What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal is to approve a request to transfer the country-code top-level domain .TD and assign the role of manager to l'Agence de Développement des Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication (ADETIC).
Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating this transfer application, PTI consulted with the applicant and other significantly interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain), and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

PTI is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the following evaluations:

- The domain is eligible for transfer, as the string under consideration represents Chad that is listed in the ISO (International Organization for Standardization) 3166-1 standard;
- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The incumbent manager consents to the transfer;
- The proposed manager and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing these domains;
- The proposal has demonstrated appropriate significantly interested parties' consultation and support;
- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposal ensures the domains are managed locally in the country, and are bound under local law;
- The proposed manager has confirmed they will manage the domains in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed manager has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the
domains;

- The proposed technical configuration meets the technical conformance requirements;

- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and

- ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org has provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name (Domain Name) System Structure and Delegation" (RFC (Request for Comments) 1591) and "GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process, Delegation and Transfer reports are posted at http://www.iana.org/reports (http://www.iana.org/reports).

**What factors the Board found to be significant?**

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s overall mission, the local communities to which ccTLDs are designated to serve, and responsive to obligations under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract.

**Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?**
The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS (Domain Name System) root zone is part of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of ccTLDs within a country.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?**

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

**f. Thank You to Local Host of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting**

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to the Hon. Ricardo Roselló Nevares, Governor of Puerto Rico; Oscar R. Moreno de Ayala, President of Puerto Rico Top Level Domain; Pablo Rodriguez, Vice President of Puerto Rico Top Level Domain; Carla Campos Vidal, Director of Puerto Rico Tourism Company; and the local host organizer, Puerto Rico Top Level Domain (.PR).

**g. Thank you to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting**

The Board wishes to thank the following sponsors: Verisign, Claro, Liberty, Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA), Afilias plc, Public Interest Registry and Uniregistry.

**h. Thank you to Interpreters, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN (Internet**
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 61 Meeting

The Board expresses its deepest appreciation to the scribes, interpreters, audiovisual team, technical teams, and the entire ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org team for their efforts in facilitating the smooth operation of the meeting. The Board would also like to thank the management and staff of Puerto Rico Convention Center for providing a wonderful facility to hold this event. Special thanks are extended to Margaret Colon, Director of Sales & Marketing; Vivian E. Santana, Director of Events; Gianni Agostini Santiago, Senior Catering Sales Manager; Carlos Rosas, IT Manager; and Wilson Alers from Media Stage Inc.

2. Main Agenda:

a. Next Steps in Community Priority Evaluation Process Review

Whereas, the Board directed the President and CEO or his designees to undertake a review of the "process by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) [organization] interacted with the [Community Priority Evaluation (CPE)] Provider, both generally and specifically with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider".

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) determined that the review should also include: (i) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report; and (ii) a compilation of the research relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such research exists for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process (collectively, the CPE Process Review). (See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-bgc-2016-10-18-en (/resources/board-material/minutes-bgc-2016-10-18-en).)

Whereas, the BGC determined that the following pending Reconsideration Requests would be on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed: 14-30, 14-32, 14-33, 16-3, 16-5, 16-8, 16-11, and 16-12. (See
Whereas, the CPE Process Review was conducted by FTI Consulting, Inc.’s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice and Technology Practice.


Whereas, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) has considered the CPE Process Review Reports (the conclusions of which are set forth in the rationale below) and has provided recommendations to the Board of next steps in the CPE Process Review.

Whereas, the Board has considered the three CPE Process Review Reports and agrees with the BAMC’s recommendations.

Resolved (2018.03.15.08), the Board acknowledges and accepts the findings set forth in the three CPE Process Review Reports.

Resolved (2018.03.15.09), the Board concludes that, as a result of the findings in the CPE Process Review Reports, no overhaul or change to the CPE process for this current round of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program is necessary.

Resolved (2018.03.15.10), the Board declares that the CPE Process Review has been completed.

Resolved (2018.03.15.11), the Board directs the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee to move forward with consideration of the remaining Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process that were placed on hold pending completion of the CPE Process Review in accordance with the Transition Process of Reconsideration Responsibilities from the BGC to the BAMC ([/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-).)
Rationale for Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 - 2018.03.15.11

CPE is a contention resolution mechanism available to applicants that self-designated their applications as community applications.\(^4\) CPE is defined in Module 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and allows a community-based application to undergo an evaluation against the criteria as defined in section 4.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook, to determine if the application warrants the minimum score of 14 points (out of a maximum of 16 points) to earn priority and thus prevail over other applications in the contention set.\(^5\) CPE will occur only if a community-based applicant selects to undergo CPE for its relevant application and after all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) evaluation process. CPE is performed by an independent provider (CPE Provider).

The Board directed the President and CEO or his designees to undertake a review of the "process by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) [organization] interacted with the [Community Priority Evaluation] CPE Provider, both generally and specifically with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider" as part of the Board's oversight of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program (Scope 1).\(^6\) The Board's action was part of the ongoing discussions regarding various aspects of the CPE process, including some issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry, LLC.

Thereafter, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) determined that the review should also include: (i) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report (Scope 2); and (ii) a compilation of the research relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such research exists for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process (Scope 3).\(^7\) Scopes 1, 2, and 3 are collectively referred to as the CPE Process Review.
The BGC determined that the following pending Reconsideration Requests would be on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed: 14-30 (.LLC), 14-32 (.INC), 14-33 (.LLP), 16-3 (.GAY), 16-5 (.MUSIC), 16-8 (.CPA), 16-11 (.HOTEL), and 16-12 (.MERCK).

On 13 December 2017, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization published three reports on the CPE Process Review.

For Scope 1, "FTI conclude[d] that there is no evidence that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process…. While FTI understands that many communications between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization and the CPE Provider were verbal and not memorialized in writing, and thus FTI was not able to evaluate them, FTI observed nothing during its investigation and analysis that would indicate that any verbal communications amounted to undue influence or impropriety by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization." (Scope 1 Report [PDF, 160 KB], Pg. 4)

For Scope 2, "FTI found no evidence that the CPE Provider's evaluation process or reports deviated in any way from the applicable guidelines; nor did FTI observe any instances where the CPE Provider applied the CPE criteria in an inconsistent manner." (Scope 2 Report [PDF, 313 KB], Pg. 3.)

For Scope 3, "[o]f the eight relevant CPE reports, FTI observed two reports (.CPA, .MERCK) where the CPE Provider included a citation in the report for each reference to research. For all eight evaluations (.LLC, .INC, .LLP, .GAY, .MUSIC, .CPA, .HOTEL, and .MERCK), FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider cited reference material in the CPE Provider's working papers that was not otherwise cited in the final CPE report. In addition, in six CPE
reports (.LLC, .INC, .LLP, .GAY, .MUSIC, and .HOTEL), FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider referenced research but did not include citations to such research in the reports. In each instance, FTI reviewed the working papers associated with the relevant evaluation to determine if the citation supporting referenced research was reflected in the working papers. For all but one report, FTI observed that the working papers did reflect the citation supporting referenced research not otherwise cited in the corresponding final CPE report. In one instance—the second .GAY final CPE report—FTI observed that while the final report referenced research, the citation to such research was not included in the final report or the working papers for the second .GAY evaluation. However, because the CPE Provider performed two evaluations for the .GAY application, FTI also reviewed the CPE Provider's working papers associated with the first .GAY evaluation to determine if the citation supporting research referenced in the second .GAY final CPE report was reflected in those materials. Based upon FTI's investigation, FTI finds that the citation supporting the research referenced in the second .GAY final CPE report may have been recorded in the CPE Provider's working papers associated with the first .GAY evaluation." (Scope 3 Report (/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-3-cpe-provider-reference-material-compilation-redacted-13dec17-en.pdf) [PDF, 309 KB], Pg. 4.)

The Board notes that FTI's findings are based upon its review of the written communications and documents described in the three Reports. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) considered the CPE Process Review Reports as part of its oversight of accountability mechanisms and recommended that the Board take the foregoing actions related to the CPE Process Review. The Board agrees. In particular, the BAMC is ready to re-start its review of the remaining reconsideration requests that were put on hold. To ensure that the review of these pending Reconsideration Requests are conducted in an efficient manner and in accordance with the "Transition Process of Reconsideration Responsibilities from the BGC to the BAMC (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-responsibilities-transition-bgc-to-bamc-05jan18-en.pdf)" [PDF, 42 KB], the BAMC has developed a Roadmap (/en/system/files/files/roadmap-reconsideration-requests-cpe-15feb18-en.pdf) [PDF, 30 KB] for the review of the pending Reconsideration Requests.
The Board acknowledges receipt of the letters to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board from dotgay LLC on 15 January 2018 and 20 January 2018, from DotMusic Limited on 16 January 2018, regarding the CPE Process Review Reports. Both dotgay LLC and DotMusic Limited claim that the CPE Process Review lacked transparency or independence, and was not sufficiently thorough, and ask that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board take no action with respect to the conclusions reached by FTI, until the parties have had an opportunity to respond to the FTI Report and to be heard as it relates to their pending reconsideration requests. (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ali-to-icann-board-15jan18-en.pdf; https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ali-to-icann-board-20jan18-en.pdf; and https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ali-to-icann-board-16jan18-en.pdf.) The Board has considered the arguments raised in the letters. The Board notes that dotgay LLC and DotMusic Limited (among other requestors) each will have an opportunity to submit supplemental materials and make a presentation to the BAMC to address how the CPE Process Review is relevant to their pending Reconsideration Requests. Any specific claims they might have related to the FTI Reports with respect to their particular applications can be addressed then, and ultimately will be considered in connection with the determination on their own Reconsideration Requests.

The Board also acknowledges receipt of the letter to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board from dotgay LLC on 31 January 2018, which attached the Second Expert Opinion of Professor William N. Eskridge, Jr., addressing FTI's Scope 2 Report and Scope 3 Report on the CPE Process.
Review. The Board has considered the arguments raised in the letter and accompanying Second Expert Opinion, and finds that they do not impact this Resolution, but instead will be addressed in connection with dotgay LLC's pending Reconsideration Request 16-3.

First, and as an initial matter, the Board does not accept dotgay LLC's assertion that "a strong case could be made that the purported investigation was undertaken with a pre-determined outcome in mind." Neither dotgay LLC nor Professor Eskridge offers any support for this baseless claim, and there is none.

Second, dotgay LLC urges the Board to entirely "reject the findings made by FTI in the FTI Reports", but dotgay LLC has submitted no basis for this outcome. All dotgay LLC offers is Professor Eskridge's Second Expert Opinion, which, at its core, challenges the merits of the report issued by the CPE Provider in connection with dotgay LLC's community application for the .GAY gTLD (generic Top Level Domain). (See Response to dotgay LLC at [PDF, 122 KB]; see also Response from dotgay LLC at [PDF, 226 KB].) Dotgay LLC will have the opportunity to include such claims in that regard and if it does, the claims will be addressed in connection with their reconsideration request that is currently pending.

The Board also acknowledges the 1 February 2018 letter [PDF, 537 KB] from
applicants Travel Reservations SRL, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Radix FXC, dot Hotel Inc. and Fegistry LLC (regarding "Consideration of Next Steps in the Community Priority Evaluation Process Review (Reconsideration Request 16-11)."
These applicants that submitted Request 16-11 claim that the CPE Process Review lacked transparency or independence, and ask that the Board address the inconsistencies to "ensure a meaningful review of the CPE regarding .hotel."
The Board understands the arguments raised in the letter, and again reiterates that the individual requestors with reconsideration requests that were placed on hold pending completion of the CPE Process Review will have the opportunity to submit additional information in support of those reconsideration requests, including the requestors that filed Reconsideration Request 16-11.

The Board acknowledges receipt of DotMusic Limited's submission to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, on 2 February 2018 (/en/system/files/files/correspondence/roussos-to-marby-02feb18-en.pdf) [PDF, 1.02 MB], regarding the CPE Process Review Reports. First, and as an initial matter, the Board does not accept DotMusic Limited's assertions that FTI's "objective was to exonerate ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the CPE panel", that "the intent of the investigation was to advocate in favor of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and [the CPE Provider]", and that "ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) carefully tailored the narrow scope of the investigation and cherry-picked documents and information to share with the FTI to protect itself."
(https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/roussos-to-marby-02feb18-en.pdf (/en/system/files/files/correspondence/roussos-to-marby-02feb18-en.pdf) [PDF, 1.02 MB], ¶ 109, Pg. 65, ¶ 69, Pg. 48, ¶ 74, Pg. 49, ¶ 76, Pg. 49.) DotMusic Limited offers no support for these baseless claims, and there is none. (See Response to DotMusic Limited,
(https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/wallace-to-rousos-schaeffer-05mar18-en.pdf) [PDF, 126 KB]; see also Responses from DotMusic Limited,
(https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ali-to-icann-board-16jan18-en.pdf) [PDF, 49 KB] letter to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, namely that the CPE Process Review lacked transparency and was too narrow.

DotMusic Limited asserts that it would be unreasonable for the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board to accept the conclusions of the FTI Report and reject DotMusic's Reconsideration Request 16-5. The Board has considered the arguments raised in DotMusic Limited's submission, and finds that they do not impact this Resolution. As noted above, DotMusic Limited (among other Requestors) will have an opportunity to submit supplemental materials and make a presentation to the BAMC to address how the CPE Process Review is relevant to its pending Reconsideration Request 16-5, such that any claims DotMusic Limited might have related to the FTI Reports can be addressed then, and then ultimately will be considered in connection with the determination on Reconsideration Request 16-5.

These applicants that submitted Request 16-11 reiterate their claim that the CPE Process Review lacked transparency, and further assert that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization continues to be "non-transparent about the CPE deliberately" insofar as ICANN
organization has not published a preliminary report of the BAMC's 2 February 2018 meeting, which these applicants claim is required pursuant to Article 3, Section 3.5(c) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-16-11-trs-et-al-petillion-to-icann-bamc-redacted-22feb18-en.pdf [PDF, 516 KB], Pg. 2.)

First, the Board notes that Article 3, Section 3.5 relates to Minutes and Preliminary Reports of meetings of the Board, the Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) and Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations). (See Article 3, Section 3.5(a).) In this regard, the timing requirements relative to the publication of preliminary reports provided by Article 3, Section 3.5(c) of the Bylaws relates to the publication of "any actions taken by the Board" after the conclusion a Board meeting, not Board Committees meetings. In either case, the minutes of the BAMC's 2 February 2018 meeting have been published and reflect that the BAMC considered the recent letters to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board regarding the CPE Process Review. (See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-bamc-2018-02-02-en (/resources/board-material/minutes-bamc-2018-02-02-en).) Second, the Board did timely publish, in accordance with Article 3, Section 3.5(c), a preliminary report regarding "Next Steps in Community Priority Evaluation Process Review – UPDATE ONLY", which reflected the Board's discussion of the CPE Process Review, including the fact that "the Board has received letters from a number of applicants ... [, that] the BAMC [has] taken the letters and reports into consideration as part of its recommendation to the Board, [and that] the proposed resolution has been continued to the Board's next meeting in Puerto Rico to allow the Board members additional time to consider the new documents." (Preliminary Report | Regular Meeting of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, available at: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2018-02-04-en (/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2018-02-04-en)). Third, the Board understands the arguments raised in the letter, and again reiterates that the individual requestors with reconsideration requests that were placed on hold pending completion of the
CPE Process Review will have the opportunity to submit additional information in support of those reconsideration requests, including the requestors that filed Reconsideration Request 16-11.

The Board acknowledges receipt of a letter from the Head of Institutional Relations at the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) to dotgay LLC, with a copy to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board regarding its "disappointing experience with the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process." (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/mazzone-to-baxter-06mar18-en.pdf) (en/system/files/correspondence/mazzone-to-baxter-06mar18-en.pdf) [PDF, 154 KB], Pg. 1.) The EBU raised very generalized concerns about the CPE process but did not provide any level of specificity about those concerns. Because the letter lacks specificity and does not detail the EBU's precise concerns, the Board regards the letter as support for the positions expressed by dotgay LLC and will be considered as part of the Board's evaluation of dotgay LLC's pending Reconsideration Request.

The Board also acknowledges receipt of letters from SERO and the National LGBT Chamber of Commerce on 18 February 2018 (/en/system/files/correspondence/strub-to-chalaby-18feb18-en.pdf) [PDF, 371 KB] and 1 March 2018 (/en/system/files/correspondence/lovitz-to-board-01mar18-en.pdf) [PDF, 1.16 MB], respectively, expressing support for dotgay LLC's community application. These letters will be considered as part of the Board's evaluation of dotgay LLC's pending Reconsideration Request.

Taking this action is in the public interest and consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, Commitments and Core Values as it will provide transparency and accountability regarding the CPE process and the CPE Process Review. This action also ensures that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) operates in a manner consistent with the Bylaws by making decisions that apply documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly without singling out any particular party for discriminatory treatment.
This action has no financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.


Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization received the Final Declaration in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Independent Review Process (IRP) and the Final Declaration As To Costs (Costs Declaration) in the IRP.

Whereas, among other things, the IRP Panel declared that "the GCC is the prevailing Party," and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) "shall reimburse the GCC the sum of $107,924.16 upon demonstration by [the] GCC that these incurred costs have been paid." (Final Declaration at pg. 45; Costs Declaration at pg. 6, V.2.)

Whereas, the Panel recommended that the "Board take no further action on the '.persiangulf' gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) application, and in specific not sign the registry agreement with Asia Green, or any other entity, in relation to the '.persiangulf' gTLD (generic Top Level Domain)." (Final Declaration at pg. 44, X.2.)

Whereas, in accordance with Article IV, section 3.21 of the applicable version of the Bylaws, the Board considered the Final Declaration and the Costs Declaration at its meeting on 16 March 2017, and determined that further consideration and analysis was needed.

Whereas, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) conducted the requested further consideration and analysis, and has recommended that: (i) the Board treat the
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1. Consent Agenda:

a. Approval of Minutes

Resolved (2019.01.27.01), the Board approves the minutes of the 25 October Regular and Organizational Meetings of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board and the 6 November Special Meeting of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.


Whereas, as part of the second review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)), on 3 February 2017 the Board accepted the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Implementation Plan and directed the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council to provide the Board with regular reporting on the implementation efforts.

Whereas, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group, with GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council approval and oversight, provided the Board via the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) with semi-annual updates on the progress of implementation efforts until such time that the implementation efforts concluded.

Whereas, the OEC monitored the progress of implementation efforts via the semi-annual implementation reports and recommends that the Board accept the Implementation Final Report of the second GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review issued by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group and approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting
Resolved (2019.01.27.02), the Board acknowledges the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group's hard work and thanks them for producing the report of implementation of recommendations to improve the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s effectiveness, transparency, and accountability, in line with the proposed timeline as set out in the adopted GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Implementation Plan.

Resolved (2019.01.27.03), the Board accepts the GNSO2 Review Implementation Final Report of the second GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review issued by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group, which marks the completion of this important review. The Board encourages the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) to continue monitoring the impact of the implementation of the recommendations from the second Review of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as part of its continuous improvement process.

**Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.02 - 2019.01.27.03**

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organizes independent reviews of its supporting organizations and advisory committees as prescribed in Article 4 Section 4.4 (/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV-4) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, to ensure ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance.

This action completes the second review of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) and is based on the Implementation Final Report as adopted by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, the final report of the independent examiner, Westlake Governance, as well as the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group's (WG (Working Group)) assessment of the recommendations as adopted by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. Following the assessment of all pertinent documents and community feedback by the OEC, the Board is now in a position to consider and accept the Implementation Final Report.

The Board, with recommendation from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (OEC), considered all relevant documents, including the final report, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Party Feasibility Assessment and Prioritization of Recommendations by Independent Examiner (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_49053/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf) ("Feasibility Assessment"), and accepted the final report issued by the independent examiner on 25 June 2016. The Board adopted the Feasibility Assessment, except recommendations 23 and 32. Additionally, the Board directed the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council to: draft an implementation plan for the adopted recommendations with a realistic timeline that took into account the continuously high community workload and consideration of the prioritization proposed by the WG (Working Group); publish the plan no later than six (6) months
after the Board's adoption of the Feasibility Assessment; ensure that the implementation plan includes definitions of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome; and report back regularly to the Board on its implementation progress.

On 3 February 2017, the Board accepted the Implementation Plan provided by the WG (Working Group) and approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council on 15 December 2016, and directed the WG (Working Group) to provide semi-annual updates to the OEC until such time that the implementation efforts have concluded.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal being considered is that the Board accepts the WG (Working Group)'s Implementation Final Report, adopted by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, and considered by the OEC.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

The Board, through the OEC, consulted with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Working Group, who was responsible for the implementation, and recommended good practices for conducting effective reviews on a timely basis and monitored the progress of the review as well as the progress of the implementation of review recommendations.

What concerns, or issues were raised by the community?

The implementation work conducted by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) followed its standard practices to promote transparency and accountability. No concerns were voiced by the community.

What significant materials did the Board review?


What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The Board found several factors to be significant, contributing to the effective completion of the implementation work:

- Convening a dedicated group that oversees the implementation of Board-accepted recommendations
- An implementation plan containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as
progress toward the desired outcome

- Timely and detailed reporting on the progress of implementation

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

This Board action is expected to have a positive impact on the community by acknowledging and highlighting an effective completion of implementation of GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Review Recommendations.

**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?**

This Board action is anticipated to have no fiscal impact as the implementation efforts have successfully concluded. The ramifications on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization, the community and the public are anticipated to be positive, as this Board action signifies an important milestone for organizational reviews and self-governance of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?**

This Board action is not expected to have a direct effect on security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System).

**How is this action within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission and what is the public interest served in this action?**

The Board's action is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitment pursuant to section 4.1 of the Bylaws to continue reviewing that entities within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) have an ongoing purpose, and to improve the performance of its supporting organizations and advisory committees. This action will serve the public interest by fulfilling ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitment to continuous review of its components to confirm that where people engage with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community support the purposes and expectations of that engagement.

**Is public comment required prior to Board action?**

No public comment is required.

c. **Consideration of the At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) Detailed Implementation Plan**

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws Article 4, Section 4.4 (/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV-4) calls on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board to "cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Council, each Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (other than the
Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)), and the Nominating Committee by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

Whereas, the independent examiner of the At-Large Review produced a Final Report (https://community.icann.org/display/ALRW/Final+Report%3A+Review+of+the+At-Large+Community) in February 2017. That report was received by the Board in June 2018, and at the same time the Board accepted the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan and the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal as approved by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee).

Whereas, in response to that June 2018 resolution, the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group was created. That Working Group developed and approved the At-Large Review Implementation Plan (https://docs.google.com/document/d/12fQ1jkp88g3sQHZy_SzlMGqEXssl8DtzTk*rCv8LpTE/edit?pli=1) (the "Implementation Plan") on 19 November 2018, which was endorsed by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) endorsement on 27 November 2018.

Resolved (2019.01.27.04), the Board acknowledges the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group's work and thanks the members of that Working Group for their efforts.

Resolved (2019.01.27.05), the Board accepts the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, including the phased approach contained within. The Board acknowledges that more details with regard to implementation details may be required for implementation of Priorities 2 and 3 activities.

Resolved (2019.01.27.06), the Board directs the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group to provide updates to the OEC every six months. Those bi-annual updates shall identify achievements as measured against the existing implementation plan, as well as details on future implementation plans. It is during these updates that the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group shall provide more details on implementation progress, and measurability. The OEC may request interim briefings if deemed necessary.

Resolved (2019.01.27.07), that any budgetary implications of the At-Large Review implementation shall be considered as part of the applicable annual budgeting processes.

_Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.04 – 2019.01.27.07_

To ensure ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organizes independent reviews of its supporting organizations and advisory committees as prescribed in Article 4 Section 4.4 (/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV-4) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for...

The At-Large Review Implementation recommendations as noted in the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal have the potential to advance ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s transparency and accountability objectives and have been considered carefully by the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee as well as by the full Board.

The Board resolution will have a positive impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and especially the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and At-Large community as it reinforces ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s and the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and At-Large community's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability, transparency and organizational effectiveness throughout the implementation process.

Due to the number of recommendations that need to be implemented, the Board supports the approach by priorities as laid out in the Implementation Plan (Exhibit A). This will allow the community time to refine details as the implementation process proceeds—especially during Priority 2 and 3 activities set out in that Implementation Plan.

Some recommendations – especially those foreseen to be implemented under Priority 2 and 3 activities – may benefit from additional details regarding their exact implementation. Due to the difficulty to predict these issues months in advance, the Board supports the idea that the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group provides updates bi-annually to the OEC. It is during these updates that the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) can provide greater implementation details with regard to those recommendations that are going to be scheduled for the forthcoming six-month period following the respective OEC update. At that time, the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) would be in a better position to flag any significant variations from the original implementation plan and timing. The At-Large Review Implementation Plan sets out the prioritization, expected resource allocation in terms of staff time, web and wiki resources, expected budgetary implications such as additional staff resources, and the steps to implementation. While the majority of implementation activities will use existing At-Large resources, any additional fiscal implications are noted below. The ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) will utilize the normal annual budgetary comment process to request the required resources. If such resources are not provided, the likely result would be a significant slow down in the speed of the Review Implementation.

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**

This resolution moves the second review of the At-Large community into the implementation phase. Following the assessment of the Implementation Plan and the feedback from the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee, the Board is now in a position to consider the Plan and instruct the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) to continue the implementation process as set out in the Plan. This step is an important part of the Organizational Review process of checks and balances, to ensure that the spirit of Board-approved recommendations will be addressed through the implementation plans, while being mindful of budgetary and timing constraints.
What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal the Board is considering is the Organizational Effectiveness Committee’s recommendation of the adoption of the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, drafted and adopted by the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group, endorsed by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee).

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

Immediately after the Board passed the Resolution on the At-Large Review, the leadership of the At-Large Review Working Group provided updates on the Review and next steps on each of the five RALO monthly teleconferences. The creation of the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group involved careful consideration of members to ensure geographical balance and diversity within each RALO, including among the 232 At-Large Structures and over 100 individual members. During the development of the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, the At-Large Review Implementation WG (Working Group) members updated the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) as well as each RALO on a regular basis with the progress that was being made. There were also several discussions on the At-Large Review Implementation during ICANN63 face-to-face sessions. At each step, feedback was discussed by the At-Large Review Implementation WG (Working Group) and incorporated into the final Plan.

What concerns, or issues were raised by the community?

During the development of the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, the At-Large community raised the concern over whether the third At-Large Summit (ATLAS III) would take place as tentatively scheduled during ICANN66 in Montreal in October 2019 and identified as a Priority 1 activity and requiring budgetary consideration in advance of the broader organizational budget cycle. In September 2018 the Board confirmed that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization still had authority to proceed with the planning and contracting.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the At-Large Review Implementation Plan as adopted by the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group and endorsed by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee).

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Community, and/or the Public (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

The work to improve the effectiveness of the At-Large organization – by implementing the issues resulting from the Review and the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, may require additional financial resources that are subject to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s normal budgetary processes. This resolution does not authorize any specific funding for those implementation efforts. The Board understands that some of the Priority 1 work, such as skills development and communication efforts, will require FY20 Additional Budget Requests. The Board also understands that the ongoing and Priority 2 activities are estimated to require the addition of one Full Time Employee equivalent, and there are
other anticipated resource needs for items such as communications and data collection.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?**

This action is not expected to have a direct impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System). Still, once the improvements are implemented, future activities of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and At-Large community, including advice or inputs into the policy development processes, will become more transparent and accountable, which in turn might indirectly contribute to the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System).

**Is public comment required prior to Board action?**

The Draft Report of the independent examiner was posted for public comment. There is no public comment required prior to this Board action. The voice of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) has been reflected throughout the review process – via the At-Large Review Working Party that produced the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) Implementation Overview Proposal; the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group that developed the implementation plan; and the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) that endorsed the implementation plan.

**How is this action within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission and what is the public interest served in this action?**

Given that At-Large represents the best interests of individual Internet end users within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s multistakeholder governance approach, the approval of the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, which will lead to a strengthened At-Large community, will have a direct positive impact to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission in its bottom-up policy development process. The public interest is also served through this action which furthers the continued development and support of a diverse and informed multistakeholder community.

**d. FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Operating Plan and Budget**

Whereas, the draft FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Operating Plan and Budget (OP&B) was posted for public comment in accordance with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws on 28 September 2018.

Whereas, comments received through the public comment process were reviewed and responded to and provided to the BFC members for review and comment.

Whereas, all public comments have been taken into consideration, and where appropriate and feasible, have been incorporated into a final FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B.

Whereas, the Public Technical Identifier's Board adopted a Final FY20 PTI OP&B on 20 December 2018, which is a required input for the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board's consideration of the broader IANA (Internet...
Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B. Per the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, once the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B is adopted by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, it is then posted on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s website and the Empowered Community has an opportunity to consider the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B for rejection.

Whereas, the public comments received, as well as other solicited community feedback were taken into account to determine required revisions to the draft IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) FY20 Operating Plan and Budget.

Resolved (2019.01.27.08), the Board adopts the FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Operating Plan and Budget, including the FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Caretaker Budget.

Rationale for Resolution 2019.01.27.08

In accordance with Section 22.4 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, the Board is to adopt an annual budget for the operation of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions and publish that budget on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) website. On 28 September 2018 drafts of the FY20 PTI O&B and the FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B were posted for public comment. The PTI Board approved the PTI Budget on 20 December 2018, and the PTI Budget was received as input into the FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget.

The published draft FY20 PTI OP&B and the draft FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B were based on numerous discussions with members of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Community, including extensive consultations with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), and other stakeholder groups throughout the prior several months.

All comments received in all manners were considered in developing the FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B. Where feasible and appropriate these inputs have been incorporated into the final FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B proposed for adoption.

The FY20 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) OP&B will have a positive impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in that it provides a proper framework by which the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) services will be performed, which also provides the basis for the organization to be held accountable in a transparent manner.

This decision is in the public interest and within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission, as it is fully consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s strategic and operational plans, and the results of which in fact allow ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to satisfy its mission.
This decision will have a fiscal impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the Community as is intended. This should have a positive impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system (DNS (Domain Name System)) with respect to any funding that is dedicated to those aspects of the DNS (Domain Name System).

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that has already been subject to public comment as noted above. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Empowered Community now has an opportunity to consider if it will exercise its rejection power over this OB&P.

e. October 2021 ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Meeting Venue Contracting

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) intends to hold its last Public Meeting of 2021 in the North America region.

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization has completed a thorough review of the available venues in the North America region and finds the one in Seattle, Washington to be the most suitable.

Resolved (2019.01.27.09), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue for the October 2021 ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Public Meeting in Seattle, Washington, in an amount not to exceed [REDACTED-FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES].

Resolved (2019.01.27.10), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

Resolved (2019.01.27.11), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article 3, section 3.5(b) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

**Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.09 – 2019.01.27.11**

As part of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Public Meeting strategy, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) seeks to host a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws) three times a year. ICANN72 is scheduled for 23-28 October 2021. Following a search and evaluation of available venues, the organization identified Seattle, Washington as a suitable location for the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Public Meeting.

The organization performed a thorough analysis of the available locations and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Location Selection Criteria (see http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria (http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria)). Based on the proposals and analysis, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has
identified Seattle, Washington as the location for ICANN72. Selection of this North America location adheres to the geographic rotation guidelines established by the Meeting Strategy Working Group.

The Board reviewed the organization's briefing for hosting the meeting in Seattle, Washington and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the October 2021 ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Public Meeting. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) conducts Public Meetings in support of its mission to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems, and acts in the public interest by providing free and open access to anyone wishing to participate, either in person or remotely, in open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting. This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS (Domain Name System).

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

f. Contract Renewal and Disbursement for ERP Initiative (Oracle Cloud)

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has an established a need to renew contracts for ERP solution, Oracle Cloud.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee has reviewed the financial implications of contract renewal with Oracle Cloud for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s ERP solution and has considered alternatives.

Whereas, both the organization and the Board Finance Committee have recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all actions necessary to execute the contracts with Oracle Cloud for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s ERP solution and make all necessary disbursements pursuant to those contracts.

Resolved (2019.01.27.12), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the take all necessary actions to renew the contracts with Oracle Cloud for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s ERP solution and make all necessary disbursements pursuant to those contracts.

Resolved (2019.01.27.13), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article 3, section 3.5(b) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.12 – 2019.01.27.13
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has successfully utilized Oracle Cloud ERP since implementation Go Live in December 2016. Over the past years, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization has gradually increased the ERP systems and transactional processing knowledge and is in a position to make incremental efficiency improvements to maximize original investment. The Oracle Cloud ERP replaced a then aging Finance, Human Resources and Procurement legacy systems. This solution provided ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org with an integrated ERP solution under a single system of record improving systems capacity, global reporting and analysis capability, leading to improved productivity and cross-functional efficiencies, and enhance internal controls.

Current Contract

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s current contract with Oracle Cloud ERP was for a three-year period. This contract expired in December 2018. Oracle Cloud has provided ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) with a one-month contract extension. Annual cost is [REDACTED – FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES].

New Contract

After thorough analysis, negotiations, and an adjustment to the number of licenses with the supplier, the organization has two options available: (i) three-year contract at [REDACTED – FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES] annually with three-year total cost of [REDACTED – FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES], (ii) five-year contract at [REDACTED – FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES] annually with five-year total cost of [REDACTED – FOR NEGOTIATION PURPOSES].

After careful analysis of options submitted by the organization, the five-year contract option is considered a viable, cost-effective solution. This solution has lower total cost, lock-in pricing for protection against increases for five years, and flexibility for the organization to perform another overall ERP systems analysis in three years (2021-2022) to determine if the solution set is best for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

The Board reviewed the organization’s and the Board Finance Committee’s recommendations for contracting and disbursement authority for Oracle Cloud ERP contract renewal.

Taking this Board action fits squarely within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s mission and the public interest in that it ensures that payments of large amounts for one invoice to one entity are reviewed and evaluated by the Board if they exceed a certain amount of delegated authority through ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Contracting and Disbursement Policy. This ensures that the Board is overseeing large disbursements and acting as proper stewards of the funding ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) receives from the public.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to renew Oracle Cloud ERP contract. This impact is currently included in the FY20 Operating Plan and Budget that is pending Board approval. This action
will not have a direct impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

g. Reaffirming the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data

Whereas, on 17 May 2018, the Board adopted the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data (the "Temporary Specification") to be effective 25 May 2018 for a 90-day period. The Temporary Specification establishes temporary requirements to allow ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators and registrars to continue to comply with existing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contractual requirements and community-developed policies concerning gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registration data (including WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym))) in light of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Whereas, on 21 August 2018, the Board reaffirmed the adoption of the Temporary Specification to be effective for an additional 90-day period beginning on 23 August 2018.

Whereas, on 6 November 2018, the Board reaffirmed the adoption of the Temporary Specification to be effective for an additional 90-day period beginning on 21 November 2018.

Whereas, the Board adopted the Temporary Specification pursuant to the procedures in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement for adopting temporary policies. This procedure requires that "[i]f the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds ninety (90) calendar days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every ninety (90) calendar days for a total period not to exceed one (1) year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus (Consensus) Policy".

Resolved (2019.01.27.14), the Board reaffirms the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data (/resources/pages/gtld-registration-data-specs-2018-05-17-en#temp-spec) pursuant to the procedures in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement concerning the establishment of temporary policies. In reaffirming this Temporary Specification, the Board has determined that:

1. The modifications in the Temporary Specification to existing requirements concerning the processing of personal data in registration data continue to be justified and immediate temporary establishment of the Temporary Specification continues to be necessary to maintain the stability or security of Registrar Services, Registry Services or the DNS (Domain Name System) or the Internet.

2. The Temporary Specification is as narrowly tailored as feasible to achieve the objective to maintain the stability or security of Registrar Services, Registry Services or the DNS (Domain Name System) or the Internet.
3. The Temporary Specification will be effective for an additional 90-day period beginning 19 February 2019.

Resolved (2019.01.27.14), the Board reaffirms the Advisory Statement Concerning Adoption of the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data (en/system/files/files/advisory-statement-gtld-registration-data-specs-17may18-en.pdf), which sets forth its detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Specification and why the Board believes such Temporary Specification should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders.

Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.14 – 2019.01.27.15

The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) went into effect on 25 May 2018. The GDPR is a set of rules adopted by the European Parliament, the European Council and the European Commission that impose new obligations on all companies and organizations that collect and maintain any "personal data" of residents of the European Union, as defined under EU data protection law. The GDPR impacts how personal data is collected, displayed and processed among participants in the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) domain name ecosystem (including registries and registrars) pursuant to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contracts and policies.

On 17 May 2018, the Board adopted the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data ("Temporary Specification") to establish temporary requirements to allow ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators and registrars to continue to comply with existing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contractual requirements and community-developed policies concerning gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) contractual requirements and community-developed policies in relation to the GDPR. The Temporary Specification, which became effective on 25 May 2018, was adopted utilizing the procedure for temporary policies established in the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

On 21 August 2018, the Board reaffirmed the Temporary Specification for an additional 90-day period beginning 23 August 2018. On 6 November 2018, the Board again reaffirmed the adoption of the Temporary Specification to be effective for a subsequent 90-day period beginning on 21 November 2018.

As required by the procedure in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements for adopting a temporary policy or specification, "[i]f the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds ninety (90) calendar days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every ninety (90) calendar days for a total period not to exceed one (1) year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus (Consensus) Policy."

Today, the Board is taking action to reconfirm the Temporary Specification for an additional 90 days as the temporary requirements continue to be justified in order to maintain the stability or security of registry services, registrar services or the DNS (Domain Name System). When adopting the Temporary Specification, the Board provided an Advisory Statement (en/system/files/files/advisory-statement-gtld-registration-data-specs-17may18-en.pdf) to provide a detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Specification and why the Board believes such
Temporary Specification should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders. The Board reaffirms the Advisory Statement, which is incorporated by reference into the rationale to the Board's resolutions.

As required when a temporary policy or specification is adopted, the Board took action to implement the consensus policy development process and consulted with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council on potential paths forward for considering the development of a consensus policy on the issues within the Temporary Specification. The consensus policy development process must be concluded in a one-year time period. The Board takes note that the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council launched an Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registration Data (https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/edpd-gtld-registration-data-specs-initial-21nov18-en.pdf). The Working Group defined a schedule to produce a final report in February 2019 and for the report to be provided to the Board for consideration prior to the expiration of the 1-year period provided for the Temporary Specification. The Board will continue to engage with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council on this matter and reconfirms its commitment to provide the necessary support to the work of the Expedited Policy Development Process to meet the deadline (see 7 August 2018 letter from Cherine Chalaby to GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-forrest-et-al-07aug18-en.pdf). The Board's action to reaffirm the Temporary Specification is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission "[…] to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems […]". As one of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s primary roles is to be responsible for the administration of the topmost levels of the Internet's identifiers, facilitating the ability to identify the holders of those identifiers is a core function of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). The Board's action today will help serve the public interest and further the requirement in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Bylaws to "assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data." [Bylaws Sec. 4.6(e)(ii)]

Also, this action is expected to have an immediate impact on the continued security, stability or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System), as it will assist in continuing to maintain WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) to the greatest extent possible while the community works to develop a consensus policy. Reaffirming the Temporary Specification is not expected to have a fiscal impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization beyond what was previously identified in the Board's rationale for resolutions 2018.05.17.01 – 2018.05.17.09 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-forrest-et-al-07aug18-en.pdf). If the resource needs are greater than the amounts currently budgeted to perform work
on WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym))- and GDPR-related issues, the President and CEO will bring any additional resource needs to the Board Finance Committee for consideration, in line with existing fund request practices.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function of the Board for which public comment is not required, however ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s approach to addressing compliance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policies and agreements concerning gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registration data in relation to the GDPR has been the subject of comments from the community over the past year (https://www.icann.org/dataprotectionprivacy/(dataprotectionprivacy)).

2. Main Agenda:

a. Delegation of the .موريتانيا country-code top-level domain representing Mauritania in Arabic Script to Université de Nouakchott Al Aasriya

Resolved (2019.01.27.16), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), PTI has reviewed and evaluated the request to delegate the .موريتانيا country-code top-level domain to Université de Nouakchott Al Aasriya. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Rationale for Resolution 2019.01.27.16

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, PTI has evaluated a request for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that the proper procedures were followed.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to create the .موريتانيا country-code top-level domain in Arabic script and assign the role of manager to Université de Nouakchott Al Aasriya.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, PTI consulted with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain), and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

PTI is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.
What significant materials did the Board review?

[REDACTED-SENSITIVE DELEGATION INFORMATION]

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to obligations under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS (Domain Name System) root zone is part of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency. This is an organizational administrative function not requiring public comment.

b. Delegation of the .SS (South Sudan) country-code top-level domain to the National Communication Authority (NCA)

Resolved (2019.01.27.17), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), PTI has reviewed and evaluated the request to delegate the .SS (South Sudan) country-code top-level domain to National Communication Authority (NCA). The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Rationale for Resolution 2019.01.27.17

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, PTI has evaluated a request for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that the proper procedures were followed.
What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to create the .SS country-code top-level domain and assign the role of manager to National Communication Authority (NCA).

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, PTI consulted with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain), and their applicability to their significantly interested parties.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

PTI is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

What significant materials did the Board review?

[REDACTED-SENSITIVE DELEGATION INFORMATION]

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to obligations under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS (Domain Name System) root zone is part of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency. This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.
c. GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Advice: Barcelona Communique (October 2018)

Whereas, the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)) met during the ICANN63 meeting in Barcelona, Spain and issued advice to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board in a communiqué (/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-icann-25oct18-en.pdf) on 25 October 2018 ("Barcelona Communiqué").

Whereas, the Barcelona Communiqué was the subject of an exchange (https://gac.icann.org/sessions/gac-and-icann-board-conference-call-regarding-icann62-communique) between the Board and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) on 28 November 2018.

Whereas, in a 20 December 2018 letter (/en/system/files/correspondence/ismail-to-chalaby-botterman-20dec18-en.pdf), the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) provided additional clarification of language contained in the Barcelona Communiqué Annex titled Follow-up to Original Joint Statement by ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) (Abu Dhabi, 2 November 2017).

Whereas, in a 21 December 2018 letter (/en/system/files/correspondence/drazek-et-al-to-icann-board-21dec18-en.pdf), the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council provided its feedback to the Board concerning advice in the Barcelona Communiqué relevant to generic top-level domains to inform the Board and the community of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) policy activities that may relate to advice provided by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee).


Whereas, the Board developed a scorecard to respond to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice in the Barcelona Communiqué, taking into account the dialogue between the Board and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee), the clarification letter provided by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Chair, the information provided by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, and the memorandum and briefing paper released by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org.

Whereas, the Board has considered the previously deferred GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice (/en/system/files/files/resolutions-panamacity62-gac-advice-scorecard-16sep18-en.pdf) regarding two-character country codes at the second level from the Panama Communiqué, and has included a response in the current scorecard "GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Advice – Barcelona Communiqué: Actions and Updates (25 January 2019)".
Resolved (2019.01.27.18), the Board adopts the scorecard titled "GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Advice – Barcelona Communiqué: Actions and Updates (25 January 2019)" in response to items of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice in the Barcelona Communiqué and the Panama Communiqué.

Rationale for Resolution 2019.01.27.18

Article 12, Section 12.2(a)(ix) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws permits 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." In its Barcelona Communiqué (25 October 2018), the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) issued advice to the Board on: two-character country codes at the second level and protection of names and acronyms of Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) in gTLDs. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) also provided a follow-up to previous advice GDPR and WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)), the Dot Amazon applications, protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers, and a follow-up to the joint statement by ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) (Abu Dhabi, 2 November 2017). 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. Any GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice approved by a full consensus of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) (as defined in the Bylaws) may only be rejected by a vote of no less than 60% of the Board, and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and the Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.

The Board is taking action today on all items in the Barcelona Communiqué, including the items related to two-character country codes at the second level as well as protections of IGOs. The Board is also taking action on the items regarding two-character country codes at the second level from the Panama Communiqué, consideration of which had been previously deferred.

The Board will continue to defer consideration of five items from the San Juan Communiqué, including: four advice items related to GDPR and WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) and one advice item related to IGO (Intergovernmental Organization) reserved acronyms, pending further discussion with the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee). The Board will consider if further action is needed following these discussions.


In adopting its response to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice in the Barcelona Communiqué, the Board reviewed various materials, including, but not limited to, the following materials and documents:
Panama Communiqué (28 June 2018):  

Barcelona Communiqué (25 October 2018):  

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council's review of the advice in the Barcelona Communiqué as presented in the 21 December 2018 letter to the Board:  

The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s clarification of Barcelona Communiqué Attach Language – Follow-up to Original Joint Statement by ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) and GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) (Abu Dhabi, 2 November 2017):  

The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Organization's memorandum providing clarification regarding the development and evolution of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization's procedure for the release of two-character labels at the second level and the standard framework of measures for avoiding confusion with corresponding country codes:  

The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Organization's Historical Overview of Events Regarding Two-Character Labels at the Second Level in the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Namespace:  

The adoption of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice as provided in the scorecard will have a positive impact on the community because it will assist with resolving the advice from the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) concerning gTLDs and other matters. There are no foreseen fiscal impacts associated with the adoption of this resolution. Approval of the resolution will not impact security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System). This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

d. Adoption of GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Consensus (Consensus) Policy relating to Certain Red Cross & Red Crescent Names at the Second Level of the Domain Name (Domain Name) System
Whereas, in March 2017 the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) ("GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)") and the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) ("GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)") engaged in a good faith, facilitated dialogue in an attempt to resolve outstanding differences between the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s original Policy Development Process ("PDP (Policy Development Process)") consensus recommendations and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice concerning certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names.

Whereas, in the course of that facilitated dialogue the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) noted certain specific matters, namely:

1. The public policy considerations associated with protecting identifiers associated with the international Red Cross movement ("Movement") in the domain name system;

2. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s rationale for seeking permanent protection for the terms most closely associated with the Movement and its respective components is grounded in the protections of the designations "Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Lion and Sun", and "Red Crystal" under international treaty law and under multiple national laws;

3. The list of names of the Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies is a finite, limited list of specific names of the National Societies recognized within the Movement (http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/ExcelExport/NS_Directory.pdf);

4. There are no other legitimate uses for these terms; and

5. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) had provided clarification following the completion of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) PDP (Policy Development Process), via its March 2014 Singapore Communiqué, on the finite scope of the specific list of Movement names for which permanent protections were being requested (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/28278854/Final%20Communique%20%20Singapore%202014.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1397225538000&api=v2)

Whereas, following the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)-GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) discussion, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board had requested that the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council consider initiating the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s process for amending previous GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendations concerning the full names of the Red Cross National Societies and the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and a defined, limited set of variations of these names, in the six official languages of the United Nations (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-03-16-en#2.e.i)


Whereas, as required by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, a public comment period was opened in November 2018 to allow the public a reasonable opportunity to provide input on the proposed Consensus (Consensus) Policy prior to Board action as well as for the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) to provide timely advice on any public policy concerns.

Whereas, the Board has considered the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s recommendations and all other relevant materials relating to this matter.

Resolved (2019.01.27.19), the Board hereby adopts the final recommendations of the reconvened International Governmental Organizations (IGO) (Intergovernmental Organization)) & International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) PDP (Policy Development Process) Working Group, as passed by a unanimous vote of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council on 27 September 2018.

Resolved (2019.01.27.20), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his authorized designee, to develop and execute an implementation plan, including costs and timelines, for the adopted recommendations consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws Annex A and the Implementation Review Team Guidelines & Principles endorsed by the Board on 28 September 2015 (see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en - 2.f.(resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#2.f)), and to continue communication with the community on such work.
Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.19 – 2019.01.27.20

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) conducted a PDP (Policy Development Process), concluding in November 2013, that considered and developed certain policy recommendations for protecting certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement. Those of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s recommendations that were consistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice on the subject; namely, relating to the specific terms "Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Crystal" and "Red Lion & Sun" were adopted by the Board in April 2014 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a). Following implementation work by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Organization and community volunteers, these four specific terms are now withheld from delegation at the top and second levels of the DNS (Domain Name System), in the six official languages of the United Nations, under a Consensus (Consensus) Policy that went into force in January 2018.

The Board did not approve the remaining GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendations from 2013 that concerned other Red Cross and Red Crescent identifiers, e.g. the full names of all the National Societies of the Red Cross movement and those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The Board did not approve these policy recommendations at that time to allow for further discussions between the Board, GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and community about the inconsistencies between the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendations and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice. Over the next several months, the Board facilitated dialogue among the groups about a possible path forward. Following the conclusion of a facilitated dialogue between the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) in March 2017, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council reconvened the original PDP (Policy Development Process) Working Group to consider possible modifications of its previous recommendations concerning these specific identifiers.

In September 2018, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council unanimously approved the modified policy recommendations presented in the final report of the PDP (Policy Development Process) Working Group. With the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council's unanimous approval of the modified policy recommendations, the Board is now taking action to adopt the revised consensus policy recommendations in accordance with the process documented under the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws.

What is the proposal being addressed?

The PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendations are that certain specific Red Cross and Red Crescent names as well as a list of agreed, permitted variants of those names be withheld from delegation at the second level of the DNS (Domain Name System), in all six official languages of the United Nations. The PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendations include a specific, documented process and
criteria for correcting errors found on the list of agreed names and variants, as well as for adding or removing entries from the list. The adopted policy will supplement the existing Consensus (Consensus) Policy on protection at the top and second levels of the terms "Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Crystal" and "Red Lion & Sun" in all six official languages of the United Nations.

For clarity, the PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendations do not include proposals for protection of the specific acronyms associated with the international Red Cross movement, which remains an issue outstanding from the original 2013 GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) PDP (Policy Development Process) that resulted in recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice regarding these acronyms.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

The reconvened PDP (Policy Development Process) Working Group performed its work in accordance with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual and Working Group Guidelines, which include provisions pertaining to broad community representation. Members of the Working Group comprised representatives from various parts of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community, including representatives of the Red Cross. The Working Group's Initial Report was published for public comment in June 2018, following which the group considered all input received in developing its final recommendations, all of which received the Full Consensus (Consensus) of the Working Group. Prior to the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council's vote on the Final Report, the Working Group chair conducted a meeting with community members who had expressed some concerns about the proposed recommendations. The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council voted unanimously to approve all the recommendations in September 2018.

The policy recommendations as approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council were published for public comment in November 2018 and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) notified of the Council's action.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Possible concerns about freedom of expression were raised concerning reservation of the Red Cross and Red names at the second level of the DNS (Domain Name System), as well as the Working Group's development of criteria and a process for adding new names and variants to the list instead of recommending a fixed list. The community also sought clarity about the mechanism for implementing the proposed policy (i.e. whether ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Org's contracts with its contracted parties will need to be amended). The Board understands that the Working Group believes it addressed these concerns in developing its final Consensus (Consensus) Policy recommendations.

Other community comments supported the proposed policy, citing the public policy need to provide adequate protections for the Red Cross against abuse of its names and recognized variants, as well as the fact that the recommended protections are grounded in international humanitarian law and multiple national laws.

What significant materials did the Board review?

What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The recommendations were developed following the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process as set out in Annex A of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws and have received the full consensus of the Working Group as well as the unanimous support of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. As stated in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws (Annex A, Sec. 9.a, (resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#annexA)), “Any PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations approved by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).”

The Bylaws also allow for input from the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) in relation to public policy concerns that might be raised if a proposed policy is adopted by the Board. In this context, the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s October 2018 Barcelona Communicque (https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann63-barcelona-communique) expressed the hope that the Board will adopt the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)’s recommendations.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The Board’s adoption of these recommendations will resolve the issue, outstanding since 2013, of inconsistencies between the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)’s advice and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)’s previous policy on these specific Red Cross and Red Crescent names. This means that the interim protections previously put into place by the Board concerning these names will be replaced by the Consensus (Consensus) Policy when it goes into effect, leading to greater clarity as to the scope of protections for these names for ICANN.
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?

Aside from any financial or other resource costs that may arise during work on implementation of the adopted policy, no fiscal or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the community or the public are envisaged.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

There are no security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System) that can be directly attributable to the implementation of the PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendations.

Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment or not requiring public comment?

This matter concerns the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s policy process, as defined and described by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)'s operating procedures. All requirements for public comments as part of these processes have been met.

e. Board Committee Membership and Leadership Changes

Whereas, Chris Disspain is a member of the Board and the current Chair of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC).

Whereas, León Sanchez is a current member of the Board and member of the BAMC.

Whereas, to facilitate the smooth transition of leadership of the BAMC, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) recommended that the Board immediately appoint León Sanchez as the Chair of the BAMC and retain Mr. Disspain as a member of the BAMC.

Whereas, Matthew Shears has expressed interest in becoming a member of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) and the BGC recommended that the Board immediately appoint Mr. Shears as a member of the OEC.

Resolved (2019.01.27.21), the Board appoints León Sanchez as the Chair of the BAMC and retains Chris Disspain as a member of the BAMC, effectively immediately.

Resolved (2019.01.27.22), the Board appoints Matthew Shears as a member of the OEC, effective immediately.
Rationale for Resolutions 2019.01.27.21 – 2019.01.27.22

The Board is committed to facilitating a smooth transition in the leadership of its Board Committees as part of the Board’s ongoing discussions regarding succession planning. To that end, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) has suggested that its current Chair, Chris Disspain, step down as Chair (but remain as a member) and that the Board appoint León Sanchez as Chair of the BAMC. As a member of the BAMC, Mr. Disspain will work with Mr. Sanchez during a transition period.

As the Board Governance Committee (BGC) is tasked with recommending committee assignments, the BGC has discussed the BAMC’s proposal and has recommended that the Board appoint León Sanchez as the new BAMC Chair and retain Mr. Disspain as a member of the BAMC, effectively immediately. The Board agrees with the BGC’s recommendation.

The Board is also committed to facilitating the composition of Board Committees in accordance with the Board Committee and Leadership Selection Procedures ([en/system/files/files/bgc-leadership-selection-procedures-02nov17-en.pdf]). The BGC has considered the interest expressed by Matthew Shears in joining the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and has recommended that the Board approve this appointment. The Board agrees with the BGC’s recommendation.

The action is in the public interest and in furtherance of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s mission as it is important that Board Committees, in performing the duties as assigned by the Board in compliance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Bylaws and the Committees’ charters, have the appropriate succession plans in place to ensure leadership continuity within the Committees. Moreover, it is equally important that the composition of Board Committees is established pursuant to the Board Committee and Leadership Selection Procedures ([en/system/files/files/bgc-leadership-selection-procedures-02nov17-en.pdf]). This action will have no financial impact on the organization and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

f. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 16-11: Travel Reservations SRL, Famous Four Media Limited (and its subsidiary applicant dot Hotel Limited), Fegistry LLC, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Spring McCook, LLC, and Radix FZC (and its subsidiary applicant dot Hotel Inc.) (.HOTEL)

Whereas, Travel Reservations SRL, Fegistry LLC, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Spring McCook, LLC, and Radix FZC (and its subsidiary applicant dotHotel Inc.) (collectively, the Requestors) submitted standard applications for .HOTEL, which was placed in a contention set with other .HOTEL applications. Another applicant, HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l. (HTLD), submitted a community-based application for .HOTEL.

Whereas, HTLD participated in Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) and prevailed.
Whereas, on 9 August 2016, the Board adopted Resolutions 2016.08.09.14 and 2016.08.09.15 (the 2016 Resolutions), which directed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization to move forward with the processing of the prevailing community application for the .HOTEL gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) (HTLD’s Application) submitted by HTLD.

Whereas, Requestors submitted Reconsideration Request 16-11 seeking reconsideration of the 2016 Resolutions.

Whereas, while Request 16-11 was pending, the Board directed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization to undertake a review of the CPE process (the CPE Process Review). The Board Governance Committee (BGC) determined that the pending Reconsideration Requests relating to CPEs, including Request 16-11, would be placed on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed.¹

Whereas, on 13 December 2017, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org published three reports on the CPE Process Review (CPE Process Review Reports).

Whereas, on 15 March 2018, the Board passed the Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11 ([resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-03-15-en#2a]), which acknowledged and accepted the findings set forth in the CPE Process Review Reports, declared that the CPE Process Review was complete, concluded that, as a result of the findings in the CPE Process Review Reports, there would be no overhaul or change to the CPE process for this current round of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, and directed the Board Accountability Mechanism Committee (BAMC) to move forward with consideration of the remaining Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process that were placed on hold pending completion of the CPE Process Review.

Whereas, in accordance with Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11 ([resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-03-15-en#2a]), the BAMC invited the Requestors to make a telephonic presentation to the BAMC in support of Request 16-11, which the Requestors did on 19 July 2018. The BAMC also invited the Requestors to submit additional written materials in response to the CPE Process Review Reports.

Whereas, the BAMC has carefully considered the merits of Request 16-11 and all relevant materials and has recommended that Request 16-11 be denied because the Board adopted the 2016 Resolutions based on accurate and complete information. The BAMC also recommended the Board deny Request 16-11 because there is no evidence supporting the Requestors’ claim that the Board failed to consider the purported “unfair advantage” HTLD obtained as a result of the Portal Configuration, nor is there evidence that the Board discriminated against the Requestors.

Whereas, the Board has carefully considered the BAMC’s Recommendation on Request 16-11 and all relevant materials related to Request 16-11, including the Requestors’ rebuttal, and the Board agrees with the BAMC’s Recommendation and concludes that the rebuttal provides no additional argument or evidence to support reconsideration.
Resolved (2019.01.27.23), the Board adopts the BAMC Recommendation on Request 16-11 ([en/system/files/files/reconsideration-16-11-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-request-16nov18-en.pdf]).

Rationale for Resolution 2019.01.27.23

1. Brief Summary and Recommendation

The full factual background is set forth in the BAMC Recommendation on Request 16-11 ([en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-10-acto-bamc-recommendation-21dec18-en.pdf]) (BAMC Recommendation), which the Board has reviewed and considered, and which is incorporated here.

On 16 November 2018, the BAMC evaluated Request 16-11 and all relevant materials and recommended that the Board deny Request 16-11 because the Board adopted the 2016 Resolutions based on accurate and complete information. The BAMC also recommended the Board deny Request 16-11 because there is no evidence supporting the Requestors' claim that the Board failed to consider the purported "unfair advantage" HTLD obtained as a result of the Portal Configuration, nor is there evidence that the Board discriminated against the Requestors.

On 30 November 2018, the Requestor submitted a rebuttal to the BAMC's Recommendation (Rebuttal). The Board notes that the Rebuttal is not called for under the Bylaws applicable to Request 16-11, which are set forth in the 2016 Bylaws that were in effect Request 16-11 was filed. Nonetheless, the Board has considered the arguments in the Requestors' rebuttal and finds that they do not support reconsideration for the reasons set forth below.

2. Issue

The issues are whether the Board's adoption of the 2016 Resolutions occurred: (i) without consideration of material information; or (ii) were taken as a result of its reliance on false or inaccurate material information.

These issues are considered under the relevant standards for reconsideration requests in effect at the time that Request 16-12 was submitted. These standards are discussed in detail in the BAMC Recommendation ([en/system/files/files/reconsideration-16-11-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-request-16nov18-en.pdf]).

3. Analysis and Rationale

A. The Board Adopted The 2016 Resolutions After Considering All Material Information And Without Reliance On False Or Inaccurate Material Information.

The Requestors suggest that reconsideration of the 2016 Resolutions is warranted because ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org failed to properly investigate the Portal Configuration and failed to address the alleged actions relating to the Portal Configuration. Specifically, the Requestors assert that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org did not verify the
affirmation by Dirk Kirschenowski, the individual whose credentials were used to access confidential information of other authorized users of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) portal, that he did not and would not provide the information he accessed to HTLD or its personnel. The BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that this argument does not support reconsideration because Requestors did not identify any false or misleading information that the Board relied upon, or material information that the Board failed to consider relating to the Portal Configuration in adopting the 2016 Resolutions.

First, the BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org undertook a careful and thorough analysis of the Portal Configuration and the issues raised by the Requestors regarding the Portal Configuration. The results of the investigation were shared with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, and were carefully considered by the Board in its adoption of the 2016 Resolutions. The BAMC noted that, in its investigation, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org did not uncover any evidence that: (i) the information Mr. Krischenowski may have obtained as a result of the portal issue was used to support HTLD's Application; or (ii) any information obtained by Mr. Krischenowski enabled HTLD's Application to prevail in CPE. Moreover, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s investigation revealed that at the time that Mr. Krischenowski accessed confidential information, he was not directly linked to HTLD's Application as an authorized contact or as a shareholder, officer, or director. Rather, Mr. Krischenowski was a 50% shareholder and managing director of HOTEL Top-Level-Domain GmbH, Berlin (GmbH Berlin), which was a minority (48.8%) shareholder of HTLD. Mr. Philipp Grabensee, the sole Managing Director of HTLD, informed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org that Mr. Krischenowski was "not an employee" of HTLD, but that Mr. Krischenowski acted as a consultant for HTLD's Application at the time it was submitted in 2012. Mr. Grabensee further verified that HTLD "only learned about [Mr. Krischenowski's access to the data] on 30 April 2015 in the context of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s investigation." Mr. Grabensee stated that the business consultancy services between HTLD and Mr. Krischenowski were terminated as of 31 December 2015.³

Second, contrary to the Requestors' assertions, the BAMC determined that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org did verify the affirmation from Mr. Krischenowski that he and his associates did not and would not share the confidential information that they accessed as a result of the Portal Configuration with HTLD. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org also confirmed with HTLD that it did not receive any confidential information from Mr. Krischenowski or his associates obtained from the Portal Configuration. As discussed in the Rationale of the 2016 Resolutions, this information was considered by the Board in adopting the Resolutions.⁴ As the Board noted Rationale of the 2016 Resolutions, even if Mr. Krischenowski (or his associates) had obtained sensitive
business documents belonging to the Requestors, it would not have had any impact on the CPE process for HTLD's Application. The Requestors have not explained how confidential documents belonging to the other applicants for .HOTEL could impact the CPE criteria, which do not consider other entities' confidential information. While Mr. Krischenowski's access occurred prior to the issuance of the CPE Report in June 2014, HTLD did not seek to amend its application during CPE, nor did it submit any documentation that could have been considered by the CPE panel.\(^5\) There is no evidence that the CPE Panel had any interaction at all with Mr. Krischenowski during the CPE process, and therefore there is no reason to believe that the CPE Panel ever received the confidential information that Mr. Krischenowski obtained.\(^5\)

For these reasons, which are discussed in further detail in the BAMC Recommendation and incorporated herein by reference, the BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, the Requestors did not identify any false or misleading information that the Board relied upon, or material information that the Board failed to consider relating to the Portal Configuration in adopting the 2016 Resolutions. The Board's decision to allow HTLD's Application to proceed was made following a comprehensive investigation, and was well reasoned and consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's Articles and Bylaws. In particular, in reaching its decision that HTLD's Application should not be excluded, the Board carefully considered the results of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's forensic review and investigation of the Portal Configuration and the Requestors' claims relating the alleged impact of Portal Configuration on the CPE of HTLD's Application.

### B. The Board Did Not Rely Upon False Or Misleading Information In Accepting The Despegar IRP Panel's Declaration.

Although Request 16-11 challenges the Board's conduct as it relates to the 2016 Resolutions, the Requestors also appear to challenge the Board's acceptance of the Despegar IRP Panel's Declaration. In particular, the Requestors assert that "the Despegar et al. IRP Panel relied on false and inaccurate material information," such that "[w]hen the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board accepted the Despegar et al. IRP Declaration, it relied on the same false and inaccurate material information."\(^2\)

As an initial matter, the Board agrees with the BAMC's conclusion that the Requestors' claim is time-barred. The Board's resolution regarding the Despegar IRP Panel's Declaration was published on 10 March 2016.\(^8\) Request 16-11 was submitted on 25 August 2016, over five months after the Board's acceptance of the Despegar IRP Panel's Declaration, and well past the then 15-day time limit to seek reconsideration of a Board action.\(^8\)

1. The Requestors' Claims Regarding the Dot Registry and Corn Lake IRP Panel Declarations Do Not Support their
Claims of Discrimination.

Even had the Requestors timely challenged the Board's resolution regarding the Despegar IRP Panel's Declaration, the Board agrees with the BAMC that the Requestors' claims do not support reconsideration. The Requestors cite to the IRP Panel Declaration issued in Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (Dot Registry IRP Panel Declaration) to support their claim that the Despegar IRP Panel Declaration was based "upon the false premise that the [CPE Provider's] determinations are presumptively final and are made independently by the [CPE Provider], without ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s active involvement." In particular, the Requestors claim that the Dot Registry IRP Panel Declaration demonstrates that "ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) did have communications with the evaluators that identify the scoring of individual CPEs," such that the Despegar IRP Panel relied upon false information (namely ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's representation in its Response to the 2014 DIDP Request that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org does not engage in communications with individual evaluators who are involved in the scoring of CPEs, which was the subject of Request 14-39), when it found ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to be the prevailing party. As a result, the Requestors suggest that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board also relied upon false information when it accepted the Despegar IRP Panel Declaration. The Requestors also argue that they are "situated similarly" to the Dot Registry claimants, and therefore if the Board refuses to grant the Requestors relief when the Board granted the Dot Registry claimants relief, then the Board is discriminating against the Requestors in contradiction to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles and Bylaws. The BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that the Dot Registry IRP Declaration and the Board's response to it, however, do not support the Requestors' request for reconsideration for the following reasons.

First, contrary to the Requestors' assertion, the Dot Registry IRP Panel did not find that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org engaged in communications with CPE evaluators who were involved in the scoring of CPEs. Second, the statements made by one IRP Panel cannot be summarily applied in the context of an entirely separate, unrelated, and different IRP. The Dot Registry IRP concerned .LLC, .INC, and .LLP while the Despegar IRP concerned .HOTEL. Different issues were considered in each IRP, based on different arguments presented by different parties concerning different applications and unrelated factual situations. As such, there is no
support for the Requestors' attempt to apply the findings of the Dot Registry IRP Declaration to the Despegar IRP.

Similarly, the BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that the Requestors' citation to the Board's acceptance of the final declaration in *Corn Lake, LLC v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)*, (Corn Lake IRP Declaration) and decision "to extend its final review procedure to include review of Corn Lake's charity expert determination" does not support reconsideration. As was the case with the Dot Registry IRP, the circumstances in the Corn Lake IRP and the Board's subsequent decision concerning .CHARITY involved different facts and distinct considerations specific to the circumstances in Corn Lake's application. As such, the Board's action there does not amount to inconsistent or discriminatory treatment; it is instead an example of the way that the Board must "draw nuanced distinctions between different gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applications," and is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles and Bylaws.

2. The CPE Process Review Confirms that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Org did not have any Undue Influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPEs Conducted.

The BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that the Requestors' suggestion that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org exerted undue influence over the CPE Provider's execution of CPE does not warrant reconsideration. Indeed, as the BAMC correctly pointed out, this argument has already been addressed by the Board in the 2018 Resolutions.

In short, the CPE Process Review's Scope 1 Report confirms that "there is no evidence that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org had any undue influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process," including with respect to HTLD's Application. The Requestors believe that the Scope 1 Report demonstrates that "the CPE Provider was not independent from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Any influence by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in the CPE was contrary to the policy, and therefore undue." The Requestors do not identify what "policy" they are referring to, but regardless, their disagreement with the conclusions of the Scope 1 Report do not support reconsideration. This is because the Requestors do not dispute that, when ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org provided input to the CPE Provider, that input did not involve challenging the CPE Provider's conclusions, but
rather was to ensure that the CPE Reports were clear and "that the CPE Provider's conclusions"—not ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's conclusions—were "supported by sufficient reasoning." The Requestors also cite "phone calls between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the CPE Provider to discuss 'various issues,'" claiming that those calls "demonstrate that the CPE Provider was not free from external influence from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)" org and was therefore not independent.42 Neither of these facts demonstrates that the CPE Provider was "not independent" or that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org exerted undue influence over the CPE Provider. These types of communications instead demonstrate that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org protected the CPE Provider's independence by focusing on ensuring that the CPE Provider's conclusions were clear and well-supported, rather than directing the CPE Provider to reach a particular conclusion. This argument therefore does not support reconsideration. Accordingly, the BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that because the Scope 1 Report demonstrates that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org did not exert undue influence on the CPE Provider and CPE process, it disproves the Requestors' claim that "the Despegar et al. IRP Panel was given incomplete and misleading information" which is based solely on the premise of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's undue influence in the CPE process.42

3. The Requestors Have Not Demonstrated that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Org was Obligated to Produce Communications Between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Org and the CPE Panel.

The Board agrees with the BAMC's conclusion that reconsideration is not warranted because, as the Requestors claim, the Despegar IRP Panel did not order ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to produce documents between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org and the CPE Provider. The BAMC noted that that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org was not ordered by the IRP Panel to produce any documents in the Despegar IRP, let alone documents that would reflect communications between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org and the CPE panel. And no policy or procedure required ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to voluntarily produce documents during the Despegar IRP or thereafter.41 In contrast, during the Dot Registry IRP, the Dot Registry IRP Panel ordered ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to produce all documents reflecting "

[consideration by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the work performed by the [CPE Provider] in connection with Dot Registry’s application] and [acts done and decisions taken by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) with respect to the work performed by the [CPE Provider] in connection with Dot Registry’s applications]. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org’s communications with the CPE panels for .INC, .LLC, and .LLP fell within the scope of such requests, and thus were produced. Ultimately, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org acted in accordance with applicable policies and procedures, including ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Bylaws, in both instances.

4. The Requestors Have Not Demonstrated that a New CPE of HTLD’s Application is Appropriate.

Without identifying particular CPE criteria, the Requestors ask the Board to "ensure meaningful review of the CPE regarding .hotel, ensuring consistency of approach with its handling of the Dot Registry [IRP Panel Declaration]." The BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, that to the extent the Requestors are asserting that the outcome of the CPE analysis of HTLD’s Application is inconsistent with other CPE applications, this argument was addressed in Scope 2 of the CPE Process Review. There, "FTI found no evidence that the CPE Provider’s evaluation process or reports deviated in any way from the applicable guidelines; nor did FTI observe any instances where the CPE Provider applied the CPE criteria in an inconsistent manner." Additionally, for the reasons discussed in above and in detail in the BAMC Recommendation, the Board finds that neither the .HOTEL CPE nor the 2018 Resolutions evidence inconsistent or discriminatory treatment toward the Requestors. For these reasons, this argument does not support reconsideration.

C. The 2018 Resolutions Are Consistent With ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission, Commitments, Core Values and Established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Policy(ies).

The Requestors’ criticisms of the 2018 Resolutions focus on the transparency, methodology, and scope of the CPE Process Review. None support reconsideration. The BAMC found, and the Board agrees, that the BAMC and the Board addressed the Requestors’ concerns regarding the 2018 Resolutions in its Recommendation on Request 18-8, which the Board adopted on 18 July 2018. The rationales set forth by the BAMC, and the Board in its determination of Request 18-8, are incorporated herein by reference.
D. The Rebuttal Does Not Raise Arguments or Facts That Support Reconsideration.

As an initial matter, Request 16-11 was submitted pursuant to the 11 February 2016 Bylaws, see Discussion supra, which do not call for a rebuttal to the BAMC's recommendation. Nonetheless, the Board has considered the Requestors' Rebuttal and finds that the Requestors have not provided any additional arguments or facts supporting reconsideration.


The Requestors assert that the Board should consider Request 16-11 under the standards for reconsideration set forth in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's 18 June 2018 Bylaws, i.e., the version of the Bylaws in effect at the time of the BAMC's recommendation, rather than the 11 February 2016 version which was in effect when Request 16-11 was submitted on 25 August 2016. However, the 18 June 2018 Bylaws did not exist when the Requestors submitted Request 16-11, and the Board did not provide for retroactive treatment when it approved the 18 June 2018 version of the Bylaws; accordingly, the 18 June 2018 Bylaws have no retroactive effect. Indeed, the Reconsideration Request form that the Requestors submitted references the standard for reconsideration under the 11 February 2016 Bylaws, instructing requestors that, for challenges to Board action, "[t]here has to be identification of material information that was in existence [at] the time of the decision and that was not considered by the Board in order to state a reconsideration request." (See Request 16-11, § 8, at Pg. 7.) Therefore, the BAMC correctly considered Request 16-11 under the 11 February 2016 Bylaws, which were in effect when the Requestors submitted Request 16-11.

2. The Requestors' Challenges to the Bylaws are Untimely.

The Requestors assert that "the formal requirements of Article 4(2)(q) [of the 18 June 2018 Bylaws] and the circumstances of this case create an unjustified imbalance that prevents Requestors from participating in the reconsideration proceedings in a meaningful way" because the BAMC issued a 33-page recommendation "almost four months" after the Requestors' telephonic presentation concerning Request 16-11, when (under the current Bylaws) rebuttals must be filed within 15 days after the BAMC publishes its recommendations and may not exceed 10 pages. (Rebuttal, at Pg. 1.) As noted above, the operative version of the Bylaws do not provide the Requestors with a right to submit a rebuttal, so reconsideration is not warranted on account of the Requestors' apparent disagreement with the deadlines governing rebuttals under the current (inapplicable) version of the Bylaws. Moreover, the Requestors have meaningfully participated in the reconsideration process: the
Requestors made a presentation at a telephonic hearing concerning Request 16-11 (Rebuttal, at Pg. 1); and, as noted in the BAMC's Recommendation, the Requestors submitted—and the BAMC considered—seven letters in support of Request 16-11.\footnote{30} The Requestors have now also submitted a rebuttal in support of Request 16-11, which the Board has considered. Accordingly, the Requestors have not shown that they have been prevented from "meaningful" participation in the reconsideration request process.

3. **The Board Considered Ms. Ohlmer's Actions When it Adopted the 2016 Resolutions.**

The Requestors assert that the "Board ignored the role of [Katrin] Ohlmer" (Rebuttal, at Pg. 3) in the Portal Configuration issue. The Requestors claim that Ms. Ohlmer was CEO of HTLD when she accessed the confidential information of other applicants, and that she had been CEO from the time HTLD submitted HTLD's Application until 23 March 2016. (Request 16-11, § 8, at Pg. 19; see also Rebuttal, at Pg. 3.) The Requestors claim that, because of her role at HTLD, information Ms. Ohlmer accessed "was automatically provided to HTLD." (Rebuttal, at Pg. 4.) The Requestors also assert that "HTLD acknowledged that [Ms. Ohlmer] was (i) principally responsible for representing HTLD, (ii) highly involved in the process of organizing and garnering support for [HTLD's Application], and (iii) responsible for the day-to-day business operations of HTLD."\footnote{31}

The Board finds that this argument does not support reconsideration as the Board did consider Ms. Ohlmer's affiliation with HTLD when it adopted the 2016 Resolutions. Indeed, the Rationale for Resolutions 2016.08.09.14 – 2016.08.09.15 notes that: (1) Ms. Ohlmer was an associate of Mr. Krischenowski; (2) Ms. Ohlmer's wholly-owned company acquired the shares that Mr. Krischenowski's wholly-owned company had held in GmbH Berlin (itself a 48.8% minority shareholder of HTLD); and (3) Ms. Ohlmer (like Mr. Krischenowski) "certified to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) [org] that [she] would delete or destroy all information obtained, and affirmed that [she] had not used and would not use the information obtained, or convey it to any third party."\footnote{32} As the BAMC noted in its Recommendation, Mr. Grabensee affirmed that GmbH Berlin would transfer its ownership interest in HTLD to another company, Afilias plc. Once this transfer occurred, Ms. Ohlmer's company would not have held an ownership interest in HTLD.\footnote{33}

4. **The Requestors' Arguments Concerning HTLD's and Mr. Krischenowski's Assurances and HTLD's Relationship with Mr. Krischenowski Do Not Support Reconsideration.**
The Board finds that the Requestors' arguments that the Board should not have accepted the statements from Messrs. Grabensee or Krischenowski that HTLD did not receive the confidential information from the Portal Configuration does not warrant reconsideration because the Requestors have not provided any arguments or facts that have not already been addressed by the BAMC in its Recommendation.

Similarly, the Board concludes that the Requestors' arguments that the Board failed to consider timing of HTLD's separation from Mr. Krischenowski in adopting the 2016 Resolutions does not warrant reconsideration. Contrary to the Requestors' argument, it is clear that the Board considered the timing of HTLD's separation from Mr. Krischenowski when it adopted the Resolutions. In the Rationale for the 2016 Resolutions, the Board referenced the same timing in the Rationale for the Resolutions, noting that "the business consultancy services between HTLD and Mr. Krischenowski were terminated as of 31 December 2015" and "Mr. Krischenowski stepped down as a managing director of GmbH Berlin effective 18 March 2016." The Requestors disagree with the Board's conclusion that the timing did not support cancelling HTLD's Application, but this disagreement, without more, is not grounds for reconsideration.

5. The Requestors Do Not Challenge the Application of Specific CPE Criteria to HTLD's Application

The Requestors claim that the BAMC incorrectly concluded that the Requestors "do not challenge the application of the CPE criteria to HTLD's application or a particular finding by the CPE Provider on any of the CPE criteria." (Rebuttal, at Pg. 9, citing Recommendation, at Pg. 1). However, neither Request 16-11 nor the Rebuttal identifies any of the CPE criteria nor discusses the application of specific CPE criteria to HTLD's Application. (See Request 16-11; Rebuttal.) The Requestors simply reiterate their arguments that the CPE Provider applied (unspecific) CPE criteria "inconsistent[ly] and erroneous[ly]," and that the BAMC should not have considered the CPE Process Review Reports when it made its Recommendation. (Rebuttal, at Pgs. 9-10.) The BAMC addressed these arguments in its Recommendation, and the Board adopts the BAMC's reasoning as if fully set forth herein.

For these reasons, the Board concludes that reconsideration is not warranted.

This action is within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission and is in the public interest as it is important to ensure that, in carrying out its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is accountable to the community for operating within the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and other established procedures, by
having a process in place by which a person or entity materially affected by an action of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board or Staff may request reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. Adopting the BAMC’s Recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

g. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-9: DotKids Foundation (.KIDS)

Whereas, in Resolution 2010.03.12.47 (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2010-03-12-en#20), as part of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board “request[ed] stakeholders to work through their [Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations)] SOs and [Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees)] ACs, and form a Working Group to develop a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and operating new gTLDs.”

Whereas, in response to Resolution 2010.03.12.47 (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2010-03-12-en#20), the Joint SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant Support Working Group (JAS WG (Working Group)) was formed.

Whereas, on 13 September 2011, the JAS WG (Working Group) issued its Final Report, setting forth various recommendations regarding financial and non-financial support to be offered to “Support-Approved Candidates” in conjunction with the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program.

Whereas, in Resolution 2011.10.28.21 (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-28-en#2), the Board committed to taking the JAS Final Report seriously, and convened a working group of Board members "to oversee the scoping and implementation of recommendations out of [the JAS Final] Report, as feasible."

Whereas, in Resolutions 2011.12.08.01 – 2011.12.08.03 (/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-12-08-en#1.1), the Board approved the implementation plan of the JAS Final Report developed by the Board working group, directed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization to finalize the implementation plan in accordance with the proposed criteria and process for the launch of the Applicant Support Program (ASP) in January 2012, and approved a fee reduction to US$47,000 Applicant Support candidates that qualify for the established criteria.

Whereas, the Requestor DotKids Foundation submitted a community-based application for .KIDS, which was placed in a contention set with one other .KIDS application and an application for .KID.
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carrying out its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is accountable to the community for operating within the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and other established procedures, by having a process in place by which a person or entity materially affected by an action of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board or Staff may request reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. Adopting the BAMC's Recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

g. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-6: Travel Reservations SRL, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Radix FZC, dot Hotel Inc., Festry LLC

Whereas, Travel Reservations SRL, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Radix FZC (and its subsidiary applicant dotHotel Inc.), and Festry LLC (collectively the Requestors) submitted standard applications for the .HOTEL generic top-level domain (gTLD (generic Top Level Domain)), which was placed in a contention set with other .HOTEL applications. One of the other application for the .HOTEL gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), was a community application filed by HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l. (HTLD).

Whereas, HTLD participated in Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) and prevailed.
Whereas, the Requestors have challenged the CPE Provider’s determination that the HTLD Application satisfied the requirements for community priority, and the Board’s decision not to cancel the HTLD Application, via numerous DIDP Requests, Reconsideration Requests, and Independent Review Process. All of those challenges have been resolved, with the exception of Reconsideration Request 16-11 (Request 16-11), which is pending.

Whereas, while Request 16-11 was pending, the Board directed ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization to undertake a review of the CPE process (the CPE Process Review). The Board Governance Committee (BGC) determined that the pending Reconsideration Requests regarding the CPE process, including Request 16-11, would be placed on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed.213

Whereas, on 13 December 2017, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org published three reports on the CPE Process Review (CPE Process Review Reports).

Whereas, on 15 March 2018, the Board passed the Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11 ([/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-03-15-en#2.a]), in which the Board acknowledged and accepted the findings set forth in the CPE Process Review Reports, declared that the CPE Process Review was complete, concluded that, as a result of the findings in the CPE Process Review Reports, there would be no overhaul or change to the CPE process for this current round of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program, and directed the Board Accountability Mechanism Committee (BAMC) to move forward with consideration of the remaining Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process that were placed on hold pending completion of the CPE Process Review.
Whereas, on 14 April 2018, the Requestors submitted Reconsideration Request 18-6 (Request 18-6), claiming that the Board's adoption of the CPE Process Review Reports in Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11 are contrary to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's commitments to transparency and to applying documented policies in a consistent, neutral, objective, and fair manner.

Whereas, the BAMC previously determined that Request 18-6 is sufficiently stated and sent the Request to the Ombudsman for review and consideration in accordance with Article 4, Section 4.2(j) and (k) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws.

Whereas, the Ombudsman recused himself from this matter pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.2(l)(iii) of the Bylaws.

Whereas, the BAMC carefully considered the merits of Request 18-6 and all relevant materials and recommended that Request 18-6 be denied because the Board considered all material information when it adopted Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11, which is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, Commitments, Core Values, and established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy(ies).

Whereas, the Board has carefully considered the BAMC's Recommendation on Request 18-6 and all relevant materials related to Request 18-6, including the Requestor's rebuttal, and the Board agrees with the BAMC's Recommendation and concludes that the rebuttal provides no additional argument or evidence to support reconsideration.

Resolved (2018.07.18.09), the Board adopts the BAMC Recommendation on Request 18-6.
Rationale for Resolution 2018.07.18.09

1. Brief Summary and Recommendation

The full factual background is set forth in the BAMC Recommendation on Request 18-6 (en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf) (BAMC Recommendation), which the Board has reviewed and considered, and which is incorporated here.

On 14 June 2018, the BAMC evaluated Request 18-6 and all relevant materials and recommended that the Board deny Request 18-6 because the Board considered all material information when it adopted the Resolutions, which is consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission, Commitments, Core Values, and established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy(ies). Specifically, as noted in Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11 (the Resolutions), the Board considered the CPE Process Review Reports. The CPE Process Review Reports identify the materials considered by FTI. Additionally, as noted in the Rationale of the Resolutions, the Board acknowledged receipt of, and took into consideration, the correspondence received after the publication of the CPE Process Review Reports in adopting the Resolutions. (See BAMC Recommendation (en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf).)

On 29 June 2018, the Requestor submitted a rebuttal to the BAMC’s Recommendation (Rebuttal), pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.2(q) of ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Bylaws. (See Rebuttal (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-requestors-rebuttal-bamc-recommendation-29jun18-en.pdf).) The Requestor claims that "the BAMC’s Recommendation is based on both factual errors and on a misrepresentation of Requestors' position and of the applicable rules."²¹⁶

The Board has carefully considered the BAMC’s Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf) and all relevant materials related to Request 18-6, including the Requestor’s rebuttal, and the Board agrees with the BAMC’s Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf) and concludes that the Rebuttal provides no additional argument or evidence to support reconsideration.

2. Issue

The issue is whether the Board’s adoption of the Resolutions contradicted ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission, Commitments, Core Values and/or established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy(ies). These issues are considered under the relevant standards for reconsideration requests, which are set forth in the BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf).

The Board notes that it agrees with the BAMC’s decision to not consider Request 16-11 in conjunction with Request 18-6 (as requested by the Requestors) because the Requests were filed under
different Bylaws with different standards for Reconsideration and involve different subject matters.

3. Analysis and Rationale

A. The Resolutions Are Consistent With ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, Commitments, Core Values and Established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Policy(ies).

The Requestor's claims focus on the transparency, methodology, and scope of the CPE Process Review. The BAMC noted, and the Board agrees, the Requestor provides no evidence demonstrating how the Resolutions violate ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitment to fairness, or that the Board's action is inconsistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitments to transparency, multistakeholder policy development, promoting well-informed decisions based on expert advice, applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly without discrimination, and operating with efficiency and excellence. Rather, it appears that the Requestor simply does not agree with findings of the CPE Process Review Reports and the Board's acceptance of those findings. As demonstrated below and in further detail in the BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf)
which is incorporated herein, these are not sufficient bases for reconsideration.


The Requestors argue that the CPE Process Review—and therefore the Resolutions—are contrary to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitments to transparency and to applying documented policies in a consistent, neutral, objective, and fair manner. Specifically, the Requestors believe that the CPE Process Review lacked transparency concerning: (1) "the selection process for the CPE process reviewer ([FTI]), and the names and curricula vitae of the FTI individuals involved in the review"; (2) the "instructions FTI received from ICANN ([Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers] [organization]"; (3) the "criteria and standards that FTI used to perform the CPE process review"; (4) the "documents or the recordings of the interviews on which [FTI's] findings are based"; and (5) the "questions that were asked during [FTI's] interviews."

With respect to the first three claims, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org provided details concerning the selection process for the CPE process reviewer almost one year ago, in
furtherance of its effort to operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner. In the same document, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org provided information concerning the scope of FTI's investigation. Similarly, the CPE Process Review Reports themselves provide extensive detail concerning FTI's "criteria and standards" for conducting the CPE Process Review. Accordingly, the BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that none of these arguments support reconsideration. (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pg. 13.)

Concerning FTI's documents, recordings, and interview questions, as noted in the CPE Process Review Reports, many of the materials that FTI reviewed are publicly available documents, and are equally available to the Requestors. Additionally, FTI requested, received, and reviewed (1) emails from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org (internal to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) personnel as well as external emails exchanged with the CPE Provider) and (2) the CPE Provider's working papers, including draft reports, notes, and spreadsheets. While the Requestors
did not file a request for documentary information pursuant to the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), these materials are the subject of two DIDP Requests, which were submitted by parties in January 2018. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization considered the request and concluded that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization explained that those documents would not be made publicly available because they were subject to certain Nondisclosure Conditions. These same Nondisclosure Conditions apply to the Requestors’ claim. Moreover, the reasoning set forth in the BAMC’s Recommendations on Reconsideration Requests 18-1 and 18-2, denying reconsideration on those DIDP Responses are applicable here and are therefore incorporated herein by reference. The Requestors here provide no evidence that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org’s decision not to disclose these materials contravened any applicable policies, or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission, Commitments, or Core Values. Accordingly, the BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, this argument does not support reconsideration. (BAMC Recommendation)
2. The Requestors' Challenges to FTI's Methodology Do Not Warrant Reconsideration.

The Requestors assert that the Board should not have acknowledged or accepted the CPE Process Review Reports because FTI's methodology was flawed.\textsuperscript{226} Specifically, the Requestors complain that FTI: (1) did not explain why the CPE Provider refused to produce email correspondence; and (2) did not try to contact former employees of the CPE Provider.\textsuperscript{227}

As discussed in the detail in the BAMC Recommendation (\texttt{https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-07-18-en.pdf}), FTI, not the Board or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org, defined the methodology for the CPE Process Review Reports.\textsuperscript{228} The Board selected FTI because it has "the requisite skills and expertise to undertake" the CPE Process Review, and relied on FTI to develop an appropriate methodology.\textsuperscript{229} The Requestors have not identified a policy or procedure (because there is none) requiring the Board or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org to develop a particular
methodology for the CPE Process Review.

With respect to the Requestor's first concern, the BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that the claim does not support reconsideration. The CPE Provider did produce to FTI, and FTI did review, the CPE Provider's working papers, draft reports, notes, and spreadsheets for all CPE Reports.²³⁰ FTI also received and reviewed emails (and attachments) produced by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization between relevant CPE Provider personnel and relevant ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization personnel related to the CPE process and evaluations.²³¹ The Requestors are correct that FTI requested additional materials from the CPE Provider such as the internal correspondence between the CPE Provider's personnel and evaluators, but the CPE Provider refused to produce certain categories of documents, claiming that pursuant to its contract with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org, it was only required to produce CPE working papers, and internal and external emails were not "working papers."²³² The BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, no policy or procedure exists that would require ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
organization to reject the CPE Process Review Reports because the CPE Provider did not produce internal emails. This argument does not support reconsideration. (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 15-16.)

The BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that the Requestors’ concern that FTI interviewed the "only two remaining [CPE Provider] personnel" does not warrant reconsideration. Other team members were no longer employed by the CPE Provider when FTI conducted its investigation, and were therefore not available for FTI to interview. Neither FTI nor the Board were required to search out every former CPE Provider employee who had any role in any CPE evaluation, particularly when FTI already had access to two individuals who were core members of every CPE evaluation team and the working papers of the CPE reports that the entire core team worked on. The Requestor has not identified a policy or procedure requiring FTI to do more (including to explain why it did not seek out former employees) because none exists. Reconsideration is not warranted on this ground. (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pg. 16.)
The Requestors also claim that FTI's methodology was flawed because FTI did not identify that the CPE Provider determined that the HTLD Application "provided for an appeal system," when in fact the application "did not provide for an appeal system" as required under Criterion 3, Registration Policies.\textsuperscript{234} The Requestors claim that "[t]he Despegar et al. IRP Panel considered [this] inconsistenc[y] to have merit," and the "existence of said inconsistencies has never been contested."\textsuperscript{235} As discussed in detail in the BAMC Recommendation and incorporated herein by reference, this assertion is an overstatement of the Despegar IRP Panel's findings. (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 16-17.) The Despegar IRP Panel stated that: (1) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org had confirmed that the CPE Provider did not have a "process for comparing the outcome of one CPE evaluation with another in order to ensure consistency," nor did ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org have a process for doing so; and that (2) "[m]uch was made in this IRP of the inconsistencies, or at least apparent inconsistencies, between the outcomes of different CPE evaluations, . . . some of which, on the basis solely of the arguments provided by [the Requestors], have
some merit. The Despegar IRP Panel did not make a determination concerning these arguments, nor was it asked to. Accordingly, the IRP Panel's side note concerning the Requestors' allegations of inconsistencies does not support reconsideration.


The BAMC determined, and the Board agrees, that the Requestors' complaints about the scope of FTI's investigation do not support reconsideration. The Requestors believe that FTI "sum[med] up" but did not "analyse" "the different reasons that the CPE Provider provided to demonstrate adherence to the community priority criteria," that it did not analyze "the inconsistencies invoked by applicants in [reconsideration requests], IRPs or other processes," and that FTI "did not examine the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applications underlying the CPE [evaluations]." Essentially, the Requestors wanted FTI to substantively re-evaluate the CPE applications, which was beyond the scope of the CPE Process Review. The requestor's substantive disagreement with FTI's methodology is not a basis for reconsideration. (BAMC Recommendation)
4. The Resolutions Are Consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, Commitments, Core Values, and Established Policy(ies).

The BAMC concluded, and the Board agrees, that there is no merit to the Requestors' assertions that the Resolutions are contrary to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s commitments to transparency and to applying documented policies in a consistent, neutral, objective, and fair manner, and they will prevent Requestors from obtaining "a meaningful review of their complaints regarding HTLD's application for .hotel, the CPE process and the CPE Review Process." In the Resolutions, the Board directed the BAMC to consider the CPE Reports along with all of the materials submitted in support of the relevant reconsideration requests. The BAMC will consider the CPE Process Review Reports in the course of its evaluation of Request 16-11 (just as the BAMC will consider all of the materials submitted by the Requestors in connection with Request 16-11), but this does not mean that the BAMC will find the CPE Process Review Reports to be determinative to its Recommendation on Request 16-11.
The BAMC notes that it provided the Requestors an opportunity to make a telephone presentation concerning the effect of the CPE Process Review on Request 16-11, which the Requestors accepted. The BAMC will carefully review and consider all of the materials that the Requestors submitted in support of Request 16-11, as well as the CPE Process Review Reports as one of many reference points in its consideration of Request 16-11. Accordingly, reconsideration is not warranted.

With respect to the Requestors’ due process claims, as discussed in the BAMC Recommendation and incorporated herein by reference, while ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org is committed to conform with relevant principles of international law and conventions, any commitment to provide due process is voluntary and not coextensive with government actors’ obligations. Constitutional protections do not apply with respect to a corporate accountability mechanism. California non-profit public benefit corporations, such as ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization, are expressly authorized to establish internal accountability mechanisms and to
define the scope and form of those mechanisms. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization was not required to establish any internal corporate accountability mechanism, but instead did so voluntarily. Accordingly, the Requestor does not have the "right" to due process or other "constitutional" rights with respect to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s accountability mechanisms. (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 19-20).

Even if ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization did have due process obligations, and even though the "rights" the Requestors invoke do not apply to corporate accountability mechanisms, the Requestors have not explained how the alleged misapplication of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's policies resulted in a denial of due process. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org did take due process into account when it designed the accountability mechanisms, including the Reconsideration Request process that the Requestors exercised by submitting Request 16-11 and the IRP Process that the Requestors exercised in the Despegar IRP. ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org's accountability mechanisms—that is, Reconsideration Requests and the Independent Review Process—consider the CPE Provider's compliance with the Guidebook and with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organization's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. They consider whether the CPE Provider complied with its processes, which requires the adjudicator (the BAMC, Board, or an Independent Panel) to consider the outcome in addition to the process. Accordingly, the accountability mechanisms, including this reconsideration request, provide affected parties like the Requestor with avenues for redress of purported wrongs, and substantively review the decisions of third-party service providers, including the CPE Provider. This is not grounds for reconsideration. (See id.)

B. The Rebuttal Does Not Raise Arguments or Facts That Support Reconsideration.

The Board has carefully considered the Requestors' Rebuttal and finds that the Requestors have not provided any additional arguments or facts supporting reconsideration. The Rebuttal claims that "the BAMC's Recommendation is based on both factual errors and on a misrepresentation of Requestors' position and of the applicable rules." (Rebuttal (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-
et-al-requestors-rebuttal-bamc-
recommendation-29jun18-en.pdf), Pg. 1)

First, the Requestors assert that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board did not consider the claims raised in the Requestors' 16 January 2018 and 22 February 2018 correspondence when the Board adopted the 2018 Resolutions. This claim is factually incorrect and does not support reconsideration. The Requestors' 16 January 2018 letter did not identify any specific challenges to the CPE Process Review Reports, but instead only made passing references to the Requestors' broad "concerns" about transparency, the methodology employed by FTI, due process, and alleged disparate treatment and inconsistencies.243 These "concerns" were then detailed in the Requestors' 1 February 2018 letter, which the Board acknowledged and considered in the 2018 Resolutions.244 Further, contrary to the Requestors' claim, the Board did acknowledge and consider the Requestors' 22 February 2018 letter.245

Second, the Requestors assert that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org has "largely ignored" many of the Requestors' challenges to the CPE Provider's determination that the HTLD Application satisfied the requirements for community priority, and the Board's decision not to cancel the HTLD Application.246 This claim is unsupported and does not warrant reconsideration because, as the BAMC explained (see BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf),
Pgs. 4, 14-15), and the Board agrees, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org responded to Requestors’ DIDP Requests, Reconsideration Requests, and the Despegar IRP in accordance with established policies and procedures. With respect to Reconsideration Request 16-11, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org has not "ignored" it, as the Requestors claim. Rather, it remains pending and will be considered on the merits as soon as practicable following the completion of the Requestors’ oral presentation to the Board. Regarding the Requestors’ claim that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) org has not provided details concerning the selection process for FTI, the Board finds that this argument has been sufficiently addressed by the BAMC. (See BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 13-14.) The Requestors have not set forth any new evidence in the Rebuttal supporting reconsideration.

Third, the Requestors repeat their argument that Board's adoption of the 2018 Resolutions will prevent Requestors from obtaining a "meaningful review of their complaints made in the framework of [Request] 16-11." The Board finds that this argument has been sufficiently addressed by the BAMC. (See BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 18-19.) The Requestors have not set
forth any new evidence in the Rebuttal supporting reconsideration.

Fourth, with respect to the Requestors' due process claim, the Requestors now assert that "the fact that the BAMC refuses to hear [Requests] 16-11 and 18-6 together limits Requestors' due process rights even further." The Requestors state that they "cannot accept the BAMC's reasoning that both [Requests] cannot be handled together because [Request] 16-11 was filed under different (previous) Bylaws," and summarily conclude that this will result in Request 16-11 being determined under "less robust accountability standards" than Request 18-6. However, the Requestors do not provide any basis for this assertion, because there is none. As the BAMC explained, "the Requests were filed under different Bylaws with different standards for Reconsideration and involve different subject matters." (BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pg. 11.) Accordingly, reconsideration is not warranted.

Finally, the Requestors again disagree with the scope of the CPE Process Review and the methodology employed by FTI. The Board finds that these arguments have been sufficiently addressed by the BAMC. (See BAMC Recommendation (/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-18-6-trs-et-al-bamc-recommendation-14jun18-en.pdf), Pgs. 15-20.) The Requestors have not set forth any new evidence in the Rebuttal supporting reconsideration.
This action is within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission and is in the public interest as it is important to ensure that, in carrying out its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is accountable to the community for operating within the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and other established procedures, by having a process in place by which a person or entity materially affected by an action of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board or Staff may request reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. Adopting the BAMC's Recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

h. AOB

No Resolutions taken.

3. Executive Session - Confidential:

a. President and CEO FY18 SR2 At-Risk Compensation and Goals for FY19

Whereas, each Board member has confirmed that he/she does not have a conflict of interest with respect to establishing the amount of payment for the President and CEO's FY18 SR2 at-risk compensation payment.
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DECLARATION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED PANELISTS, members of the Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel" or "Panel"), having been designated in accordance with ICANN Bylaws dated 11 April 2013, hereby issue the following Final Declaration ("Declaration").

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Declaration is issued in the context of an Independent Review Process ("IRP") as provided for in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN"; "ICANN Bylaws" or "Bylaws"). In accordance with those Bylaws, the conduct of this IRP is governed by the International Arbitration Rules of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution as amended and in effect June 1, 2009 ("ICDR; "ICDR Rules") as supplemented by the Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process ("Supplementary Procedures").

2. The subject matter of the dispute here concerns alleged conduct by the ICANN Board in relation to one particular facet of the process by which new generic top-level domains ("gTLDs", also known as gTLD "strings") are applied for, reviewed and delegated into the Internet's domain name system ("DNS") root zone.

3. As explained in this Declaration, the Applicant, Booking.com, alleges that, in establishing and overseeing the process by which so-called string similarity reviews are conducted, and in refusing to reconsider and overturn a decision to place Booking.com’s applied-for gTLD string .hotels in a so-called string contention set, the Board acted in a manner inconsistent with applicable policies, procedures and rules as set out in ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and gTLD Applicant Guidebook ("Guidebook").

4. Reading between the lines of the parties’ submissions, the Panel senses that both sides would welcome the opportunity to contribute to an exchange that might result in enabling disputants in future cases to avoid having to resort to an IRP to resolve issues such as have arisen here. Certainly the Panel considers that the present matter would ideally have been resolved amicably by the parties. This is particularly true given that the matter here concerns two of ICANN’s guiding principles – transparency and fairness – as applied to one of ICANN’s most essential activities – the delegation of new gTLDs\(^2\) – in circumstances in which various members of the Internet community, including certain members of the ICANN Board’s New gTLD Program Committee, have expressed their own concerns regarding the string similarity review process. That being the case, though, the Panel does not shy away from the duty imposed by the Bylaws to address the questions before it and to render the

---

\(^1\) As requested by the ICDR, the Declaration was provided to the ICDR in draft form on 26 January 2015 for non-substantive comments on the text (if any). It was returned to the Panel on 2 March 2015.

\(^2\) As stated in the very first sentence of the Guidebook: "New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN's agenda since its creation."
present Declaration, in accordance with, and within the constraints of the Bylaws, the ICDR Rules and the Supplementary Procedures.

II. THE PARTIES

A. The Applicant: Booking.com

5. The Applicant, Booking.com, is a limited liability company established under the law of the Netherlands. Booking.com describes itself as "the number one online hotel reservation service in the world, offering over 435,605 hotels and accommodations." Booking.com's primary focus is on the U.S. and other English-language markets.

6. Booking.com is represented in this IRP by Mr. Flip Petillion and Mr. Jan Janssen of the law firm Crowell & Moring in Brussels, Belgium.

B. The Respondent: ICANN

7. The Respondent, ICANN, is a California not-for-profit public benefit corporation, formed in 1998. As set forth in Article I, Section 1 of its Bylaws, ICANN's mission is "to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's system of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure option of the Internet's unique identifier systems." ICANN describes itself as "a complex organization that facilitates input from a wide variety of Internet stakeholders. ICANN has a Board of Directors and staff members from around the globe, as well as an Ombudsman. ICANN, however, is much more than just the corporation—it is a community of participants." 4

8. ICANN is represented in this IRP by Mr. Jeffrey A. LeVee, Esq. and Ms. Kate Wallace, Esq. of the law firm Jones Day in Los Angeles, California, USA.

III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND – IN BRIEF

9. We recount here certain uncontested elements of the factual and procedural background to the present IRP. Other facts are addressed in subsequent parts of the Declaration, where the parties' respective claims and the Panel's analysis are discussed.

A. ICANN's Adoption of the New gTLD Program and the Applicant Guidebook

10. Even before the introduction of ICANN's New gTLD Program ("Program"), in 2011, ICANN had, over time, gradually expanded the DNS from the original six gTLDs (.com; .edu; .gov; .mil; .net; .org) to 22 gTLDs and over 250 two-letter country-code TLDs. 5 Indeed, as noted above, the introduction of new gTLDs has been "in the forefront of ICANN's agenda" for as long as ICANN has existed.

3 Request, ¶ 10.
4 Response, ¶ 11-12.
5 Request, ¶ 12; see also Guidebook, Preamble.
11. The Program has its origins in what the Guidebook refers to as “carefully deliberated policy development work” by the ICANN community.\footnote{Guidebook, \textit{Preamble}}

12. In 2005, ICANN’s Generic Names Supporting Organization (“GNSO”), one of the groups that coordinates global Internet policy at ICANN, commenced a policy development process to consider the introduction of new gTLDs.\footnote{Request, ¶ 13, Reference Material 7, “Public Comment Forum for Terms of Reference for New gTLDs (6 December 2005), http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-06dec05-en.html#TOR; Reference Material 8, “GNSO Issues Report, Introduction of New Top-Level Domains (5 December 2005) at pp. 3-4. See also Guidebook, \textit{Preamble}. Booking.com refers to the GNSO as “ICANN’s main policy-making body for generic top-level domains”. Article X of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation provides: “There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains” (Section 1); the GNSO shall consist of “a number of Constituencies” and “four Stakeholder Groups” (Section 2).} As noted in the Guidebook:

\begin{quote}
Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups – governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community – were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward.
\end{quote}

13. In October 2007, the GNSO formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations.

14. In June 2008, the ICANN Board decided to adopt the policies recommended by the GNSO.\footnote{Guidebook, \textit{Preamble}. A review of this policy process can be found at http://gnsoc.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds (last accessed on January 15, 2015).} As explained in the Guidebook, ICANN’s work next focused on implementation of these recommendations, which it saw as “creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval.”\footnote{Guidebook, \textit{Preamble}: “This implementation work is reflected in the drafts of the applicant guidebook that were released for public comment, and in the explanatory papers giving insight into rationale behind some of the conclusions reached on specific topics. Meaningful community input has led to revisions of the draft applicant guidebook.”}

15. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board in June 2011 to implement the New gTLD Program and its foundational instrument, the Guidebook.\footnote{RM 10 (ICANN resolution). The Guidebook (in its 30 May 2011 version) is one of seven “elements” of the Program implemented in 2011. The other elements were: a draft communications plan; “operational readiness activities”; a program to ensure support for applicants from developing countries; “a process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs who want to participate in the [Program]”; budgeted expenditures; and a timetable.}

16. As described by ICANN in these proceedings, the Program “constitutes by far ICANN’s most ambitious expansion of the Internet’s naming system. The Program’s goals include
enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs ..."  

17. The Guidebook is "continuously iterated and revised", and "provides details to gTLD applicants and forms the basis for ICANN’s evaluation of new gTLD applications."  

12 As noted by Booking.com, the Guidebook "is the crystallization of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs."  

B. Booking.com’s Application for .hotels, and the Outcome

18. In accordance with the process set out in the Guidebook, Booking.com filed an application (Application ID 1-1016-75482) for the gTLD string .hotels.

19. At the same time, Despegar Online SRL ("Despegar"), a corporation established under the law of Uruguay, applied (Application ID 1-1249-87712) for the string .hoteis.

20. “Hoteis” is the Portuguese word for “hotels”.

21. According to Booking.com, Despegar is “a competitor of Booking.com."  

14 Booking.com claims that it intends "to operate .hotels as a secure Internet environment providing hotel reservation services for consumers, hotels, and other stakeholders,"  

15 while Despegar similarly intends .hoteis to be dedicated primarily to “individuals that are interested in, and businesses that offer, hotel- and travel-related content."  

16 That being said, a key difference between the two applications, as Booking.com acknowledges, is that Booking.com intends to focus the services it will offer under its proposed gTLD "on the U.S. (with its strongly Anglos-Saxon traditions) and other English-language markets," whereas Despegar intends to target "Portuguese-speaking" markets.

22. As part of the Initial Evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs were subject, .hotels and .hoteis were each required to undergo so-called string review in accordance with the Guidebook, the first component of which is a process known as string similarity review. As provided by the Guidebook, the string similarity review was conducted by an independent

---

11 Response, ¶ 14.

12 Response, ¶ 14. The resolution (RM 10) adopting the Guidebook explicitly “authorizes staff to make further updates and changes to the Applicant Guidebook as necessary and appropriate, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process, and to prominently publish notice of such changes.”

13 Request, ¶ 13. See also Guidebook, Module 1-2: “This Applicant Guidebook is the implementation of Board approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs, and has been revised extensively via public comment and consultation over a two-year period.”

14 Request, ¶ 17.

15 Request, ¶ 5.

16 Request, ¶ 17. See also Despegar Application for .hoteis (Request, Annex 2), § 18(a).

17 Request, ¶ 16.

18 Request, ¶ 17. See also Despegar Application for .hoteis (Request, Annex 2), § 18(a).
String Similarity Panel ("SSP") selected and engaged by ICANN for this purpose. (Extracts of the relevant provisions of the Guidebook can be found below, at Part IV of this Declaration.) ICANN engaged InterConnect Communications Ltd. ("ICC"), a company registered under the law of England and Wales, specializing in communications sector strategy, policy and associated regulatory frameworks,\(^{19}\) in cooperation with University College London, to act as the SSP.

23. On 26 February 2013 ICANN published the results of all of the string similarity reviews for all of the applications for new gTLDs submitted as part of the Program. The announcement revealed, among other things, that two “non-exact match” contention sets had been created: .hotels & .hoteis; and .unicorn & .unicom.\(^{20}\) Booking.com’s applied for string .hotels (as well as the .hoteis, .unicorn and .unicom strings) had thus failed the string similarity review.

24. The results of the string similarity review were notified to Booking.com by ICANN that same day. In its letter of 26 February 2013 ICANN wrote:

> After careful consideration and extensive review performed against the criteria in Section 2.2.1.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, the String Similarity Panel has found that the applied-for string (.hotels) is visually similar to another applied-for string (.hoteis), creating a probability of user confusion.

> Due to this finding, the … two strings have been placed in a contention set.\(^{21}\)

25. The impact of being put into a contention set is that the proposed strings in the set will not be delegated in the root zone unless and until the applicants reach agreement on which single string should proceed (with the other proposed string therefore rejected), or until after an auction is conducted, with the highest bidder being given the right to proceed to the next step in the review process.

C. **DIDP Request and Request for Reconsideration**

26. On 28 March 2013 Booking.com submitted a request for information under ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy ("DIDP Request") asking for “all documents directly and indirectly relating to (1) the standard used to determine whether gTLD strings are confusingly similar, and (2) the specific determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar.”\(^{22}\)

27. On the same date, Booking.com also filed a formal Request for Reconsideration ("Request for Reconsideration"). The “specific action(s)” that Booking.com asked to be reconsidered were: the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set; and the decision not to

---

\(^{19}\) See [http://www.icc-uk.com/](http://www.icc-uk.com/)

\(^{20}\) Request, Annex 3. ICANN published document dated 26 February 2013. As its name suggests, a “non-exact match” connotes a determination that two different (non-identical) strings are visually similar within the meaning of the Guidebook. Another 752 applied-for gTLDs were put into 230 identical contention sets.


\(^{22}\) Request, ¶ 30 and Annex 3.
provide a "detailed analysis or a reasoned basis" for the decision to place .hotels in contention.\[23\]

28. ICANN responded to the DIDP Request on 27 April 2013. Although ICANN provided certain information regarding the review process, in its response to the DID\[2\] Request, ICANN also noted:

The SSP is responsible for the development of its own process documentation and methodology for performing the string similarity review, and is also responsible for the maintenance of its own work papers. Many of the items that are sought from ICANN within the [DIDP] Request are therefore not in existence within ICANN and cannot be provided in response to the DIDP Request. ICANN will, however, shortly be posting the SSP’s String Similarity Process and Workflow on the New gTLD microsite. ...\[24\]

29. By letter dated 9 May 2013 Booking.com replied to ICANN, writing that "ICANN’s response fails to provide any additional information or address any of Booking.com’s concerns as conveyed in its DIDP Request or Request for Reconsideration."\[25\] On 14 May 2013, ICANN answered that it "intends to post the string similarity process documentation on or before ... 17 May 2013."\[26\] ICANN further informed Booking.com that "ICANN will afford you 30 days from the posting of the process document for the submission of a revised Request for Reconsideration."\[27\]

30. On 7 June 2013, ICANN published the “String Similarity New gTLD Evaluation Panel [i.e., the SSP] – Process Description” ("SSP Process Description").\[28\]

31. On 26 June 2013 Booking.com wrote to ICANN regarding both its DIDP Request and its 28 March 2013 Request for Reconsideration. In its letter, Booking.com noted among other things that "the generalized information ICANN thus far has provided does not explain a rationale for or analysis for the decision to put .hotels and .hotels in a contention set and therefore does not allow Booking.com to appropriately amend its Request for Reconsideration.” The letter concluded by stating: “Considering ICANN’s obligations of transparency and accountability, there cannot be any ‘compelling reason for confidentiality’.

\[23\] Request, Annex 12, §3. The Request for Reconsideration (which appears to be in the form of a template) expressly states at §2 that it is a “Request for Reconsideration of ... Staff [vs. Board] action/inaction.” The cover letter attaching the Request states that, “[d]espite the fact that the origin of the decisions is unclear, this Reconsideration Request is being submitted as a reconsideration of a ‘Staff action’. In the event that the decisions referenced above are determined to be a ‘Board action’, this request may be amended.” As explained below, the Request for Reconsideration was amended on 7 July 2013. That amendment did not alter the stated nature of the request in §2 or the description of the specific actions that Booking.com sought to have reconsidered (§3). Unless otherwise indicated, all further references in this Declaration to the Request for Reconsideration are understood to be the amended Request for Reconsideration.

\[24\] Request, Annex 5.

\[25\] Request, Annex 6.

\[26\] Request, Annex 7.

\[27\] Request, Annex 7.

\[28\] Request, Annex 8.
And ... there are numerous compelling reasons for publication of [the information requested by Booking.com].”\textsuperscript{29}

32. ICANN responded on 25 July 2013, explaining among other things that “the evaluation of the .hotels string by the SSP panel was performed according to the [SSP Process Description] ...” and “[the SSP’s work was subjected to quality review, as has been publicly discussed.”\textsuperscript{30} Approximately six months later, on 9 January 2014, ICANN posted a letter dated 18 December 2013 addressed to ICANN by the SSP Manager at ICC (Mr. Mark McFadden) providing a further “summary of the process, quality control mechanisms and some considerations surrounding the non-exact contention sets for the string similarity evaluation ...” (“SSP Manager’s Letter”).\textsuperscript{31} According to that Letter:

   When ALL of the following features of a pairwise comparison [of non-exact match strings] are evident the evaluators found the string pair to be confusingly similar:

   • Strings of similar visual length on the page;
   • Strings within +/- 1 character of each other;
   • Strings where the majority of characters are the same and in the same position in each string; and
   • The two strings possess letter combinations that visually appear similar to other letters in the same position in each string

   o For example m–m & l–i

33. Meanwhile, on 7 July 2013 Booking.com had submitted its amended Request for Reconsideration. In its letter attaching the amended Request for Reconsideration, Booking.com stated: “Booking.com reserves the right to further amend its Request for Reconsideration upon receipt of the information it previously requested and urges ICANN to publish the requested information as specified in our letter of 26 June 2013.”\textsuperscript{32}

34. By virtue of Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws, ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“BGC”) is charged with evaluating and making recommendation to the Board with respect to requests for reconsideration. The Board’s New gTLD Program Committee (“NGPC”) receives and acts on such recommendations on behalf of the ICANN Board. In accordance with this procedure, Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was evaluated by the BGC. In a detailed analysis dated 1 August 2013, the BGC “conclude[d] that Booking.com has not

\textsuperscript{29} Request, Annex 9.
\textsuperscript{30} Request, Annex 10.
\textsuperscript{31} Request, Annex 11.
\textsuperscript{32} Request, Annex 13.
stated proper grounds for reconsideration and we therefore recommend that Booking.com’s request be denied” (‘BGC Recommendation’). 33

35. At a telephone meeting held on 10 September 2013 the NGPC, “bestowed with the powers of the Board”, considered, discussed and accepted the BGC Recommendation. Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied. 34

D. The Cooperative Engagement Process

36. Booking.com thereafter filed a request for a Cooperative Engagement Process (“CEPT”) on 25 September 2013, with a view to attempting to reach an amicable resolution of its dispute with ICANN. In its CEP request, Booking.com wrote:

Booking.com is of the opinion that Resolution 2013.09.10.NG02 [the Board resolution denying its Request for Reconsideration] violates various provisions of ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation. In particular Booking.com considers that ICANN’s adoption of [the Resolution] is in violation of Articles I, II(3), II and IV of the ICANN Bylaws as well as Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation. In addition, Booking.com considers that ICANN has acted in violation of Articles 3, 5, 7 and 9 of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitment. 35

37. The CEP ultimately did not result in a resolution, and Booking.com duly commenced the present IRP.

38. One further point should be made, here, prior to describing the commencement and conduct of the present IRP proceedings: The determination by the SSP that .hotels and .hoteis are so visually similar as to give rise to the probability of user confusion, and the resulting placement of those applied-for strings into a contention set, does not mean that Booking.com’s application for .hotels has been denied or that .hotels will not proceed to delegation to the root zone. Rather, as noted above and explained in the extracts from the Guidebook reproduced below, the Guidebook establishes a process for resolving such contention, under which the applicants for the contending strings in the set – here, Booking.com and Despegar – may resolve the contention by negotiation, failing which the matter will proceed to auction. Ultimately, no matter the outcome of these IRP proceedings, Booking.com may yet be successful and .hotels may yet be delegated into the Internet root zone. However, the fact that .hotels has been put into a contention set does raise the risk that .hotels may never be delegated into the root zone, or that it may be more costly for Booking.com to obtain approval of its proposed string. It also has caused a significant delay in the potential delegation of the string into the root zone (which could prove to be detrimental to the ultimate success of Booking.com’s proposed string if other applicants

33 Request, Annex 14, BGC Recommendation dated 1 August 2013, p.9. See also Request, Annex 15, NGPC Resolution dated 10 September 2013. As noted in footnote 1 to the BGC Recommendation, the Recommendation was ultimately finalized and submitted for posting on 21 August 2013.

34 Request, Annex 15, NGPC Resolution dated 10 September 2013.

35 Request, Annex 17.
whose strings were not put into a contention set are able to establish themselves as pioneer providers of hotel- and travel-related services under a different new gTLD).

E. The IRP Proceedings


40. In accordance with Article IV, Section 3(9) of the ICANN Bylaws, Booking.com requested that a three-member IRP panel be constituted to consider and determine the Request. As the omnibus standing panel referred to in Article IV, Section 3(6) of the ICANN Bylaws had yet to be established, Booking.com further proposed, in accordance with Article 6 of the ICDR Rules, that each party appoint one panelist, with the third (the Chair of the panel) to be appointed by the two party-appointed panelists.

41. On 25 April 2014, ICANN submitted a Response to ICANN’s Request with supporting documents ("Response").

42. The parties having thereafter agreed on the number of panelists and the method of their appointment, David H. Bernstein, Esq. was duly appointed as panelist by Booking.com on 1 May 2014, and the Hon. A Howard Matz was duly appointed as panelist by ICANN on 30 May 2014.

43. On 17 July 2014, the ICDR notified the parties that Mr. Stephen L. Drymer had been duly nominated by the two party-appointed panelists as Chair of the Panel. Mr. Drymer’s appointment became effective and the Panel was duly constituted as of 1 August 2014.

44. On 21 August 2014, further to consultations among the panelists and between the Panel and the parties, the Panel convened a preparatory conference with the parties (by telephone) for the purpose of discussing organizational matters, including a timetable for any further written statements or oral argument. Both parties requested the opportunity to make supplemental submissions and to present oral argument.

45. On 22 August 2014 the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 in which, among other things, it established a Procedural Timetable for the IRP. As specifically requested by the parties, the Procedural Order and Timetable provided for the submission of additional written statements by the parties as well as for a brief oral hearing to take place by telephone, all on dates proposed by and agreed between the parties.36

46. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, on 6 October 2014 Booking.com submitted its Reply to ICANN’s Response, accompanied by additional documents ("Reply").

---

36 Paragraph 6 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that, in its forthcoming Reply to ICANN’s Response, “Booking.com shall only address two issues raised in Respondent’s Response: (1) the nature and scope of the IRP requested; (2) the nature of the relief sought by Claimant.” Paragraph 7 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that “Respondent’s Sur-Reply ... shall address only the issues raised in the Reply.”
47. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, ICANN submitted a Sur-Reply on 20 November 2014 ("Sur-Reply").

F. The Hearing

48. As provided by Procedural Order No. 1 and the Procedural Timetable, a hearing was held (by telephone) on 10 December 2011, commencing at 9:00 PST/18:00 CET.

49. In the light of the significance of the issues raised by the parties, and given the many questions prompted by those issues and by the parties' extensive written submissions and supporting materials, the Panel indicated that it would allow the hearing to continue beyond the approximately one hour originally envisaged. The hearing ultimately lasted two and one-half hours. Counsel for each party made extensive oral submissions, including rebuttal and sur-rebuttal submissions, and responded to the panelists' questions.

50. Prior to the close of the hearing each party declared that it had no objection concerning the conduct of the proceedings, that it had no further oral submissions that it wished to make, and that it considered that it had had a full opportunity to present its case and to be heard.

51. As agreed and ordered prior to the close of the hearing, the parties were provided the opportunity to file limited additional materials post-hearing, in relation to a certain question asked of them by the Panel. This was done, and, on 13 December 2014, the proceedings were declared closed.

IV. ICANN ARTICLES, BYLAWS AND POLICIES – KEY ELEMENTS

52. We set out here the key elements of ICANN's Articles of Association, Bylaws and policies on which the parties rely in their submissions and to which the Panel will refer later in this Declaration.

A. Articles of Association

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.

[Underlining added]

B. Bylaws

ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Section 1. MISSION

The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers,
and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the internet’s unique identifier systems.

[...]

Section 2. CORE VALUES

In performing its mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:

1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN’s activities to those matters within ICANN’s mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.

3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties.

4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.

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’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.
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 III: TRANSPARENCY

Section 1. PURPOSE

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.

[...]

ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 1. PURPOSE

In carrying out its mission as set out in these Bylaws, ICANN shall 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. The provisions of this Article, creating processes for reconsideration and independent review of ICANN actions and periodic review of ICANN's structure and procedures, are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article III and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws.

Section 2. RECONSIDERATION

1. ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action of ICANN may request review or reconsideration of that action by the Board.

2. Any person or entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that he, she, or it have 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. The Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The Board Governance Committee shall have the authority to:

   a. evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;
b. summarily dismiss insufficient requests;

c. evaluate requests for urgent consideration;

d. conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

e. request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;

f. make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the Board of Directors; and

g. make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary.

[...]

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.

2. 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 causally connected to the Board’s alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board’s action.

3. A request for independent review must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting (and the accompanying Board Briefing Materials, if available) that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation. Consolidated requests may be appropriate when the causal connection between the circumstances of the requests and the harm is the same for each of the requesting parties.

4. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel"), which shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the 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 [ICANN]?

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:
a. summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious;

b. request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other parties;

c. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and

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;

e. consolidate requests for independent review if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar; and

f. determine the timing for each proceeding.

[...]

14. Prior to initiating a request for independent review, the complainant is urged to enter into a period of cooperative engagement with ICANN for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. [...]

15. Upon the filing of a request for an independent review, the parties are urged to participate in a conciliation period for the purpose of narrowing the issues that are stated within the request for independent review. A conciliator will be appointed from the members of the omnibus standing panel by the Chair of that panel. [...]

16. Cooperative engagement and conciliation are both voluntary. However, if the party requesting the independent review does not participate in good faith in the cooperative engagement and the conciliation processes, if applicable, and ICANN is the prevailing party in the request for independent review, the IRP Panel must award to ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the proceeding, including legal fees.

[...]

18. The IRP Panel should strive to issue its written declaration no later than six months after the filing of the request for independent review. The IRP Panel shall make its declaration based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its declaration shall specifically designate the prevailing party. The party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the IRP Provider, but in an extraordinary case the IRP Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest. Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses.

[Underlining added]

53. Lest there be any misunderstanding as regards the proper subject matter of IRP proceedings or the role of the Panel, we note that, as was clearly established during the hearing, it is common ground between the parties that the term "action" (or "actions") as used in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws is to be understood as action(s) or inaction(s) by the ICANN Board. The Panel observes that this understanding comports not only with the provisions of Article
IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws concerning “Reconsideration”, which expressly refer to “actions or inactions of the ICANN Board”, but with the clear intent of Section 3 itself, which stipulates at sub-section 11 that “[t]he IRP Panel shall have the authority to: … (c) declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.”

C. The gTLD Applicant Guidebook

54. As noted above and as understood by all, the Guidebook is (to borrow Booking.com’s phrase) “the crystallization of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.”

55. The Guidebook is divided into “Modules”, each of which contains various sections and subsections. The three Modules of primary relevance here are Modules 1, 2 and 4. Module 1, titled “Introduction to the gTLD Application Process,” provides an “overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domains.” Module 2, titled “Evaluation Procedures,” describes the “evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation.” Module 4, titled “String Contention Procedures,” concerns “situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.”

(i) Initial Evaluation

56. As explained in Module 1, “[i]mmediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness.” Initial Evaluation begins “immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation.”

57. Initial Evaluation is comprised of two main elements or types or review: string review, which concerns the applied-for gTLD string; and applicant review, which concerns the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services. It is the first of these – string review, including more specifically the component known as string similarity review – that is particularly relevant.

(ii) String Review, including String Similarity Review

58. String review is itself comprised of several components, each of which constitutes a separate assessment or review of the applied-for gTLD string, conducted by a separate reviewing body or panel. As explained in Module 2:

The following assessments are performed in the Initial Evaluation:

---

37 Request, ¶ 13.
39 Module 2-2.
40 Guidebook, §1.1.2.2: “Administrative Completeness Check”, Module 1-5.
41 Guidebook, §1.1.2.5: “Initial Evaluation”, Module 1-8 (underlining added).
- String Reviews
  - String similarity
  - Reserved names
  - DNS stability
  - Geographic names

[...]

An application must pass all these reviews to pass the Initial Evaluation. Failure to pass any one of these reviews will result in a failure to pass the Initial Evaluation.\(^{42}\)

59. As indicated, all complete applications are subject to Initial Evaluation, which means that all applied-for gTLD strings are subject to string review. String review is further described in Module 2 as follows:

[String review] focuses on the applied-for gTLD string to test:

- Whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion;
- Whether the applied-for gTLD string might adversely affect DNS security or stability; and
- Whether evidence of requisite government approval is provided in the case of certain geographic names.\(^{43}\)

60. The various assessments or reviews (i.e., string similarity, reserved names, DNS stability, etc.) that comprise string review are elaborated at Section 2.2.1 of Module 2. As mentioned, the most relevant of these reviews for our purposes is string similarity review, which is described in detail at Section 2.2.1.1. Because of the central importance of the string similarity review process in the context of the present dispute, this section of the Guidebook is reproduced here at some length:

### 2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

This review involves a preliminary comparison of each applied-for gTLD string against existing TLDs, Reserved Names (see subsection 2.2.1.2), and other applied-for strings. The objective of this review is to prevent user confusion and loss of confidence in the DNS resulting from delegation of many similar strings.

Note: In this Applicant Guidebook, "similar" means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

\(^{42}\) Module 2-2. The same is true of applicant review, which is also comprised of various assessments concerning the applicant entity.

\(^{43}\) Guidebook, §2.2: "Initial Evaluation", Module 2-4 (underlining added). See also Module 1-9: "String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS ..."
The visual similarity check that occurs during Initial Evaluation is intended to augment the objection and dispute resolution process (see Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures) that addresses all types of similarity.

This similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel.

2.2.1.1 Reviews Performed

The String Similarity Panel’s task is to identify visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.

The panel performs this task of assessing similarities that would lead to user confusion in four sets of circumstances, when comparing:

[...]

• Applied-for gTLD strings against other applied-for gTLD strings;

[...]

Similarity to Other Applied-for gTLD Strings (String Contention Sets) – All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed against one another to identify any similar strings. In performing this review, the String Similarity Panel will create contention sets that may be used in later stages of evaluation.

A contention set contains at least two applied-for strings identical or similar to one another. Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for more information on contention sets and contention resolution.

[...]

2.2.1.2 Review Methodology

The String Similarity Panel is informed in part by an algorithmic score for the visual similarity between each applied-for string and each of other existing and applied-for TLDs and reserved names. The score will provide one objective measure for consideration by the panel, as part of the process of identifying strings likely to result in user confusion. In general, applicants should expect that a higher visual similarity score suggests a higher probability that the application will not pass the String Similarity review. However, it should be noted that the score is only indicative and that the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the Panel’s judgment.

The algorithm, user guidelines, and additional background information are available to applicants for testing and informational purposes. [footnote in the original: See http://icann.word-group.com/algorithm] Applicants will have the ability to test their strings and obtain algorithmic results through the application system prior to submission of an application.

[...]

The panel will examine all the algorithm data and perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion. In cases of strings in scripts not yet supported by the algorithm, the panel’s assessment process is entirely manual.
The panel will use a common standard to test for whether string confusion exists, as follows:

**Standard for String Confusion** – String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For the likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

An application that fails the String Similarity review due to similarity to an existing TLD will not pass the Initial Evaluation, and no further reviews will be available. Where an application does not pass the String Similarity review, the applicant will be notified as soon as the review is completed.

An application for a string that is found too similar to another applied-for gTLD string will be placed in a contention set.44

[Underlining added]

61. Module 4 of the Guidebook, as mentioned, concerns "situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases." As explained in Module 4:

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or

2. Two or more applicants for similar gTLD strings successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes, and the similarity of the strings is identified as creating a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated.

ICANN will not approve applications for proposed gTLD strings that are identical or that would result in user confusion, called contending strings. If either situation above occurs, such applications will proceed to contention resolution through either community priority evaluation, in certain cases, or through an auction. Both processes are described in this module. A group of applications for contending strings is referred to as a contention set.

---

44 Module 2-5 to 2-9. As regards the concept of string contention, see also Guidebook, §1.1.2.10: "String Contention", Module 1-13: "String contention applies only when there is more than one qualified application for the same or similar gTLD strings. String contention refers to the scenario in which there is more than one qualified application for the identical gTLD string or for similar gTLD strings. In this Applicant Guidebook, "similar" means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone."
(In this Applicant Guidebook, "similar" means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.)

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

Contention sets are groups of applications containing identical or similar applied-for gTLD strings. Contention sets are identified during Initial Evaluation, following review of all applied-for gTLD strings. ICANN will publish preliminary contention sets once the String Similarity review is completed, and will update the contention sets as necessary during the evaluation and dispute resolution stages.

Applications for identical gTLD strings will be automatically assigned to a contention set.

[...]

The String Similarity Panel will also review the entire pool of applied-for strings to determine whether the strings proposed in any two or more applications are so similar that they would create a probability of user confusion if allowed to coexist in the DNS. The panel will make such a determination for each pair of applied-for gTLD strings. The outcome of the String Similarity review described in Module 2 is the identification of contention sets ...

[...]

As described elsewhere in this guidebook, cases of contention might be resolved by community priority evaluation [NB: community priority evaluation applies only to so-called "community" applications; it is not relevant here] or an agreement among the parties. Absent that, the last-resort contention resolution mechanism will be an auction.

[...]

62. As provided in Module 4, the two methods relevant to resolving a contention such as between .hotels and .hoteis are self-resolution (i.e., an agreement between the two applicants for the contending strings) and auction:

4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention. This may occur at any stage of the process, once ICANN publicly posts the applications received and the preliminary contention sets on its website.

Applicants may resolve string contention in a manner whereby one or more applicants withdraw their applications.

[...]

4.3 Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort

It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.
63. Module 5 of the Guidebook, titled *Transition to Delegation*, describes ‘the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.” Section 5.1 states:

> ICANN's Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program. The Board reserves the right to individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community. Under exceptional circumstances, the Board may individually consider a gTLD application. For example, the Board might individually consider an application as a result of GAC Advice on New gTLDs or of the use of an ICANN accountability mechanism."\(^6\)

[Underlining added]

V. SUMMARY OF THE PARTIES' POSITIONS

64. The following brief summary of the parties’ respective positions is provided with a view solely to assisting the reader to understand the present Declaration. It is not intended to recapitulate – and it does not recapitulate – the entirety of the parties’ allegations and arguments. Additional references to the parties’ positions, including submissions made by them in the course of the proceedings, are contained in the discussion at Part VI below.

A. Booking.com’s position

(i) The Panel’s Authority

65. Booking.com submits that the mandate of the Panel is “to determine whether the contested actions of the ICANN Board are consistent with applicable rules.”\(^7\) According to Booking.com:

> The set of rules against which the actions of the ICANN Board must be assessed includes: (i) ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws – both of which must be interpreted in light of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments, and both of which require compliance with inter alia international law and generally accepted good governance principles – and (ii) secondary rules created by ICANN, such as the Applicant Guidebook. In setting up, implementing and supervising its policies and processes, the Board must comply with the fundamental principles embodied in these rules. That obligation includes a duty to ensure compliance with its obligations to act in good faith, transparently, fairly, and in a manner that is non-discriminatory and ensures due process.\(^6\)

\(^{45}\) Module 5-2.

\(^{46}\) Module 5-4.

\(^{47}\) Reply, ¶ 3.

\(^{48}\) Reply, ¶ 3.
66. Booking.com submits that IRP panels have broad authority to evaluate actions of the ICANN Board. An overly restrictive interpretation of the standard of review, such as proposed by ICANN in these proceedings, would, says Booking.com, "fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN’s commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability, as required by Article 9.1 of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments and ICANN’s core values."\textsuperscript{49}

(ii) Booking.com’s Claims

67. The purpose of the IRP initiated by Booking.com is, in its own words, “to challenge the ICANN Board’s handling of Booking.com’s application for the new gTLD .hotels.”\textsuperscript{50} This includes the determination of the SSP to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention and the refusal of the Board (and its committees) to revise that determination. Elsewhere in its submissions, Booking.com makes an even broader claim; it asserts that it challenges the conduct of the ICANN Board in relation to what Booking.com refers to as the setting up, implementation, supervision and review of the entire of string similarity review process, and the Board’s alleged failure “to ensure due process and to respect its fundamental obligations to ensure good faith, transparency, fairness and non-discrimination” throughout.\textsuperscript{51}

68. In effect, Booking.com’s specific claims can be divided into two broad categories: claims related to the string similarity review process generally; and claims related to the particular case of .hotels.

69. Booking.com professes that this case “is not about challenging a decision on the merits [i.e., the decision to place .hotels in contention]”; it is about “ICANN’s failure to respect fundamental [procedural] rights and principles in handling New gTLD applications, in particular in the context of String Similarity Review.”\textsuperscript{52}

70. Booking.com also repeatedly emphasizes – and this is crucial – that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the process as set out in the Guidebook. Rather, as indicated, it contests “the way in which that process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board.”\textsuperscript{53} Equally crucial, as will be seen, is Booking.com’s acknowledgment that the established process was followed in the case of the review of .hotels.

a. The string similarity review process

71. According to Booking.com, the problem began when the ICANN Board failed to “provide transparency in the SSP selection process,” in particular by failing “to make clear how

\textsuperscript{49} Reply, ¶ 6.
\textsuperscript{50} Reply, ¶ 7.
\textsuperscript{51} Reply, ¶ 15.
\textsuperscript{52} Reply, ¶ 14.
\textsuperscript{53} Reply, ¶ 17.
[ICANN] would evaluate candidate responses or how it ultimately did so. The problem was compounded by the selection of ICC/University College London to perform string similarity reviews as the independent SSP. In Booking.com’s words:

[The identities of the unsuccessful candidates (if any) to perform the String Similarity Review remain unknown. Applicants have never been given any information in relation to the candidate responses that were submitted. ... There is no indication that any other candidate expressed an interest in performing the String Similarity Review. No information has been provided as to the steps (if any) taken by ICANN to reach out to other potential candidates. Numerous questions remain: How did ICANN deal with the situation if there was only one (or only a very few) respondent(s) wishing to perform the String Similarity Review? How did this impact on the discussions with InterConnect Communications? What are the terms of ICANN’s contract with InterConnect Communications?]56

72. Booking.com also faults ICANN for “allowing the appointed SSP to develop and perform an unfair and arbitrary review process”, specifically, by allowing the SSP “to perform the String Similarity Review (i) without any (documented) plan or methodology ... (ii) without providing any transparency regarding the evaluators or the evaluation criteria ... and (iii) without informing applicants of its reasoning ....”56

73. Among other things, Booking.com takes ICANN to task for establishing and posting the SSP Process Description and the SSP Manager’s Letter (see Part III.C above) only long after the string similarity review process had ended.57

74. It also alleges that the factors identified in the SSP Manager’s Letter are “arbitrary and baseless ... not supported by any methodology capable of producing compelling and defensible conclusions ... [which] has allowed applications with at least equally serious visual string similarity concerns – such as .parts/.paris, .maif/.mail, .ruf/.rul, .voto/volo and .date/data ... – to proceed while singling out .hotels/hoteis.”58 According to Booking.com: “The failure to take actual human performance into account is at odds with the standard for assessment, i.e., the likelihood of confusion on the part of the average Internet user. Hence, the approach is directly contrary to ICANN’s own policy.”59

75. Booking.com further contends that the SSP process is unfair and non-transparent due to the fact that the identity of SSP members has never been publicly disclosed.55

76. Further, Booking.com argues that the process is unfair, non-transparent and arbitrary – and thus violates ICANN policy – for failing to provide for a “well-documented rationale” for each

54 Reply, ¶ 20.
55 Reply, ¶ 20.
56 Reply, ¶ 23.
57 Reply, ¶ 24.
58 Reply, ¶ 25.
59 Reply, ¶ 25.
60 Reply, ¶ 26-27.
SSP determination. In the absence of reasons for each string similarity determination, says Booking.com, "there is no basis on which decisions can be evaluated and, where appropriate, challenged."61

77. Another ground for Booking.com’s challenge is the alleged failure by the ICANN Board to providing "effective supervision or quality control" of the SSP: "If nobody but the evaluator has any insight into how the evaluation was carried out, no effective quality control can be performed."62 Nor, according to Booking.com, does the quality review of the SSP’s work supposedly performed by JAS Advisers (the independent consultant engaged by ICANN for this purpose) overcome the problem of a lack of transparency:

Booking.com is not aware that any selection process was put in place in relation to the appointment of JAS Advisors to perform the String Similarity Review quality control. No criteria for performing the quality control were published. When ICANN was looking for evaluators, no call for expressions of interest or similar document was issued for the selection of quality controllers.63

78. In any case, says Booking.com, the "quality control review over a random sampling of applications to, among other things, test whether the process [set out in the Guidebook] was followed," which ICANN claims was performed on the SSP’s work,64 could not provide adequate quality control of the string similarity review process.65 Finally, Booking.com argues that the arbitrary and unfair result of the string similarity review concerning .hotels – i.e., the decision to place .hotels and .hotelis in contention – demonstrates that, "whatever quality control review ICANN may have engaged in ...must therefore have been deficient."66

b. **The case of .hotels**

79. Booking.com argues, in part on the basis of expert evidence which it adduces in this IRP proceeding,67 that "[t]here is no probability of user confusion if both .hotels and .hotelis were delegated as gTLD strings into the Internet root zone ... The SSP could not have reasonably found that the average reasonable Internet user is likely to be confused between the two strings."68 It continues:

---

61 Reply, ¶ 28-29.
62 Reply, ¶ 30.
63 Reply, ¶ 31. Booking.com states that it “doubts” that any quality review was in fact performed, whether by JAS Advisers or any other entity.
64 Response, ¶ 30.
65 Reply, ¶ 34.
66 Reply, ¶ 38.
67 Request, Annex 20, Expert Report of Prof. Dr. Piet Desmet of the Faculty of Arts, Department of Linguistics of Leuven University, dated 10 March 2014. Portions of the work underlying Prof. Desmet’s report were performed by Dr. Emmanuel Keuleers, Research Fellow in the Department of Experimental Psychology at Ghent University.
68 Request, ¶ 58.
Since .hotels and .hoteis are not confusingly similar, the determination that they are is contradictory to ICANN policy as established in the Applicant Guidebook. Acceptance of the determination, and repeated failure to remedy the wrongful determination, is a failure to act with due diligence and independent judgment, and a failure to neutrally and fairly apply established policies as required by Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation.69

80. According to Booking.com, the Board should have acted to overturn the determination of the SSP either in the context of the Request for Reconsideration or under the authority accorded it by Module 5-4 of the Guidebook to “individually consider a gTLD application”.70

81. Booking.com claims that its DIDP Request alerted the Board to the need to intervene to “correct the errors in the process” related to .hotels, and that its Request for Reconsideration of the SSP determination further informed the Board of the many errors in the SSP’s review of .hotels, “giving the Board ample opportunity to correct those errors.”71 Booking.com claims that the Board’s failure, when responding to the DIDP Request, “to offer any insight into the SSP’s reasoning”, its refusal to reconsider and overturn the SSP determination regarding .hotels on the sole ground (says Booking.com) that “the Reconsideration process is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of evaluation panels”, and its failure to investigate Booking.com’s complaints of a lack of fairness and transparency in the SSP process, constitute violations of ICANN’s governing rules regarding string similarity review.72

82. According to Booking.com, among the most compelling evidence of ICANN’s failure in this regard are the statements made on the record by several members of the NGPC during its 10 September 2013 meeting at which Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied.73 Given the importance that the Panel attaches to these statements, they are addressed in some detail in the Analysis in Part VI, below.

83. In its written submissions Booking.com asks the Panel to grant the following relief:

Finding that ICANN breached its Articles of Incorporation, its Bylaws, and the gTLD Applicant Guidebook;

Requiring that ICANN reject the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar and disregard the resulting contention set;

Awarding Booking.com its costs in this proceeding; and

69 Request, ¶ 59.
70 Reply, ¶ 39.
71 Reply, ¶ 41.
72 Reply, ¶ 41. In the passage of Booking.com’s submissions referred to here (as elsewhere), Booking.com speaks of violations of ICANN’s obligations of “due process”, which, it says, comprise concepts such as the right to be heard, the right to receive reasons for decisions, publicity, etc. For reasons explained in Part VI, below, the Panel prefers to use the terms fairness and transparency to connote the essence of ICANN’s obligations under review in this IRP.
73 See Part II.C, above.
Awarding such other relief as the Panel may find appropriate or Booking.com may request.

84. At the hearing Booking.com further requested that the Panel not only require ICANN to disregard the SSP determination regarding .hotels/.hoteis, but also order ICANN to "delegate both .hotels and .hoteis."

B. ICANN’s position

85. ICANN’s position is best summed up by ICANN itself:

Booking.com’s IRP Request is really about Booking.com’s disagreement with the merits of the String Similarity Panel’s conclusion that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar. But the Panel’s determination does not constitute Board action, and the Independent Review Process is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of an independent evaluation panel. The IRP Panel is tasked only with comparing contested actions of the ICANN Board to ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation; it is not within the IRP Panel’s mandate to evaluate whether the String Similarity Panel’s conclusion that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar was wrong.74

86. According to ICANN, the Board “did exactly what it was supposed to do under its Bylaws, its Articles of Incorporation, and the Guidebook.”75

(i) The Panel’s Authority

87. Throughout its submissions ICANN repeatedly stresses what it says is the very limited authority enjoyed by IRP panels.

88. As provided in Article IV, Section 3(4) of ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN observes that this Panel (as all IRP panels) is charged only with “comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.”76

89. ICANN notes that, in undertaking this compare-and-declare mission, the Panel is further constrained to apply the very specific “standard of review” set out in Bylaw Article IV, Section 3(4), which requires the Panel to focus on three particular questions: “did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?”; “did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?”; and “did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?”77

74 Response, ¶ 9.
75 Response, ¶ 8. Both parties agree that, as submitted by Booking.com, the “rules” at issue, against which the conduct of the ICANN Board is to be assessed, include the relevant provisions of the Guidebook.
76 See for example Response, ¶ 2, ¶ 9.
77 Response, ¶ 2.
90. ICANN further asserts that the IRP process "is not available as a mechanism to challenge the actions or inactions of ICANN staff or third parties that may be involved in ICANN activities,"\(^{76}\) such as the action of the SSP which resulted in .hotels and .hoteis being placed in contention. Nor, says ICANN, may the IRP process be used as an "appeal mechanism" by which to overturn substantive decisions – such as the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly visually similar – with which an applicant may disagree.\(^{79}\)

91. In this regard ICANN states that the affirmative relief sought by Booking.com – specifically, a declaration requiring that ICANN "reject the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar and disregard the resulting contention set" and (as requested at the hearing) that ICANN "delegate both .hotels and .hoteis" – exceeds the authority of the Panel.\(^{80}\)

(ii) ICANN’s Response to Booking.com’s Claims

a. The string similarity review process

92. According to ICANN, "[e]arly on in the iterations of the Guidebook, it was determined that, in the initial evaluation stage, the String Similarity Panel would only examine strings for visual confusion," and "[i]f applied-for strings are determined to so nearly resemble each other visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion, the string will be placed in a contention set, which is then resolved pursuant to the contention set resolution processes in Module 4 of the Guidebook."\(^{81}\)

93. According to ICANN, it was also determined early on that, as stated in Section 2.2.1.1 of the Guidebook, "[t]his similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel," not by ICANN itself. ICC was duly selected to perform the string similarity review further to "an open and public request for proposals," pursuant to which, as the successful bidder, "ICC was responsible for the development of its own process documents and methodology for performing the String Similarity Review consistent with the provisions of the Guidebook."\(^{82}\) ICANN emphasizes that "the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or anyone else) may conduct a substantive review of ICC’s results."\(^{83}\)

94. In ICANN’s submission, the alternative proposed by Booking.com, that “the ICANN Board – and the ICANN Board alone – was obligated to perform the String Similarity Review for the more than 1,900 new gTLD applications submitted,” is "untenable and is not supported by ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles."\(^{84}\) As noted by ICANN, the Guidebook defines six distinct

---

\(^{76}\) Response, ¶ 3.

\(^{79}\) Response, ¶ 49.

\(^{80}\) Response, ¶ 55.

\(^{81}\) Response, ¶ 15 (underlining in original).

\(^{82}\) Response, ¶ 16.

\(^{83}\) Response, ¶ 17.

\(^{84}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 7.
review processes that every gTLD application is required to go through, including string similarity review; each of those review processes was conducted by independent experts specifically engaged by ICANN staff for the purpose.

95. ICANN submits that "there simply is no requirement – under ICANN’s governing documents or imposed by law – that would mandate that the ICANN Board inject itself into the day-to-day affairs of the evaluation process in the manner Booking.com proposes." It asserts that, consistent with well-settled legal principles, "neither ICANN’s Bylaws, nor the Articles, nor the Guidebook requires the ICANN Board to conduct any analysis of the decisions of third party experts retained to evaluate string similarity." Moreover, ICANN asserts that "[s]imply because the ICANN Board has the discretion [under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook] to consider individual applications does not mean it is required to do so or that it should do so, particularly at an initial evaluation stage."

97. ICANN claims that that Booking.com’s repeated invocation of the Board’s so-called obligation to ensure “due process” in the administration of the New gTLD Program is misplaced. First, neither applicable California law nor any provision of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook “specifically affords any gTLD applicant a right to procedural ‘due process’ similar to that which is afforded in courts of law.” Second, because ICANN conducts its activities in the public interest it nevertheless provides “more opportunity for parties to be heard and to dispute actions taken” than most private corporate entities. Third, the “decision to proceed with the New gTLD Program followed many years of discussion, debate and deliberation within the ICANN community, including participation from end users, civil society, technical experts, business groups, governments and others.” Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, “ICANN adhered to the policies and procedures articulated in its Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the Guidebook, the latter of which was adopted only after being publicly vetted with ICANN’s stakeholders and the broader Internet community.”

98. ICANN’s response to Booking.com’s various allegations regarding particular elements of the string similarity review process – including for example the selection of the SSP, the publication of the SSP’s methodology, the anonymity of the individuals SSP members, the supposed lack of quality control – is essentially three-fold: first, the actions challenged by Booking.com are *not* Board actions, but actions of ICANN staff or third parties, which cannot...
be challenged by means of IRP proceedings; second, in any case, Booking.com’s claims are factually incorrect, and there has been no violation of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook; third, Booking.com’s claims are time-barred given that Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws requires that IRP requests “must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting … that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation.”92

b. The case of .hotels

99. ICANN’s position as regards the determination to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention is similar in many respects to its position regarding the string similarity review process generally. ICANN argues that the Board played no role whatsoever in performing the review of .hotels; that the SSP’s determination was in any event well supported and there was no violation of applicable rules; and that the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or any other body, including an IRP panel) may conduct a substantive review of a string similarity determination.

100. In any event, ICANN asserts that .hotels and .hoteis in fact meet every one of the visual similarity criteria applied by the SSP, as set out in the SSP Manager’s Letter. Moreover, .hotels and .hoteis scored a stunning 99% for visual similarity under the publicly available SWORD algorithm which, as provided by Section 2.2.1.1.2 (Module 2-7) of the Guidebook, establishes “one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP].” According to ICANN (in response to a question posed by the Panel during the hearing), this was the highest algorithmic score among the comparison of all non-identical pairs within the 1917 new gTLD applications received by ICANN;93 the only other pair of non-exact match strings found to be confusingly visually similar – .unicom and .unicom – scored only 94%.94

101. According to ICANN, “it was not clearly ‘wrong,’ as Booking.com argues, for the [SSP] to find that .hotels/.hoteis are confusingly similar.”95

102. In conclusion, ICANN states that its conduct with respect to Booking.com’s application for .hotels, including in evaluating Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration, was fully consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, its Bylaws and the procedures established in the Guidebook; and the fact that Booking.com disagrees with the SSP’s determination to put .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set does not give rise to an IRP.

103. ICANN asks the Panel to deny Booking.com’s IRP Request.

VI. ANALYSIS

A. The Panel’s Authority

92 Sur-Reply, ¶ 20-42.
93 A number of these applications were subsequently withdrawn.
94 Identical pairs, of course, received a score of 100% for visual similarity under the SWORD algorithm.
95 Response, ¶ 53.
104. The jurisdiction and authority of an IRP panel is expressly prescribed – and expressly limited – by the ICANN Bylaws. To recap, Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws provides:

4. [The IRP Panel] shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the 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 [ICANN]?

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

[...]

c. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and

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;

[...]

18. [...] The IRP Panel shall make its declaration based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties [...]

[Underlining added]

105. Similarly, Article 8 of the Supplementary Procedures reads:

8. Standard of Review

The IRP is subject to the following standard of review: (i) did the ICANN Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision; (ii) did the ICANN Board exercise due diligence and care in having sufficient facts in front of them; (iii) did the ICANN Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

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.

106. There is no dispute as regards the Panel's duty to compare the actions of the Board to ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (and, in this case, Guidebook) with a view to
declaring whether those actions are inconsistent with applicable policies. Where the parties disagree is with respect to the standard of review to be applied by the Panel in assessing Board conduct.

107. ICANN submits that its Bylaws "specify that a deferential standard of review be applied when evaluating the actions of the ICANN Board … the rules are clear that the appointed IRP Panel is neither asked to, nor allowed to, substitute its judgment for that of the Board." Booking.com argues that this "is simply wrong. No such specification is made in ICANN's Bylaws or elsewhere, and a restrictive interpretation of the standard of review would ... fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN's commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability."  

108. In the opinion of the Panel, there can be no question but that the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws establishing the Independent Review Process and defining the role of an IRP panel specify that the ICANN Board enjoys a large degree of discretion in its decisions and actions. So long as the Board acts without conflict of interest and with due care, it is entitled – indeed, required – to exercise its independent judgment in acting in what it believes to be the best interests of ICANN. The only substantive check on the conduct of the ICANN Board is that such conduct may not be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws – or, the parties agree, with the Guidebook. In that connection, the Panel notes that Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws also clearly states that in exercising its judgment, the Board (indeed "[a]ny ICANN body making a recommendation or decision") shall itself "determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand."

109. In other words, in making decisions the Board is required to conduct itself reasonably in what it considers to be ICANN's best interests; where it does so, the only question is whether its actions are or are not consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and, in this case, with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook.

110. There is also no question but that the authority of an IRP panel to compare contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and to declare whether the Board has acted consistently with the Articles and Bylaws, does not extend to opining on the nature of those instruments. Nor, in this case, does our authority extend to opining on the nature of the policies or procedures established in the Guidebook. In this regard it is recalled that Booking.com itself repeatedly stresses that it does not contest the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook, but merely whether ICANN's actions were consistent with various elements of that process. Stated differently, our role in this IRP includes assessing whether the applicable rules – in this case, the rules regarding string similarity review – were followed, not whether such rules are appropriate or advisable.

111. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the IRP Panel may only review ICANN Board actions or inactions under the deferential standard advocated by ICANN in these proceedings. Rather, as explained below, the IRP Panel is charged with "objectively" determining whether

96 Response, ¶ 24.
97 Reply, ¶6.
or not the Board’s actions are in fact consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook, which the Panel understands as requiring that the Board’s conduct be appraised independently, and without any presumption of correctness.

112. In the only other IRP of which the Panel is aware in which such questions were addressed in a published decision, the distinguished members of the IRP panel had this to say about the role of an IRP panel, and the applicable standard of review, in appraising Board action:

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers is a not-for profit corporation established under the law of the State of California. That law embodies the ‘business judgment rule’. Section 309 of the California Corporations Code provides that a director must act ‘in good faith, in a manner such director believes to be in the best interests of the corporation and its shareholders...’ and shields from liability directors who follow its provisions. However ICANN is no ordinary non-profit California corporation. The Government of the United States vested regulatory authority of vast dimension and pervasive global reach in ICANN. In recognition of the fact that the Internet is an international network of networks, owned by no single nation, individual or organization -- including ICANN -- ICANN is charged with ‘promoting the global public interest in the operational stability of the Internet...’ ICANN 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...’ Thus, while a California corporation, it is governed particularly by the terms of its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as the law of California allows. Those Articles and Bylaws, which require ICANN to carry out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law, do not specify or imply that the international [sic] Review Process provided for shall (or shall not) accord deference to the decisions of the ICANN Board. The fact that the Board is empowered to exercise its judgment in the application of ICANN’s sometimes competing core values does not necessarily import that that judgment must be treated deferentially by the IRP. In the view of the Panel, the judgments of the ICANN Board are to be reviewed and appraised by the Panel objectively, not deferentially. The business judgment rule of the law of California, applicable to directors of California corporations, profit and nonprofit, in the case of ICANN is to be treated as a default rule that might be called upon in the absence of relevant provisions of ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws and of specific representations of ICANN... that bear on the propriety of its conduct. In the instant case, it is those Articles and Bylaws, and those representations, measured against the facts as the Panel finds them, which are determinative.98

[Underlining added.]

113. While on no way bound by that decision, we agree with its conclusions in this respect.

114. At the end of the day we fail to see any significant difference between the parties’ positions in this regard. The process is clear, and both parties acknowledge, that the Panel is tasked with determining whether or not the Board’s actions are consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Guidebook. Such a determination calls for what the panel in

98 ICDR Case No. 50 117 T 00224 08, ICM Registry, LLC v. ICANN, Declaration dated 19 February 2010 ("ICM Registry"), ¶ 136.
the ICM Registry matter called an “objective” appraisal of Board conduct as measured against the policies and rules set out in those instruments; all agree that it is the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook which are determinative.

115. That being said, we also agree with ICANN to the extent that, in determining the consistency of Board action with the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook, an "IRP Panel is neither asked to, nor allowed to, substitute its judgment for that of the Board." In other words, it is not for the Panel to opine on whether the Board could have acted differently than it did; rather, our role is to assess whether the Board’s action was consistent with applicable rules found in the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook. Nor, as stated, is it for us to purport to appraise the policies and procedures established by ICANN in the Guidebook (since, again, this IRP is not a challenge to those policies and procedures themselves99), but merely to apply them to the facts.

116. With the foregoing firmly in mind, the Panel turns now to the issues to be determined in order to resolve the present dispute.

B. The String Similarity Review Process

117. The Panel is not unsympathetic to Booking.com’s complaints regarding the string similarity review process as established by the Guidebook. There is no question but that that process lacks certain elements of transparency and certain practices that are widely associated with requirements of fairness. For example, the Guidebook provides no means for applicants to provide evidence or make submissions to the SSP (or any other ICANN body) and so be fully “heard” on the substantive question of the similarity of their applied-for gTLD strings to others.

118. Indeed, as stated at the outset of this Declaration, these observations and the concerns that they engender were voiced by several members of the ICANN Board’s New gTLD Program Committee which voted to accept the BGC’s Recommendation to deny Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration. The Panel can do no better than reproduce the statements made by the NGPC members in this respect, as recorded in the minutes of the NGPC’s 10 September 2013 meeting.100

99 As discussed in more detail in the following section (at para. 117 and following) and again at Part IV of this Declaration, the important questions that Booking.com highlights in its pleadings, as to whether the string similarity review process is consistent with ICANN’s guiding principles of transparency and fairness, and regarding the published views of various members of ICANN’s NGPC in this respect, are matters which the ICANN Board, in its discretion, may wish to consider on its own motion in the context of the present case, in accordance with its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook, or when it issues the Guidebook for round two of the New gTLD Program. Those questions include a lack of clarity surrounding the way in which the string similarity review is conducted by the SSP, and the absence of any means for applicants to be heard in the string similarity review process where they may have evidence to adduce or arguments to make (such as the evidence and arguments presented by Booking.com to this Panel), which could in fact be relevant to the SSP’s determination.

100 Request, Annex 16.
Mr. George Sadowski stated his intention to abstain from the vote because, although "he understood that the BGC did the right thing, [he] thought the end result that was contrary to ICANN's ... and the user's best interests."

Ms. Olga Madruga-Forti also stated her intention to abstain from voting on the BGC recommendation "because there was not sufficient rationale provided for why the string similarity review panel made its determination."

In response to a comment by the Chair that the Request for Reconsideration deserved to be denied "[b]ecause the process was followed," Mr. Ray Plzak "agreed that the process was followed, but noted that the process needs to be reviewed to potentially add a mechanism that would allow persons who don't agree with the outcome to make an objection, other than using a Reconsideration Request."

Mr. Plzak "recommended the Committee send a strong signal to the BGC, or adopt a resolution recommending that the BGC consider development of a different mechanism to provide an avenue for the community to appeal the outcome of a decision based on the merits."

Ms. Madruga-Forti agreed and "recommended that in the future a remand or appeals mechanism may help alleviate the concerns noted."

Mr. Bill Graham also agreed with Mr. Plzak's suggestion, and noted that "generally, there is a considerable level of discomfort and dissatisfaction with the process as expressed by Committee members."

The Chair "agreed with [Mr. Graham's] sentiment."

The General Counsel and Secretary noted that ICANN ... "has tried to encourage more use of the ombudsman, or other accountability mechanisms for these types of concerns."

119. Ultimately, five members of the NGPC voted in favour of the resolution accepting the BGC's Recommendation; two members were unavailable to vote; and four members abstained. The abstaining members offered the following voting statements:

- Mr. Plzak stated that he abstained from voting "because he is disappointed in what is being done to remedy the situation. [He] would like to see more resolve to fix the process."

- Ms. Madruga-Forti stated that:

> [T]he BGC has done an appropriate job of applying a limited review standard to the application for reconsideration, but unfortunately, in this circumstance, to apply that limited review accompanied by a lack of information regarding the rationale of the string similarity review panel is not possible in a logical and fair manner. The public interest would not be served by applying the limited review standard without proper information on the basis and reasoning for the decision of the panel. In my opinion, the public interest would be better served by abstaining and continuing to explore ways to
establish a better record of the rationale of the string similarity review panel in circumstances such as this.

- Mr. Kuo-Wei Wu agreed with Ms. Madruga-Forti's and Mr. Plzak's voting statements.

- Mr. Sadowsky provided the following detailed statement:

I have a strong concern regarding the ratification of the BGC recommendation to deny the reconsideration request regarding string contention between .hotels and .hotels, and I therefore have therefore abstained when the vote on this issue was taken.

The reconsideration process is a very narrowly focused instrument, relying solely upon investigating deviations from established and agreed upon process. As such, it can be useful, but it is limited in scope. In particular, it does not address situations where process has in fact been followed, but the results of such process have been regarded, sometimes quite widely, as being contrary to what might be best for significant or all segments of the ... community and/or Internet users in general.

The rationale underlying the rejection of the reconsideration claim is essentially that the string similarity process found that there was likely to be substantial confusion between the two, and that therefore they belonged in a contention set. Furthermore, no process has been identified as having been violated and therefore there is nothing to reconsider. As a Board member who is aware of ICANN's ... Bylaws, I cannot vote against the motion to deny reconsideration. The motion appears to be correct based upon the criteria in the Bylaws that define the reconsideration process and the facts in this particular case. However, I am increasingly disturbed by the growing sequence of decisions that are based upon a criterion for user confusion that, in my opinion, is not only both incomplete and flawed, but appears to work directly against the concept that users should not be confused. I am persuaded by the argument made by the proponents of reconsideration in this case that users will in fact not be confused by .hotels and .hotels, since if they enter the wrong name, they are very likely to be immediately confronted by information in a language that they did not anticipate.

Confusion is a perceptual issue. String similarity is only one consideration in thinking about perceptual confusion and in fact it is not always an issue. In my opinion, much more perceptual confusion will arise between .hotel and .hotels than between .hotels and .hotel. Yet if we adhere strictly to the Guidebook and whatever instructions have or have not been given to string similarity experts, it is my position that we work against implementing decisions that assist in avoiding user confusion, and we work in favor of decisions that are based upon an incorrect, incomplete and flawed ex ante analysis of the ICANN Network real issues with respect to user confusion.

The goal of the string similarity process is the minimization of user confusion and ensuring user trust in using the DNS ... The string similarity exercise is one of the means in the new gTLD ... process to minimize such confusion and to strengthen user trust. In placing our emphasis, and in fact our decisions, on string similarity only, we are unwittingly substituting the means for the goal, and making decisions regarding the goal on the basis of a means test. This is a disservice to the Internet user community.

I cannot and will not vote in favor of a motion that reflects, directly or indirectly, an unwillingness to depart from what I see as such a flawed position and which does not reflect in my opinion an understanding of the current reality of the situation.
120. These statements reflect to an important degree the Panel’s own analysis.

121. The elements of the string similarity review process were established and widely published several years ago, after extensive consultation and debate among ICANN stakeholders and the Internet community. Booking.com correctly describes the process established (or “crystallized”) in the Guidebook as a component of “a consensus policy” concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.\textsuperscript{101} 

122. The Guidebook makes clear that, as part of the initial evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs are subject, each string would be reviewed for a number of factors, one of which is “string similarity”, which involves a determination of “whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion”\textsuperscript{102}. The term “user” is elaborated elsewhere in the Guidebook, which speaks of confusion arising “in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user.”\textsuperscript{103} 

123. The Guidebook explains that string similarity review comprises merely a “visual similarity check,”\textsuperscript{104} with a view to identifying only “visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.”\textsuperscript{105} 

124. The Guidebook makes clear that string similarity reviews would be conducted by an independent third party – the SSP – that would have wide (though not complete) discretion both in formulating its methodology and in determining string similarity on the basis of that methodology.

125. Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Guidebook, titled “Review Methodology”, provides that the SSP “is informed in part by an algorithmic score for ... visual similarity,” which “will provide one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP].” Section 2.2.1.1.2 further states that, in addition to “examining all the algorithm data,” the SSP will “perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion.” It is noted that the objective algorithmic score is to be treated as “only indicative”. Crucially, “the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the [SSP’s] judgment.” (Underlining added)

126. In sum, the Guidebook calls for the SSP to determine whether two strings are so “visually similar” as to create a “probability of confusion” in the mind of an “average, reasonable Internet user.” In making this determination, the SSP is informed by an “algorithmic score”, to ensure that the process comprises at least one “objective measure”. However, the algorithmic score is not determinative. The SSP also develops and performs “its own review”. At the end of the day, the determination is entirely a matter of “the [SSP’s] judgment.”

\textsuperscript{101} Request, ¶ 13.
\textsuperscript{102} Guidebook, §2.2 (Module 2-4).
\textsuperscript{103} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1.2. (Underlining added)
\textsuperscript{104} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1. (Underlining added)
\textsuperscript{105} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1. (Underlining added)
127. By its very nature this process is highly discretionary. It is also, to an important degree, subjective. The Guidebook provides no definition of "visual similarity", nor any indication of how such similarity is to be objectively measured other than by means of the SWORD algorithm. The Guidebook provides no definition of "confusion," nor any definition or description of an "average, reasonable Internet user." As Mr. Sadowski of the NGPC put it: "Confusion is a perceptual issue." (Mr. Sadowski further noted: "String similarity is only one consideration in thinking about perceptual confusion, and in fact it is not always an issue.) The Guidebook mandates the SSP to develop and apply "its own review" of visual similarity and "whether similarities rise to the level of user confusion", in addition to SWORD algorithm, which is intended to be merely "indicative", yet provides no substantive guidelines in this respect.

128. Nor does the process as it exists provide for gTLD applicants to benefit from the sort of procedural mechanisms – for example, to inform the SSP's review, to receive reasoned determinations from the SSP, or to appeal the merits of those determinations – which Booking.com claims are required under the applicable rules. Clearly, certain ICANN NGPC members themselves consider that such input would be desirable and that changes to the process are required in order for the string similarity review process to attain its true goal, which Mr. Sadowski referred to as "the minimization of user confusion and ensuring user trust in using the DNS". However, as even the abstaining members of the NGPC conceded, the fact is that the sort of mechanisms that Booking.com asserts are required (and which those NGPC members believe should be required) are simply not part of the string similarity review process as currently established. As to whether they should be, it is not our place to express an opinion, though we note that such additional mechanisms surely would be consistent with the principles of transparency and fairness.

129. We add that we agree with ICANN that the time has long since passed for Booking.com or any other interested party to ask an IRP panel to review the actions of the ICANN Board in relation to the establishment of the string similarity review process, including Booking.com's claims that specific elements of the process and the Board decisions to implement those elements are inconsistent with ICANN's Articles and Bylaws. Any such claims, even if they had any merit, are long since time-barred by the 30-day limitation period set out in Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws. As ICANN expressed during the hearing, if Booking.com believed that there were problems with the Guidebook, it should have objected at the time the Guidebook was first implemented.

130. When asked during the hearing about its failure to object timely, Booking.com argued that it could not have known how the Board's actions – that is, how the process established in the Guidebook – would affect it prior to the submission of its application for .hotels. However, that is not a persuasive or meritorious answer. As did all stakeholders, Booking.com had the opportunity to challenge the Board's adoption of the Guidebook, at the time, if it considered any of its elements to be inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

C. The Case of .hotels

131. In the light of the preceding analysis of Booking.com's challenge concerning the ICANN Board's actions in relation to the string similarity review process generally, the Panel is not
persuaded by its challenge concerning the Board's conduct in relation to the review of .hotels specifically.

132. There are two principal elements to this part of Booking.com's case: a challenge in relation to the process followed by the SSP; and a challenge in relation to the Board's handling of Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration of the SSP's determination. However, the fundamental obstacle to Booking.com's case is that the established process was followed in all respects.

133. Booking.com itself acknowledges that "the process was followed" by the SSP, which determined that .hotels and .hoteis were so visually similar as to warrant being placed in a contention set. So too did all of the NGPC members who commented on the matter recognize that "the process was followed" – for all their stated misgivings concerning the outcome of the process.

134. The same is true of the Request for Reconsideration. The Panel is struck by the extent and thoughtfulness not only of the NGPC's consideration of the issue, certain aspects of which are discussed above, but of the BGC's detailed analysis and its Recommendation to the NGPC, on the basis of which Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration was denied. Contrary to Booking.com's allegations, in neither instance was this merely a blind acceptance of a decision of a subordinate body. In fact, the reconsideration process itself, however limited and perhaps imperfect it may be, is inconsistent with Booking.com's claims of lack of "due process".

135. Although not addressed in great detail by the parties, the Panel considers several observations made by the BGC in its 1 August 2013 Recommendation to be particularly apposite:

- These standing requirements [for Requests for Reconsideration] are intended to protect the reconsideration process from abuse and to ensure that it is not used as a mechanism simply to challenge an action with which someone disagrees, but that it is limited to situations where the staff [or the Board] acted in contravention of established policies. 106

- Although the String Similarity Review was performed by a third party, ICANN has determined that the Reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges of the third party's decisions where it can be stated that either the vendor failed to follow its process in reaching the decision, or that ICANN staff failed to follow its process in accepting that decision. 107

- Booking.com does not suggest that the process for String Similarity Review set out in the Applicant Guidebook was not followed, or that ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in accepting the [SSP] decision on placing .hotels and .hoteis in contention sets. Instead, Booking.com is supplanting what it believes the review

106 BGC Recommendation, p. 2.
107 BGC Recommendation, p. 4. The BGC explains that "Because the basis for the Request is not Board conduct, regardless of whether the 20 December 2012 version, or the 11 April 2013 version, of the Reconsideration Bylaws is operative, the BGC’s analysis and recommendation below would not change."
methodology for assessing visual similarity should have been, as opposed to the methodology set out at Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook. In asserting a new review methodology, Booking.com is asking the BGC (and the Board through the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC)) to make a substantive evaluation of the confusability of the strings and to reverse the decision. In the context of the New gTLD Program, the Reconsideration process is not however intended for the Board to perform a substantive review of [SSP] decisions. While Booking.com may have multiple reasons as to why it believes that its application for .hotels should not be in contention set with .hotels, Reconsideration is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of the evaluation panels.108

- Booking.com also claims that its assertions regarding the non-confusability of the .hotels and .hotels strings demonstrate that “it is contrary to ICANN policy to put them in a contention set.” (Request, pages 6-7.) This is just a differently worded attempt to reverse the decision of the [SSP]. No actual policy or process is cited by Booking.com, only the suggestion that – according to Booking.com – the standards within the Applicant Guidebook on visual similarity should have resulted in a different outcome for the .hotels string. This is not enough for Reconsideration.109

- Booking.com argues that the contention set decision was taken without material information, including Booking.com’s linguistic expert’s opinion, or other “information that would refute the mistaken contention that there is likely to be consumer confusion between ‘.hotels’ and ‘.hotels.'” (Request, page 7.) However, there is no process point in the String Similarity Review for applicants to submit additional information. This is in stark contrast to the reviews set out in Section 2.2.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, including the Technical/Operational review and the Financial Review, which allow for the evaluators to seek clarification or additional information through the issuance of clarifying questions. (AGB, Section 2.2.2.3 [Evaluation Methodology]).110

- Just as the process does not call for additional applicant inputs into the visual similarity review, Booking.com’s call for further information on the decision to place .hotels and .hotels in a contention set ... is similarly not rooted in any established ICANN process at issue. [...] While applicants may avail themselves of accountability mechanism to challenge decisions, the use of an accountability mechanism when there is no proper ground to bring a request for review under the selected mechanism does not then provide opportunity for additional substantive review of decisions already taken.111

- While we understand the impact that Booking.com faces by being put in a contention set, and that it wishes for more narrative information regarding the [SSP’s] decision, no such narrative is called for in the process.112

- The Applicant Guidebook sets out the methodology used when evaluating visual similarity of strings. The process documentation provided by the String Similarity Review Panel describes the steps followed by the [SSP] in applying the methodology

---

108 BGC Recommendation, p. 5.
109 BGC Recommendation, p. 6.
110 BGC Recommendation, p. 6.
111 BGC Recommendation, pp. 6-7.
112 BGC Recommendation, p. 7.
set out in the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN then coordinates a quality assurance review over a random selection of [SSP's] reviews to gain confidence that the methodology and process were followed. That is the process used for a making and assessing a determination of visual similarity. Booking.com's disagreement as to whether the methodology should have resulted in a finding of visual similarity does not mean that ICANN (including the third party vendors performing String Similarity Review) violated any policy in reaching the decision (nor does it support a conclusion that the decision was actually wrong).\textsuperscript{113}

- The [SSP] reviewed all applied for strings according to the standards and methodology of the visual string similarity review set out in the Applicant Guidebook. The Guidebook clarifies that once contention sets are formed by the [SSP], ICANN will notify the applicants and will publish results on its website. (AGB, Section 2.2.1.1.1.) That the [SSP] considered its output as “advice” to ICANN (as stated in its process documentation) is not the end of the story. Whether the results are transmitted as “advice” or “outcomes” or “reports”, the important query is what ICANN was expected to do with that advice once it was received. ICANN had always made clear that it would rely on the advice of its evaluators in the initial evaluation stage of the New gTLD Program, subject to quality assurance measures. Therefore, Booking.com is actually proposing a new and different process when it suggests that ICANN should perform substantive review (instead of process testing) over the results of the String Similarity Review Panel’s outcomes prior to the finalization of contention sets.\textsuperscript{114}

- As there is no indication that either the [SSP] or ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in reaching or accepting the decision on the placement of .hotels and .hoteis in a non-exact contention set, this Request should not proceed.\textsuperscript{115}

136. These excerpts of the BGC Recommendation not only illustrate the seriousness with which Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was heard, they mirror considerations to which we fully subscribe and which we find apply as well, with equal force and effect, in the context of Booking.com’s IRP Request.

137. It simply cannot be said – indeed, it is not even alleged by Booking.com – that the established process was not followed by the ICANN Board or any third party either in the initial string similarity review of .hotels or in the reconsideration process.

138. Booking.com was asked at the hearing to identify with particularity the ICANN Board’s actions (including inactions) in this case that it claims are inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Guidebook and regarding which it asks the Panel to render a declaration. It identified four:

- The Board’s adoption of certain provisions of the Guidebook, including the allegedly ill-defined, unfair and non-transparent procedures for selecting the SSP and supervising the SSP’s performance of the string similarity review process. As discussed, any claims in this regard are time-barred.

\textsuperscript{113} BGC Recommendation, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{114} BGC Recommendation, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{115} BGC Recommendation, p. 10.
• The Board's acceptance of the SSP determination. As ICANN argues, there was no action (or inaction) by the Board here, no decision made (or not made) by the Board or any other body to accept the SSP's determination. The Guidebook provides that applied-for strings "will be placed in contention set" where the SSP determines the existence of visual similarity likely to give rise to user confusion. Simply put, under the Guidebook the Board is neither required nor entitled to intervene at this stage to accept or not accept the SSP's determination. Booking.com is correct that the Board could nevertheless have stepped in and reversed the SSP determination under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook, but did not do so; that inaction is addressed below.

• The Board's denial of Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration. As discussed above, there is nothing in the evidence that even remotely suggests that ICANN's conduct in this regard was inconsistent with its Articles, Bylaws or the Guidebook. On the contrary, we have already stated that the detailed analysis performed by the BGC and the extensive consideration of the BGC Recommendation by the NGCP undermine any claim that ICANN failed to exercise due care and independent judgment, or that its handling of the Request for Reconsideration was inconsistent with applicable rules or policy. As discussed above, just as in the present IRP, the question in the reconsideration process is whether the established process was followed. This was the question that the BGC and NGPC asked themselves in considering Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration, and which they properly answered in the affirmative in denying Booking.com's request.

• The Board's refusal to "step in" and exercise its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook to "individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the internet community." As pointed out by ICANN during the hearing, the fact that the ICANN Board enjoys such discretion and may choose to exercise it any time does not mean that it is bound to exercise it, let alone at the time and in the manner demanded by Booking.com. In any case, the Panel does not believe that the Board's inaction in this respect was inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or indeed with ICANN's guiding principles of transparency and fairness, given (1) Booking.com's concession that the string similarity review process was followed; (2) the indisputable conclusion that any challenge to the adoption of the SSP process itself is time-barred; (3) the manifestly thoughtful consideration given to Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration by the BGC; and (4), the fact that, notwithstanding its protestations to the contrary, Booking.com's real dispute seems to be with the process itself rather than how the process was applied in this case (given that, as noted, Booking.com concedes that the process was indeed followed).

139. The Panel further considers that these – in addition to any and all other potential (and allegedly reviewable) actions identified by Booking.com during the course of these proceedings – fail on the basis of Booking.com's dual acknowledgement that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process, and that that process was duly followed in this case.
140. Finally, the panel notes that Booking.com’s claim – largely muted during the hearing – regarding alleged “discrimination” as regards the treatment of its application for .hotels also founders on the same ground. Booking.com acknowledges that the established string similarity review process was followed; and there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that .hotels was treated any differently than any other applied-for gTLD string in this respect. The mere fact that the result of the string similarity review of .hotels differed from the results of the reviews of the vast majority of other applied-for strings does not suggest discriminatory treatment. In any event, the Panel cannot but note the obvious, which is that .hotels is not alone in having been placed in contention by the SSP. So too was .hoteis; and so too were .unicom and .unicorn. Moreover, and once again, it is recalled that Booking.com does not claim to challenge the merits of the string similarity review, that is, the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are so visually similar as to warrant placement in a contention set.

D. Conclusion

141. In launching this IRP, Booking.com no doubt realized that it faced an uphill battle. The very limited nature of IRP proceedings is such that any IRP applicant will face significant obstacles in establishing that the ICANN Board acted inconsistently with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. In fact, Booking.com acknowledges those obstacles, albeit inconsistently and at times indirectly.

142. Booking.com purports to challenge “the way in which the [string similarity review] process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board”; yet it also claims that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook. It asks the Panel to overturn the SSP’s determination in this case and to substitute an alternate result, in part on the basis of its own “expert evidence” regarding similarity and the probability of user confusion as between .hotels and .hoteis; yet it claims that it does not challenge the merits of the SSP determination and it acknowledges that the process set out in the Guidebook was duly followed in the case of its application for .hotels.

143. In sum, Booking.com has failed to overcome the very obstacles that it recognizes exist.

144. The Panel finds that Booking.com has failed to identify any instance of Board action or inaction, including any action or inaction of ICANN staff or a third party (such as ICC, acting as the SSP), that could be considered to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook. This includes the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to what Booking.com calls the implementation and supervision of the string similarity review process generally, as well as the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to the string similarity review of .hotels in particular.

145. More particularly, the Panel finds that the string similarity review performed in the case of .hotels was not inconsistent with the Articles or Bylaws or with what Booking.com refers to as the “applicable rules” as set out in the Guidebook.

146. To the extent that the Board’s adoption and implementation of specific elements of the new gTLD Program and Guidebook, including the string similarity review process, could
potentially be said to be inconsistent with the principles of transparency or fairness that
underlie ICANN’s Articles and Incorporation and Bylaws (which the Panel does not say is the
case), the time to challenge such action has long since passed.

147. Booking.com’s IRP Request must be denied.

VII. THE PREVAILING PARTY; COSTS

148. Article IV, Section 3(18) of the Bylaws requires that the Panel “specifically designate the
prevailing party.” This designation is germane to the allocation of costs, given that Article
IV, Section 3(18) provides that the “party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for
bearing all costs of the IRP Provider.”

149. The same provision of the Bylaws also states that “in an extraordinary case the IRP
Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the
prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the
reasonableness of the parties’ positions and their contribution to the public interest.
Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses.”

150. Similarly, the Supplementary Procedures state, at Article 11:

_The IRP PANEL shall fix costs in its DECLARATION. The party not prevailing in an IRP
shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the proceedings, but under
extraordinary circumstances the IRP PANEL may allocate up to half of the costs to the
prevailing party, taking into account the circumstances of the case, including the
reasonableness of the parties’ positions and their contribution to the public interest._

_In the event the Requestor has not availed itself, in good faith, of the cooperative
engagement or conciliation process, and the requestor is not successful in the
Independent Review, the IRP PANEL must award ICANN all reasonable fees and costs
incurred by ICANN in the IRP, including legal fees._

151. The “IRP Provider” is the ICDR, and, in accordance with the ICDR Rules, the costs to be
allocated between the parties – what the Bylaws call the “costs of the IRP Provider”, and
the Supplementary Procedures call the “costs of the proceedings” – include the fees and
expenses of the Panel members and of the ICDR (we refer to all of these costs as “IRP
costs”).

152. ICANN is undoubtedly the prevailing party in this case. That being said, the Panel
considers that the nature and significance of the issues raised by Booking.com, and the
contribution to the “public interest” of its submissions, are such that it is appropriate and
reasonable that the IRP costs be shared equally by the parties. We consider that the
extraordinary circumstances of case – in which some members of ICANN’s New gTLD
Program Committee have publicly declared that, in their view, the rules on the basis of
which Booking.com’s claims fail should be reconsidered by ICANN – warrants such a
holding.

153. The Panel cannot grant Booking.com the relief that it seeks. A panel such as ours can
only declare whether, on the facts as we find them, the challenged actions of ICANN are
or are not inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. We have
found that the actions in question are not inconsistent with those instruments. The
process established by ICANN under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and set out
in the Guidebook was followed, and the time to challenge that process (which
Booking.com asserts is not its intention in these proceedings in any event) has long
passed.

154. However, we can — and we do — acknowledge certain legitimate concerns regarding the
string similarity review process raised by Booking.com, discussed above, which are
evidently shared by a number of prominent and experienced ICANN NGPC members.
And we can, and do, encourage ICANN to consider whether it wishes to address these
issues in an appropriate manner and forum, for example, when drafting the Guidebook
for round two of the New gTLD Program or, more immediately, in the exercise of its
authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook (which it may choose to
exercise at any time, in its discretion) to consider whether, notwithstanding the result of
the string similarity review of .hotels and .hoteis, approval of both of Booking.com's and
Despegar's proposed strings would be in the best interest of the Internet community.

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

(1) Booking.com's IRP Request is denied;

(2) ICANN is the prevailing party;

(3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP
Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and
expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR,
totalling US$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling
US$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the
amount of US$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of
the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com

(4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which
shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final
Declaration of this IRP Panel.
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David H. Bernstein

I, Stephen L. Drymer, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

3 March 2015

Date

Stephen L. Drymer
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement

This Consulting Master Services Agreement (together with the Exhibits and Attachments hereto, this “Agreement”) is effective as of July 26, 2011 (the “Effective Date”), by and between the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, with its principal offices located at 4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330, Marina del Rey, CA, USA 90292 and The Economist Intelligence Unit, NA, Incorporated, with its principal offices located at 750 Third Avenue, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10017, hereinafter referred to as “Contractor”.

WHEREAS, Contractor and ICANN desire to enter into an agreement for the performance by Contractor of certain professional consulting services in connection with activities being conducted by ICANN.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing, the mutual promises and covenants contained herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. SERVICES: Contractor shall provide to ICANN such professional consulting services as are set forth in statements of work (each a “Statement of Work”) signed by and in a form acceptable to both parties, which shall set forth the manner of the work which will be provided to ICANN pursuant to this Agreement (the “Services”) and the products and materials to be produced by Contractor pursuant to the Services (the “Products”). Any Services provided hereunder shall be rendered by Contractor in a manner consistent with industry standards, and shall be provided in accordance with all applicable laws. Contractor’s Services shall not be exclusive to ICANN, provided that during the term of Contractor’s engagement hereunder, Contractor will not render services that prevent, interfere or conflict with, or delay the prompt performance of the Services.

2. TERM: Contractor shall render the Services on the date or dates set forth on any Statements of Work entered into hereunder.

3. COMPENSATION: Subject to all the provisions of this Agreement, including, but not limited to, the “Supplemental Terms” (attached hereto as Exhibit A) and any and all Statements of Work, ICANN agrees to pay Contractor as full and complete consideration for Contractor’s services hereunder, and Contractor agrees to accept, the sum as set out in the applicable Statement of Work, payable in US Dollars for the Services, which shall be paid in accordance with the payment schedule set forth in such Statement of Work.

4. RIGHTS:

   (a) In consideration of the amounts payable by ICANN pursuant to Section 3, and subject to Section 4(b), Contractor assigns to ICANN exclusive ownership rights, in perpetuity of all copyright in and to the Products.
(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Agreement, any and all rights (including without limitation copyright, trademarks and rights in data) in and to any content, data, brands and materials included in the Products that are in existence prior to the commencement of the Services to be provided under any and all Statements of Work (the "Pre-Existing Materials") shall not be transferred to ICANN and shall remain the exclusive property of Contractor or its licensors. Contractor grants to ICANN a non-exclusive, perpetual, royalty free license (including the right to sublicense to other parties) to use, reproduce, modify and distribute any Pre-Existing Materials on condition that: (i) such Pre-Existing Materials are used as part of the Products they are provided within and only as required in order to use the Products; and (ii) no modification shall be made that misrepresents or distorts the content or meaning of such Pre-Existing Materials.

(c) The transfer in Section 4(a) shall, subject to Section 4(b), include the right to apply for any and all patents arising from the Products and to register any copyright subsisting therein (collectively, the "Legal Rights")

(d) Save as set out in any applicable Statement of Work, Contractor will not be entitled to any royalty, commission or other payment with respect to the Products or Legal Rights in addition to the fees payable for the services to be provided under such Statement of Work.

(e) Contractor warrants that all Products will be Contractor's original work and do not infringe any copyrights, trade secrets, trademarks, patents or other proprietary rights of any third party.

5. **INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS:** Contractor acknowledges and agrees that Contractor is an Independent Contractor and that Contractor's employees or agents, if any, are not employees or agents of ICANN for any purpose, including but not limited to national or local withholding or employer taxation obligations. Contractor agrees to indemnify and hold ICANN harmless (including attorney's fees and costs incurred by ICANN) should Contractor fail to meet Contractor's obligations with respect to its employees with regard to the payment or withholding of social security and other taxes, federal and state (or other such political or governmental subdivision) income taxes, unemployment insurance, and similar items should ICANN be held liable or responsible therefore. Contractor retains the sole right to control or direct the manner in which the Services are to be performed. Without limiting the foregoing, ICANN retains the right to inspect, to stop work, to prescribe alterations, and generally supervise Contractor's work to ensure its conformity with the applicable Statement of Work. Contractor acknowledges that Contractor has no authority for or on behalf of ICANN to make, enter into or amend any contracts or agreements or to take any action which would impose liability on ICANN, without the express written consent of an authorized officer of ICANN. Contractor represents to ICANN that Contractor is engaged in an independent calling and will comply with all laws regarding business permits and licenses that may be required to carry out Contractor's obligations under this Agreement.
6. **IMMIGRATION LAW:** With respect to each of Contractor's employees who render services to ICANN hereunder, Contractor shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable immigration laws, including the U.S. Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, and with all employment eligibility verification provisions required by law.

7. **INTERPRETATION:** In the event of a conflict between: (i) this Agreement; and (ii) any Statement(s) of Work, the terms of the applicable Statement of Work shall prevail.

[signature page follows]
The parties shall indicate their acceptance of this Agreement by signing in the appropriate space provided below.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

By: ____________________________
    Signature

    AKRAM ATALLAH, CEO
    Print Name and Title

Date: 8/9/11

THE ECONOMIST INTELLIGENCE UNIT, NA, INCORPORATED

By: ____________________________
    Signature

    ________
    Print Name and Title

Date: 7/10/11
EXHIBIT A
SUPPLEMENTAL TERMS

1. RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS: Except as set forth in the applicable Statement of Work, Contractor agrees that ICANN shall have the exclusive right, but not the obligation, to register copyright and file applications for patents throughout the world to protect ICANN’s Legal Rights in and to the Products and that Contractor shall, upon the request of ICANN, perform (at no cost to Contractor) such legal acts and execute and deliver to ICANN, any such documents, applications and assignments reasonably requested by ICANN to register ICANN’s Legal Rights in and to the Products.

2. FORCE MAJEURE: In the event of an occurrence of an event of force majeure, as the term is generally understood, ICANN shall have the right to suspend this Agreement and shall have the right, but not the obligation, to extend this Agreement by the length of any such suspension. If an event of force majeure continues for eight (8) consecutive weeks, ICANN shall have the right to terminate this Agreement.

3. WARRANTIES: Contractor represents and warrants to ICANN as follows:

   (a) Contractor is fully authorized to enter into, and perform its obligations under this Agreement. This Agreement creates lawful, valid, and binding obligations, enforceable against Contractor in accordance with its terms.

   (b) Contractor has the right to grant all rights granted herein, including but not limited to all necessary literary, artistic, musical and/or intellectual property rights, and is free to enter into and fully perform this Agreement.

   (c) The exercise of rights granted herein, the performance of the Services and the delivery of the Products will not infringe on any of the following rights of any third party: copyright, trademark, or other intellectual property rights.

   (d) Contractor has not entered and shall not enter into any arrangement or agreement that will interfere or conflict with the rights granted to ICANN hereunder.
5. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

(a) Each party acknowledges that it may disclose Confidential Information (as defined below) to the other in connection with this Agreement. The party receiving the Confidential Information will: (i) maintain it in confidence, except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this Agreement, in which event confidentiality and use restrictions will be imposed upon the parties to whom such disclosures are made; (ii) use at least the same degree of care in maintaining its secrecy as it uses in maintaining the secrecy of its own Confidential Information, but in no event less than a reasonable degree of care; (iii) at the disclosing party’s option, destroy or return all copies, notes, packages, diagrams, computer memory media and all other materials containing any portion of the Confidential Information to the disclosing party promptly following the earlier of (A) such party’s request, (B) completion of the intended use of the Confidential Information, or (C) termination of this Agreement; and (iv) not use the Confidential Information other than for purposes of fulfilling its obligations under this Agreement. “Confidential Information” means all proprietary, secret or confidential information or data relating to either of the parties and its operations, employees, products or services, and any Personal Information. “Personal Information” means personally identifiable information relating to such party’s employees, consumers and potential consumers. Each party will notify
the other party immediately upon discovery of any lost or altered Confidential Information.

(b) Information will not be considered Confidential Information to the extent, but only to the extent, that such information: (i) is already known to the receiving party free of any restriction at the time it is obtained from the other party; (ii) is subsequently learned from an independent third party free of any restriction and without breach of this Agreement; (iii) becomes publicly available through no wrongful act of either party; (iv) is independently developed by one party without reference to any Confidential Information of the other; or (v) is required to be disclosed by law, regulation, court order or subpoena, provided that the disclosing party will exercise reasonable efforts to notify the other party prior to disclosure. The parties agree also that the existence and terms of this Agreement are confidential and shall not be disclosed by either party without prior consent in writing by the other party.

6. **SURVIVING OBLIGATIONS:** The parties' representations, warranties, and indemnity obligations shall remain in effect following the termination or expiration of this Agreement.

7. **ASSIGNMENT:** Neither party may without prior consent in writing assign this Agreement or any of its rights or obligations hereunder.

8. **REMEDIES:** In recognition of the relative risks and benefits of this Agreement to both ICANN and Contractor, ICANN agrees that, to the fullest extent permitted by law, except for claims for indemnification under Section 4, any liability of Contractor (including its consultants, employees, and agents) for damages to ICANN shall be limited to an amount equal to the total amount paid to Contractor pursuant to this Agreement. EXCEPT FOR CLAIMS FOR INDEMNIFICATION UNDER SECTION 4, IN NO EVENT SHALL ANY PARTY TO THIS AGREEMENT OR ANY OF ITS DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AGENTS OR SUBCONTRACTORS BE LIABLE TO THE OTHER PARTY UNDER ANY THEORY OF TORT, CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY OR OTHER LEGAL OR EQUITABLE THEORY FOR LOST PROFITS, EXEMPLARY, PUNITIVE, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, INDIRECT, CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES OR THE LIKE, EACH OF WHICH IS HEREBY EXCLUDED BY AGREEEMENT OF THE PARTIES REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SUCH DAMAGES WERE FORESEEABLE OR WHETHER EITHER PARTY OR ANY ENTITY HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

9. **TERMINATION:**

(a) Each Party shall have the right to terminate this Agreement or any Statement of Work for convenience. Termination under this provision will be effective thirty (30) days after written notice by one party to the other; provided, that ICANN will be required to make payment for all work in progress and Products actually delivered under any active Statement of Work in the event of a termination of this Agreement or the applicable Statement of Work pursuant to this Section 9(a); and, provided, further, that, without prejudice to the generality of Section 7 of the Agreement to which these Supplemental Terms are attached, the termination provisions of each Statement of Work, if any, will supersede this Section 9(a).
(b) Each party shall have the right to terminate this Agreement if such party has a good faith belief, based on the facts then available, that the other party has engaged in any of the following conduct: fraud, misappropriation or embezzlement of funds, or gross misconduct. Termination under this provision shall be effective immediately upon receipt of notice by the relevant party.

(c) Other Provisions: Either party shall have the right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to other provisions contained throughout this Agreement, including but not limited to Section 2 (if ICANN) of these Supplemental Terms. Nothing contained within this provision shall negate or override its rights to terminate contained within other provisions herein, and it may elect at its option the most favorable applicable termination provision or provisions contained within this Agreement.

10. DEFAULT:

(a) If either party fails, refuses or neglects to perform any of its material obligations hereunder, for any reason other than incapacity, such party shall be in "default" of this Agreement. If either party refuses or states that it will refuse to comply with any of its material obligations hereunder, such refusal or statement may be treated by the other party as an immediate default, regardless of whether the time for performance of such obligation or obligations has arrived. Further, a party may, at any time, make a written request for the other party to confirm in writing its intentions and willingness to comply with its obligations hereunder, either generally or with respect to any particular matter. If, within five (5) days from delivery of such request at the address for notices set forth herein (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays and federal holidays), the recipient of the request fails to deliver the requested information to the other party, such failure may be treated by such other party as an immediate default.

(b) Either party may suspend this Agreement with respect to performance of its obligations while any default of the other party continues.

11. CURING PROVISION: Neither party shall bring or make any claim that the other party has breached any of the provisions hereunder unless such party has first made a written demand to cure such failure, and the other party has not satisfied the obligations within ten (10) business days of receipt of such demand. The written demand shall specify the provision claimed to be breached, the date such obligation or performance was to have been satisfied and any other identifying specifics.

12. MISCELLANEOUS:
ICANN Contractor Consulting Agreement  
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(a) **No Implied Waiver:** No failure on the part of ICANN or Contractor to exercise and no delay in exercising, and no course of dealing with respect to any right, power or privilege under this Agreement shall operate as a waiver thereof, nor shall any single or partial exercise of any right, power or privilege under this Agreement preclude the exercise of any other right, power or privilege.

(b) **Counterparts:** This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts (and by different parties on separate counterparts) each of which shall be an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

(c) **No Violation of Law:** If any provision of this Agreement shall be deemed invalid or unenforceable as written, it shall be construed, to the greatest extent possible, in a manner which shall render it valid and enforceable, and any limitations on the scope or duration of any such provision necessary to make it valid and enforceable shall be deemed to a part hereof; no invalidity or unenforceability shall affect any other portion of this Agreement.

(d) **Choice of Law and Submission to Jurisdiction:** This Agreement shall be governed by applicable U.S. federal law and by the laws of the State of California applicable to contracts entered into and to be wholly performed within the State of California. Contractor and ICANN hereby submit and consent to the jurisdiction of the State and Federal Courts located in Los Angeles County, California, USA.

(e) **Paragraph Headings:** Paragraph headings contained in this Agreement are for convenience and shall not be considered for any purpose in construing this Agreement.

13. **NOTICES:** Any notice given under this Agreement will be in writing and will be effective (a) upon receipt if (i) delivered by hand or (ii) sent via overnight mail by a nationally recognized express delivery service; or (b) three (3) days after deposit in the U.S. mail, postage prepaid, certified mail return receipt requested, when addressed as follows:

**To ICANN:**
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers  
4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330  
Marina del Rey, California 90292  
Attn: General Counsel

**To Contractor:**
The Economist Intelligence Unit, NA, Incorporated  
750 Third Avenue, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10017  
Attn: Contracts Manager, Americas

with a copy to:
Group General Counsel, The Economist Group, 25 St James’s Street, London  
SW1 A 1HG
14. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT:** This Agreement cancels and supersedes all prior negotiations and understandings between ICANN and Contractor relating hereto. This Agreement is not valid or binding unless and until in writing and signed by a duly authorized officer of ICANN and Contractor. No amendment, modification, extension, release, discharge or waiver of this Agreement, or any provision hereof, shall be valid or binding unless in writing and signed by a duly authorized officer of ICANN and Contractor. No oral agreement shall be binding on ICANN or Contractor unless and until reduced to writing and signed by a duly authorized officer of ICANN and Contractor.
Appendix 1
Form of Notice and Acknowledgement

[Name of Third Party]
Address Attention:

The advice, recommendations and information in the document included with this notice were prepared for the sole benefit of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), based on the specific facts and circumstances of ICANN, and its use is limited to the scope of The Economist Intelligence Unit, NA, Incorporated's ("EIU") engagement for ICANN. It has been provided to you for informational purposes only and you are not authorized by EIU to rely upon it and any such reliance by you or anyone else shall be at your or their own risk. You acknowledge and agree that EIU accepts no responsibility or liability in respect of the advice, recommendations or other information in such document to any person or organization other than ICANN. You shall have no right to disclose the advice, recommendations or other information in such document to anyone else without including a copy of this notice and, unless disclosure is required by law or to fulfill a professional obligation required under applicable professional standards, obtaining a signed acknowledgement of this notice from the party to whom disclosure is made and you provide a copy thereof to ICANN and EIU. You acknowledge and agree that you will be responsible for any damages suffered by EIU as a result of your failure to comply with the terms of this notice.

Please acknowledge your acceptance of the foregoing by signing and returning to us a copy of this letter.

Very truly yours,

ICANN

By: ________________
Name:  
Title:  

Accepted and Agreed to on this ___ day of ____, 20__ by:
[Name of Third Party]

By: ________________
Name:  
Title:  

IRI-18481v5
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
Cooperative Engagement Process – Requests for Independent Review
11 April 2013

As specified in Article IV, Section 3 of the ICANN Bylaws, prior to initiating an independent review process, the complainant is urged to enter into a period of cooperative engagement with ICANN for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. It is contemplated that this cooperative engagement process will be initiated prior to the requesting party incurring any costs in the preparation of a request for independent review. Cooperative engagement is expected to be among ICANN and the requesting party, without reference to outside counsel.

The Cooperative Engagement Process is as follows:

1. In the event the requesting party elects to proceed to cooperative engagement prior to filing a request for independent review, the requesting party may invoke the cooperative engagement process by providing written notice to ICANN at [independentreview@icann.org], noting the invocation of the process, identifying the Board action(s) at issue, identifying the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation that are alleged to be violated, and designating a single point of contact for the resolution of the issue.

2. The requesting party must initiate cooperative engagement within fifteen (15) days of the posting of the minutes of the Board (and the accompanying Board Briefing Materials, if available) that the requesting party contends demonstrates that the ICANN Board violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation.

3. Within three (3) business days, ICANN shall designate a single executive to serve as the point of contact for the resolution of the issue, and provide notice of the designation to the requestor.

4. Within two (2) business days of ICANN providing notice of its designated representatives, the requestor and ICANN’s representatives shall confer by telephone or in person to attempt to resolve the issue and determine if any issues remain for the independent review process, or whether the matter should be brought to the ICANN Board’s attention.

5. If the representatives are not able to resolve the issue or agree on a narrowing of issues, or a reference to the ICANN Board, during the first conference, they shall further meet in person at a location mutually agreed to within 7 (seven) calendar days after such initial conference, at which the parties shall attempt to reach a definitive agreement on the resolution of the issue or on the narrowing of issues remaining for the independent review process, or whether the matter should be brought to the ICANN Board’s attention.

6. The time schedule and process may be modified as agreed to by both ICANN and the requester, in writing.

If ICANN and the requestor have not agreed to a resolution of issues upon the conclusion of the cooperative engagement process, or if issues remain for a request
Cooperative Engagement Process – Requests for Independent Review
11 April 2013

for independent review, the requestor’s time to file a request for independent review designated in the Bylaws shall be extended for each day of the cooperative engagement process, but in no event, absent mutual written agreement by the parties, shall the extension be for more than fourteen (14) days.

Pursuant to the Bylaws, if the party requesting the independent review does not participate in good faith in the cooperative engagement process and ICANN is the prevailing party in the independent review proceedings, the IRP panel must award to ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the proceeding, including legal fees. ICANN is expected to participate in the cooperative engagement process in good faith.
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
## ACTIVE COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requestor(s)</th>
<th>Subject Matter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-2014</td>
<td>GCCIX, W.L.L.</td>
<td>.GCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2015</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Ltd.</td>
<td>.PERSIANGULF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Oct-2018</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Ltd.</td>
<td>.HALAL .ISLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Nov-2019</td>
<td>Namecheap, Inc.</td>
<td>.ORG and .INFO Registry Agreement renewals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECENTLY CLOSED COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date(s)</th>
<th>Requestor(s)</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>IRP Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Oct-2018</td>
<td>Travel Reservations SRL, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Radix FZC, dot Hotel Inc., Fegistry LLC</td>
<td>.HOTEL</td>
<td>18 November 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP) is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. (See Bylaws, Art. 4 § 4.3(e).) The requesting party may invoke the CEP by providing written notice to ICANN, noting the invocation of the process, identifying the Board action(s) at issue, identifying the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation that are alleged to be violated, and designating a single point of contact for the resolution of the issue. Further information regarding the CEP is available at: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf).

2 The CEP process provides that "[i]f ICANN and the requestor have not agreed to a resolution of the issues upon the conclusion of the cooperative engagement process, or if issues remain for a request for independent review, the requestor's time to file a request for independent review designated in the Bylaws shall be extended for each day of the cooperative engagement process, but in no event, absent mutual written agreement by the parties, shall the extension be for more than fourteen (14) days." ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf))
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES
STATUS UPDATE – 23 DECEMBER 2019

ACTIVE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-Nov-2019</td>
<td>16-Dec-2019</td>
<td>Fegistry, LLC, Minds + Machines Group, Ltd., Radix Domain Solutions Pte. Ltd., and Domain Ventures Partners PCC Limited</td>
<td>.HOTEL</td>
<td>Panel Selection: IRP commenced on 16 December 2019; no panelists have been selected. Materials: Written submissions, Declaration(s), and Scheduling Order(s) are posted <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/irp-fegistry-et-al-v-icann-hotel-2019-12-20-en">here</a>. Hearing(s): No hearings are currently scheduled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes: (i) ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (ii) empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in § 4.3(b)(i)); (iii) ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants; (iv) address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)); (v) provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation; (vi) reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation; (vii) secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes; (viii) lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction; and (ix) provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions. (See Bylaws, Art. 4, § 4.3)
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES
STATUS UPDATE – 23 DECEMBER 2019

RECENTLY CLOSED INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Date IRP Closed</th>
<th>Date of Board Consideration of IRP Panel’s Final Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no recently closed IRPs.

---

4 IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws as of 1 October 2016: IRP proceedings initiated Pursuant to Article 4, § 4.3(x)(iii)(A) of the ICANN Bylaws. “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board’s next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision of the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision by the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4)
From: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 2:33 PM
To: Russ Weinstein
Subject: CPE results discussion
Attachments: Draft CPE Result GMBH 04_RW_CB.docx; Draft CPE Result LLP 04_CB.docx; Draft CPE Result LLC 04_RW_CB.docx
Signed By: christopher.bare@icann.org

Here are the ones I had comments on for our discussion.

Chris
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-17627
Applied-for String: LLC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priority Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Did Not Prevail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring 5 Point(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Eligibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

1-A: Delineation 0/4 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies (or LLCs) as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLCs commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation.

An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLCs are a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLCs are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLCs share a key characteristic with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLCs are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant US state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability companies operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other responsibilities beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

LLCs can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore, members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and registered business address. LLCs are expected to conduct business in conjunction with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates a LLC’s level of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no
documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence

To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With the number of registered LLC’s in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not know that business with an LLC.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word...
as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community**

2-A Nexus: 0/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identity” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLC) over-reaches substantially as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the majority of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that “LLC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

2-B Uniqueness: 0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant.
Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

### Criterion #3: Registration Policies

#### 3-A Eligibility

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20.e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

#### 3-B Name Selection

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20.e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

#### 3-C Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in
Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

### 3-D Enforcement  
0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeal mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement</th>
<th>2/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-A Support</td>
<td>1/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

| 4-B Opposition | 1/2 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

Comment [A16]: I think this is good
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.

Comment [A17]: The way I read this, it is relevant because it is from an organization of non-negligible size. I don’t think that is the intention. Can we rephrase to say something to effect of an organization with standing and of non-negligible size, and perhaps even define the standing it has.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1-880-35508</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String:</td>
<td>LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priority Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Did Not Prevail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

**Panel Summary**

**Overall Scoring**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Eligibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass: 14

**Criterion #1: Community Establishment**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-A Delineation</th>
<th>0/2 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

**Delineation**  
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
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The community defined in the application ("L.P") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as Limited Liability Partnerships with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Partnerships or (LLP's) as they are commonly abbreviated, are specifically designed to represent professional service businesses in the US. Limited Liability Partnerships are commonly adopted by businesses which focus on: accounting, attorneys, architects, dentists, doctors and other fields treated as professionals under each state's law....

A Limited Liability Partnership is defined as a partnership in which some or all partners (depending on jurisdiction) have limited liability. LLP's therefore exhibit qualities of both partnerships and corporations. In an LLP, one partner is not responsible or liable for another partner's misconduct or negligence. This distinction is why the LLP is a popular business entity amongst accountants, doctors, and lawyers; which deal heavily with issues that could inspire malpractice lawsuits.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability partnership with the relevant US state (LLPs operate in about 40 US states). In addition, limited liability partnerships must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability partnerships operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization; there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Limited Liability Partnerships can be formed through all but ten states in the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in close to forty US states. LLP formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLP by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLP application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007.
The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B Extension.

Size

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community amongst its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLP as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application, “LLPs represent a small but prestigious sector of business in the United States.”

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition amongst its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community amongst its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuit of the LLP community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition amongst its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community**

**0/4 Point(s)**

2-A Nexus

**0/3 Point(s)**

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLP) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLP” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Partnership is primarily shortened to LLP when used to delineate business entity types…

LLP is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that LLP as corporate identifier is used in eleven other jurisdictions (Canada, China, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, and the United Kingdom) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Poland, the UK, Canada and Japan, amongst others. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

2-B Uniqueness

**0/1 Point(s)**

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #3: Registration Policies</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A Eligibility</td>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability partnerships and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state's registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20c of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection | 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second-level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use | 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement | 0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for enforcement are not consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 0 points under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

To fulfill the requirements for Enforcement, the registration policies must include rules for enforcement that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the enforcement restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.
Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, it a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second-level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20 of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

2/4 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s) or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the community, explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function other than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/members organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from a group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>. 
Privileged and Confidential.

Hi EIU Contact Information Redacted

Russ and I reviewed the first 4 drafts (GMBH, LLC, LLP, INC) and had a few more comments. We really like several of the additional details you updated.

I’ve attached 3 documents with track changes on so you can see our comments.

- Many comments apply across reports. We tried not to repeat comments on each report.
- We are not sure all comments need to be addressed in the reports, but we should make sure that we are prepared to discuss at next week’s briefing as we would expect similar questions to come up.
- You will see that there are a couple areas where we still are unsure about how best to capture the research and reasoning that led to the conclusion. We can expect that some of the subjective decisions will be questioned and we want to try to alleviate some of that by detailing some of what was done.
- We were also discussing how best to message the issue of clarifying construed community. Several applicants seem to have had trouble defining the community they are intending to serve and have instead defined a large group that includes members that are only peripherally relevant.

Confidential Third Party Information

Thanks

Chris

From: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 4:48 PM
To: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>
Cc: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Subject: Updated draft results (4)

Hi Chris and Russ,
I have attached the revised set of four corporate designation results (draft). We addressed most of your comments.

1. The term 'construed community' was not well received by the applicant community. We suggest a change to the term itself as well as additional explanation as to what is meant. Perhaps acknowledgement that while a group appears to exist/has existed for some time, the lack of an organizing or governing body.....does not meet requirements for the group to be considered a community......

Added in language from the AGB. Second paragraph under 4.2.3.
2. Criterion 1A- Delineation: Reference is made to the lack of at least one major entity dedicated to the community. Would a large number of smaller entities qualify as a majority. A reference to that effect and the fact that this was not represented in the application might help.

We will keep an open mind about fragmented communities.

3. Criterion 1A: Delineation: The report cites that lack of a dedicated entity leads to the lack of organized activities. Can we elaborate? What constitutes an organized activity. Does the registering of a company with the Secretaries of State count as an activity?

EIU feedback: too difficult to define such activities because of how they would vary across community. Moreover, it's not defined in the AGB, so the EIU decided not to add any clarification on this.

4. Criterion 2B- Uniqueness: There is reference to the string having other significant meaning. Can we have an example (such as was provided in MLS) as to what other meanings might exist?

Added examples where appropriate. If the applicant did not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus, then they are ineligible for a score of 1 on Uniqueness and this is the explanation that we provided.

5. Criterion 3c- Content and Use: can we have an example or explanation as to how the applications Content and Use policies fall short of the requirements (reference to GMBH)?

Yes, we added in more information on this.

6. Criterion 4- Community Endorsement: We expect this section to get a lot of attention. More detail explaining the difference in the relevance of the letters of support would be helpful. For example an explanation that the letters form the SoS while somewhat relevant did carry as much weight due to the fact that they are not dedicated to the community but act as a regulator...etc.

We used the definitions provided in the AGB to add clarity on this section.

7. The term 'does not have awareness and recognition among its members' appears many times. Can we do something to highlight this theme to bring it to the forefront. This seems to be a critical part of every evaluation.

Already discussed-- likely difficult to add this.

Once you have the opportunity to take a second look, please feel free to provide feedback via phone or email that we can incorporate ahead of the meeting next week.
Best wishes,

EIU Contact Information
   Redacted

Economist Intelligence Unit
Custom Research
   EIU Contact Information Redacted

Website: research.eiu.com

This e-mail may contain confidential material. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. It may also contain personal views which are not the views of The Economist Group. We may monitor e-mail to and from our network.

Sent by a member of The Economist Group. The Group's parent company is The Economist Newspaper Limited, registered in England with company number 236383 and registered office at 25 St James's Street, London, SW1A 1HG. For Group company registration details go to http://legal.economistgroup.com
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35508
Applied-for String: LLP
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result: Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass: 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

1A: Delineation

0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLP") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as Limited Liability Partnerships with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Partnerships or (LLP’s) as they are commonly abbreviated, are specifically designed to represent professional service businesses in the US. Limited Liability Partnerships are commonly adopted by businesses which focus on accounting, attorneys, architects, dentists, doctors and other fields treated as professionals under each state’s law....

A Limited Liability Partnership is defined as a partnership in which some or all partners (depending on jurisdiction) have limited liability. LLP’s therefore exhibit qualities of both partnerships and corporations. In an LLP, one partner is not responsible or liable for another partner’s misconduct or negligence. This distinction is why the LLP is a popular business entity amongst accountants, doctors, and lawyers, which deal heavily with issues that could inspire malpractice lawsuits.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability partnership with the relevant US state (LLPs operate in about 40 US states). In addition, limited liability partnerships must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability partnerships operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

**Organization**

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization; these must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Limited Liability Partnerships can be formed through all but ten states in the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in close to forty US states. LLP formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLP by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the .LLP application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

**Pre-existence**

To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007.
(when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a "community" construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLP as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application, "LLP's represent a small but prestigious sector of business in the United States."

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a "community" construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the LLP community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</th>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 A Nexus</td>
<td>0/3 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLP) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

> “LLP” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Partnership is primarily shortened to LLP when used to delineate business entity types...

LLP is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that LLP as corporate identifier is used in eleven other jurisdictions (Canada, China, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, and the United Kingdom) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Poland, the UK, Canada and Japan, amongst others. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

| 2-B Uniqueness | 0/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #3: Registration Policies</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A Eligibility</td>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability partnerships and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection
1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criteria for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use
1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement
0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant...
Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement. Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20a of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement  2/4 Point(s)

4-A Support  1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refused from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

4-B Opposition  1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
# New gTLD Program

## Community Priority Evaluation Report

**Report Date:** 19 May 2014

### Application ID
- 1-880-17627

### Applied for String
- LLC

### Applicant Name
- Dot Registry LLC

## Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priority Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Did Not Prevail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

## Panel Summary

### Overall Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

## Criterion #1: Community Establishment

### 1-A: Delineation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-A Delineation</th>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

**Delineation**

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies or (LLC’s) as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLC’s commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation…

An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLC’s are a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLC’s are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLC’s share a key characteristic with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLC’s are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant US state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability companies operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application, LLC’s can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and registered business address. LLC’s are expected to conduct business in conjunction with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates a LLC’s level of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no...
documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence

To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is concerned to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

I-B Extension

0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B Extension.

Size

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of considerable size. The community for LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With the number of registered LLC’s in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with an LLC.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is concerned to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).
as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

### Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-A Nexus</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that “LLC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

### Criterion #3: Uniqueness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-B Uniqueness</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook.
Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

### Criterion #3: Registration Policies

#### 3A Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A Eligibility</th>
<th>1/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

#### 3B Name Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3B Name Selection</th>
<th>1/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

#### 3C Content and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3C Content and Use</th>
<th>1/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in
Section 2(e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement 0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 2(e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement 2/4 Point(s)

4-A Support 1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

4-B Opposition 1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
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From: Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 6:41 PM
To: EUI Contact Information Redacted, Christopher Bare
Cc: EUI Contact Information Redacted, Daniel Halloran
Subject: Re: Updated draft results (4)
Signed By: russ.weinstein@icann.org

Hi,

Thanks for these. On my initial review they looked very good. We will discuss the rationale in the presentation tomorrow. I would ask we make one change to all of the reports prior to final version, when discussing the research conducted related to organizing around sectors rather than corporate identifiers, there is a phrase that says "our research..." can this be modified to the "the Panel's research" or something to that effect. Since the report is on ICANN logo and we try and differentiate the CPE Panel determined, I think the term "our" could create be less than precise.

Thanks, talk to you tomorrow.

Russ Weinstein
Sr. Manager gTLD Operations
ICANN
Contact Information Redacted

Russ.Weinstein@icann.org

From: EUI Contact Information Redacted
Date: Tuesday, June 3, 2014 10:33 AM
To: Chris Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>
Cc: Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>, EUI Contact Information Daniel Halloran <daniel.halloran@icann.org>
Subject: Re: Updated draft results (4)

Hi Chris,

Back to you. All changes were made in track changes so that you can easily review. We've also responded to some of your comments in comment boxes.

Best wishes,

Hilary

On 2 June 2014 21:23, Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org> wrote:

For INC, the changes should be the same as the others. The only reason we didn’t mark up that document was that the recommendations were identical.

Thanks
Chris
From: EIU Contact Information Redacted  
Date: Monday, June 2, 2014 5:58 PM  
To: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>  
Cc: Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>, EIU Contact Information Redacted Daniel Halloran <daniel.halloran@icann.org>  
Subject: Re: Updated draft results (4)  

Hi Chris,

I’ve made the suggested changes and sent along to Leila for a review to make sure I captured everything. Quick question: is there a reason why you didn’t send back .INC? Should we make the same changes for that evaluation?

Best wishes,

[Redacted]

On 2 June 2014 12:07, EIU Contact Information Redacted wrote:
Thanks, Chris. I will look through and let you know of any questions and next steps.

On 30 May 2014 17:34, Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org> wrote:

Privileged and Confidential.

[Redacted]

Russ and I reviewed the first 4 drafts (GMBH, LLC, LLP, INC) and had a few more comments. We really like several of the additional details you updated.

I’ve attached 3 documents with track changes on so you can see our comments.

- Many comments apply across reports. We tried not to repeat comments on each report.
- We are not sure all comments need to be addressed in the reports, but we should make sure that we are prepared to discuss at next week’s briefing as we would expect similar questions to come up.
- You will see that there are a couple areas where we still are unsure about how best to capture the research and reasoning that led to the conclusion. We can expect that some of the subjective decisions will be questioned and we want to try to alleviate some of that by detailing some of what was done.
- We were also discussing how best to message the issue of clarifying construed community. Several applicants seem to have had trouble defining the community they are intending to serve and have instead defined a large group that includes members that are only peripherally relevant.

Confidential Third Party Information
Thanks

Chris

From: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 4:48 PM
To: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>
Cc: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Subject: Updated draft results (4)

Hi Chris and Russ,

I have attached the revised set of four corporate designation results (draft). We addressed most of your comments.

1. The term 'construed community' was not well received by the applicant community. We suggest a change to the term itself as well as additional explanation as to what is meant. Perhaps acknowledgement that while a group appears to exist/has existed for some time, the lack of an organizing or governing body … does not meet requirements for the group to be considered a community……

Added in language from the AGB. Second paragraph under 4.2.3.

2. Criterion 1A- Delineation: Reference is made to the lack of at least one major entity dedicated to the community. Would a large number of smaller entities qualify as a majority. A reference to that effect and the fact that this was not represented in the application might help.

We will keep an open mind about fragmented communities.

3. Criterion 1A: Delineation: The report cites that lack of a dedicated entity leads to the lack of organized activities. Can we elaborate? What constitutes an organized activity. Does the registering of a company with the Secretaries of State count as an activity?

EIU feedback: too difficult to define such activities because of how they would vary across community. Moreover, it's not defined in the AGB, so the EIU decided not to add any clarification on this.

4. Criterion 2B- Uniqueness: There is reference to the string having other significant meaning. Can we have an example (such as was provided in MLS) as to what other meanings might exist?
Added examples where appropriate. If the applicant did not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus, then they are ineligible for a score of 1 on Uniqueness and this is the explanation that we provided.

5. Criterion 3c- Content and Use: can we have an example or explanation as to how the applications Content and Use policies fall short of the requirements (reference to GMBH)?

Yes, we added in more information on this.

6. Criterion 4- Community Endorsement: We expect this section to get a lot of attention. More detail explaining the difference in the relevance of the letters of support would be helpful. For example an explanation that the letters form the SoS while somewhat relevant did carry as much weight due to the fact that they are not dedicated to the community but act as a regulator…etc.

We used the definitions provided in the AGB to add clarity on this section.

7. The term 'does not have awareness and recognition among its members' appears many times. Can we do something to highlight this theme to bring it to the forefront. This seems to be a critical part of every evaluation.

Already discussed-- likely difficult to add this.

Once you have the opportunity to take a second look, please feel free to provide feedback via phone or email that we can incorporate ahead of the meeting next week.

Best wishes,

EIU Contact
Information
Redacted

Economist Intelligence Unit
Custom Research
EIU Contact Information Redacted

Website: research.eiu.com
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New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1.680-17627</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String:</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>5 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass: 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment 0/4 Point(s)

1-A: Delineation 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies or (LLCs) as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLCs commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation... An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLCs have a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLCs are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLCs share a key characteristic, with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLCs are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated. Membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Specifically, firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria related to the entity structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel's research, there is no evidence of LLCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. However, the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability companies operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with bring part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization:
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: these must be at least one entity dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual state, these government agencies are not acting as a community, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretary of State of US states are not usually dedicated to the community as they have other roles, functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

LLCs can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore, members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state's regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and registered business address. LLCs are expected to conduct business in conjunction with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates an LLC's level...
of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed overly to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed overly to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With the number of registered LLC’s in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with an LLC.

However, as previously stated the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLC’s from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only
satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not meet the requirements for longevity. As mentioned previously, "The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the application refers to a "community" consistent merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" consistent merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that this application refers to a "community" consistent merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel's research, there is no evidence of LLCs in different sectors acting as a community as defined by the AGB. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

2-A Nexus

The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but does not reach substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or a well-known short form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. "Identify" means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without ever reaching substantially beyond the community. The applied-for string (LLC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant's community. According to the application documentation:

"LLC" was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that "LLC" would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. The Panel's research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.
While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical entity than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial overreach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

2-B Uniqueness

0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

Criterion #3: Registration Policies

3-A Eligibility

1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state's registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20 of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection

1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD.

The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20 of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.
3-C. Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant's abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D. Enforcement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeal mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that included specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongly applied for and was awarded a second-level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

4-A. Support

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. "Relevance" refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or
Documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, remained silent, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

### 4.B Opposition

1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criteria for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4.B. Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the applicant must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups of individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
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Community Priority Evaluation Report  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1-880-35508</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String:</td>
<td>LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Dot Registry LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>5 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Eligibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment  
0/4 Point(s)

1-A: Delimitation  
0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delimitation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delimitation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delimitation.

Delimitation  
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delimitation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLP") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as Limited Liability Partnerships with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Partnerships or (LLPs) as they are commonly abbreviated, are specifically designed to represent professional service businesses in the US. Limited Liability Partnerships are commonly adopted by businesses which focus on: accounting, attorneys, architects, dentists, doctors and other fields treated as professionals under each state's law...

A Limited Liability Partnership is defined as a partnership in which some or all partners (depending on jurisdiction) have limited liability. LLPs therefore exhibit qualities of both partnerships and corporations. In an LLP, one partner is not responsible or liable for another partner's mistakes or negligence. This distinction is why the LLP is a popular business entity amongst accountants, doctors, and lawyers; which deal heavily with issues that could inspire malpractice lawsuits.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined as membership requires formal recognition as a limited liability partnership with the relevant US state (LLPs operate in about 40 US states). In addition, limited liability partnerships must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other factors not related to the entities structure as an LLP. Based on our research, the Panel's research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretaries of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Limited Liability Partnerships can be formed through all but ten states in the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in close to forty US states. LLP formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state's regulations. Persons form an LLP by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLP application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.
Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0/2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application did not meet the criteria for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of considerable size. The community for .LLP as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application, “LLPs represent a small but prestigious sector of business in the United States.”

However, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria, not related to the entities structure as an LLP. Based on the research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the AGA. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the .LLP community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.
Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLP. Based on our research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the AGB. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</th>
<th>0/4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-A Nexus</td>
<td>0/3 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criteria for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. "Identify" means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLP) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant's community. According to the application documentation:

"LLP" was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language, Limited Liability Partnership is primarily shortened to LLP when used to delineate business entity types...

LLP is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that LLP as corporate identifiers is used in eleven other jurisdictions (Canada, China, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, and the United Kingdom) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Poland, the UK, Canada and Japan, amongst others. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-B Uniqueness</th>
<th>0/1 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1.
To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

**Criterion #3: Registration Policies**

3-A Eligibility

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability partnerships and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second-level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D. Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, it registered the application for and was awarded a second-level domain name, the right to hold the domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Supporting specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, extracted from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.
### 4-B Opposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/2 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.5 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
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New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35979
Applied-for String: INC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result | Did Not Prevail
--- | ---

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>5 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment
1-A: Delineation

0/4 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("INC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as corporations within the United States or its territories. This would include Corporations, Incorporated Businesses, Benefit Corporations, Mutual Benefit Corporations and Non-Profit Corporations. Corporations or "INC's" as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most complex business entity structures in the U.S. Corporations commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation....

A corporation is defined as a business created under the laws of a State as a separate legal entity, that has privileges and liabilities that are distinct from those of its members. While corporate law varies in different jurisdictions, there are four characteristics of the business corporation that remain consistent: legal personality, limited liability, transferable shares, and centralized management under a board structure. Corporate statutes typically empower corporations to own property, sign binding contracts, and pay taxes in a capacity separate from that of its shareholders.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined, as membership requires formal registration as a corporation with the relevant US state. In addition, corporations must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on our research, the Panel's research, there is no evidence of INCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant's Guidebook. These incorporated firms would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretaries of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Corporations can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. Corporation formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each State's regulations. Persons form a corporation by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Incorporation. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of organization, which establish a limited liability company as a legal entity. At minimum, the Articles of Incorporation give a brief description of proposed business activities, shareholders, stock issued and the registered business address.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the INC application, there is no
documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is intended to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .INC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With almost 470,000 new corporations registered in the United States in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) resulting in over 8,000,000 total corporations in the US, it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with a corporation.

However, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on our research the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of INCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These incorporated firms would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.
The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the INC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

However, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on our research, the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of INCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These incorporated firms would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community 0/4 Point(s)
2-A Nexus 0/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (INC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“INC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language the word incorporation is primarily shortened to Inc. when used to delineate business entity types. For example, McMillon Incorporated would additionally be referred to as McMillon Inc. Since all of our community members are incorporated businesses we believed that “INC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

Inc. is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US Territories denoting the corporate status of an entity. Our research indicates that Inc. as corporate identifier is used in three other jurisdictions (Canada, Australia, and the Philippines) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Canada, Australia and the Philippines. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

Criterion #3: Registration Policies

3-A Eligibility

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered corporations and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application, etc. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for nexus.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the application possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate
registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not
the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling
a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not
consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters
of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one
particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from
other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they
were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority
Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

4-B Opposition

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for
Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook,
as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application
received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of
relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at
most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition
from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified
in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that
limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The
remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities
which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The
Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for
Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the
final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not
constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement.
For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook
and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
Hi Chris,

We have thoroughly reviewed the evaluations and relevant materials and have provided our responses below.

1. Which organization was the one you identified as relevant and of non-negligible size? Was it one of the two mentioned?

The EIU identified the European Commission as the relevant organization of non-negligible size.

2. Was EIU aware of the application comment and posted correspondence that rescinded the opposition? If so, was this considered in the evaluation?

The EIU was not aware of the second application comment from the European Commission. The EIU follows a process once an evaluation is commenced. This process includes receiving application comments from ICANN via the external shared drive at the start of each evaluation. The EIU then reviews and evaluates the relevance of each comment. The European Commission’s first comment, an objection, was included in the application comments documentation provided by ICANN.

The EIU’s process has never included the retrieval or review of additional application comments posted to the ICANN website, nor was the EIU ever asked or instructed to undertake such a review of application comments. As a result, the EIU was not aware of the second comment posted by the European Commission at a later date.

The EIU process does include a weekly review of correspondence (i.e. letters) posted to ICANN’s correspondence page. On a weekly basis, an EIU team member reviews the correspondence section of the website for all new correspondence, and determines whether there are any new letters relevant to CPE.

The EIU was aware of the posted correspondence from the US state of Delaware and reviewed the correspondence during the evaluation process.

3. How did the opposition letter referenced in the evaluation report impact the overall scoring? (e.g. Applicant got 1 point instead of 2 for opposition) Would it have made a material difference to the score?

If the EIU had considered the letter from the European Commission withdrawing its opposition, the score for Opposition would have increased to two (2), up from one (1) previously, for the evaluations in question. However, this would have had no material impact on the final outcome.
of the evaluation.

--

Please let me know if you have any follow-up questions.

Best wishes,

[Redacted]

On 16 July 2014 19:20, Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org> wrote:

The applicant for LLC, LLP, and INC (Dot Registry, LLC) has filed Reconsideration Requests (RR) with the ICANN board. Our legal team is currently drafting a response to these RRs and need some additional information from EIU.

In the RRs, the applicant is questioning the one opposition letter that 'was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size'. The applicant is claiming that the 2 opposition letters they were aware of from organizations of non-negligible size (Secretary of State for Delaware, European Commission) were rescinded later by the authors. The State of Delaware was rescinded via application comments on 20 March and the European Commission via correspondence posted on 25 March.

What we need to know from you in order to write our response:

1. Which organization was the one you identified as relevant and of non-negligible size? Was it one of the two mentioned?
2. Was EIU aware of the application comment and posted correspondence that rescinded the opposition? If so, was this considered in the evaluation?
3. How did the opposition letter referenced in the evaluation report impact the overall scoring? (e.g. Applicant got 1 point instead of 2 for opposition) Would it have made a material difference to the score?

We would like the information as soon as possible. Tomorrow would be great, Thursday at the latest as we want to have the response ready for the board meeting later this week.

Here are the links to the RRs for your reference. They make for some interesting reading.

LLC: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/14-30-2014-06-25-en
INC: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/14-32-2014-06-26-en
LLP: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/14-33-2014-06-26-en

Let us know if you have any questions about what we are asking.

Thanks

Chris

--

This e-mail may contain confidential material. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. It may also contain personal views which are not the views of The Economist Group. We may monitor e-mail to and from our network.

Sent by a member of The Economist Group. The Group's parent company is The Economist Newspaper Limited, registered in England with company number
236383 and registered office at 25 St James’s Street, London, SW1A 1HG. For Group company registration details go to http://legal.economistgroup.com
From: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>
To: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Cc: Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>
Subject: Feedback on draft reports
Received(Date): Tue, 27 May 2014 09:29:09 -0700

EIU Contact Information Redacted

Russ and I reviewed the draft reports and have some feedback.

1. The term 'construed community' was not well received by the applicant community. We suggest a change to the term itself as well as additional explanation as to what is meant. Perhaps acknowledgement that while a group appears to exist/has existed for some time, the lack of an organizing or governing body.....does not meet requirements for the group to be considered a community.....

2. Criterion 1A- Delineation: Reference is made to the lack of at least one major entity dedicated to the community. Would a large number of smaller entities qualify as a majority. A reference to that effect and the fact that this was not represented in the application might help.

3. Criterion 1A: Delineation: The report cites that lack of a dedicated entity leads to the lack of organized activities. Can we elaborate? What constitutes an organized activity. Does the registering of a company with the Secretaries of State count as an activity?

4. Criterion 2B- Uniqueness: There is reference to the string having other significant meaning. Can we have an example (such as was provided in MLS) as to what other meanings might exist?

5. Criterion 3c- Content and Use: can we have an example or explanation as to how the applications Content and Use policies fall short of the requirements (reference to GMBH)?

6. Criterion 4- Community Endorsement: We expect this section to get a lot of attention. More detail explaining the difference in the relevance of the letters of support would be helpful. For example an explanation that the letters form the SoS while somewhat relevant did carry as much weight due to the fact that they are not dedicated to the community but act as a regulator....etc.

7. The term 'does not have awareness and recognition among its members' appears many times. Can we do something to highlight this theme to bring it to the forefront. This seems to be a critical part of every evaluation.

Russ, anything else to add?

Thanks

Chris
Hi Chris and Russ,

I have attached the revised set of four corporate designation results (draft). We addressed most of your comments.

1. The term 'constructed community' was not well received by the applicant community. We suggest a change to the term itself as well as additional explanation as to what is meant. Perhaps acknowledgement that while a group appears to exist/has existed for some time, the lack of an organizing or governing body does not meet requirements for the group to be considered a community.

Added in language from the AGB. Second paragraph under 4.2.3.

2. Criterion 1A: Delineation: Reference is made to the lack of at least one major entity dedicated to the community. Would a large number of smaller entities qualify as a majority. A reference to that effect and the fact that this was not represented in the application might help.

We will keep an open mind about fragmented communities.

3. Criterion 1A: Delineation: The report cites that lack of a dedicated entity leads to the lack of organized activities. Can we elaborate? What constitutes an organized activity. Does the registering of a company with the Secretaries of State count as an activity?

EIU feedback: too difficult to define such activities because of how they would vary across community. Moreover, it's not defined in the AGB, so the EIU decided not to add any clarification on this.

4. Criterion 2B: Uniqueness: There is reference to the string having other significant meaning. Can we have an example (such as was provided in MLS) as to what other meanings might exist?

Added examples where appropriate. If the applicant did not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus, then they are ineligible for a score of 1 on Uniqueness and this is the explanation that we provided.

5. Criterion 3c- Content and Use: can we have an example or explanation as to how the applications Content and Use policies fall short of the requirements (reference to GMBH)?
Yes, we added in more information on this.

6. Criterion 4- Community Endorsement: We expect this section to get a lot of attention. More detail explaining the difference in the relevance of the letters of support would be helpful. For example an explanation that the letters form the SoS while somewhat relevant did carry as much weight due to the fact that they are not dedicated to the community but act as a regulator’s etc.

We used the definitions provided in the AGB to add clarity on this section.

7. The term ‘does not have awareness and recognition among its members’ appears many times. Can we do something to highlight this theme to bring it to the forefront. This seems to be a critical part of every evaluation.

Already discussed-- likely difficult to add this.

Once you have the opportunity to take a second look, please feel free to provide feedback via phone or email that we can incorporate ahead of the meeting next week.

Best wishes,

  EIU Contact
  Information
  Redacted

Economist Intelligence Unit
Custom Research
  EIU Contact Information Redacted

Website: research.eiu.com
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New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35979
Applied-for String: INC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>5 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment 0/4 Point(s)
1-A Delineation 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("INC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as corporations within the United States or its territories. This would include Corporations, Incorporated Businesses, Benefit Corporations, Mutual Benefit Corporations and Non-Profit Corporations. Corporations or "INC’s" as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most complex business entity structures in the U.S. Corporations commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation....

A corporation is defined as a business created under the laws of a State as a separate legal entity, that has privileges and liabilities that are distinct from those of its members. While corporate law varies in different jurisdictions, there are four characteristics of the business corporation that remain consistent: legal personality, limited liability, transferable shares, and centralized management under a board structure. Corporate statutes typically empower corporations to own property, sign binding contracts, and pay taxes in a capacity separate from that of its shareholders.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a corporation with the relevant US state. In addition, corporations must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same corporate legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between corporations operating in different sectors of the economy. These corporations would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Corporations can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. Corporation formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each State’s regulations. Persons form a corporation by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Incorporation. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of organization, which establish a limited liability company as a legal entity. At minimum, the Articles of Incorporation give a brief description of proposed business activities, shareholders, stock issued and the registered business address.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the .art application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does
not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

|0/2 Points|

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of considerable size. The community for .INC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With almost 470,000 new corporations registered in the United States in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) resulting in over 8,000,000 total corporations in the US, it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with a corporation.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because corporations operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed
merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the .INC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because corporations operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-A Nexus</th>
<th>0/3 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applied-for string (.INC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“.INC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language the word incorporation is primarily shortened to Inc. when used to delineate business entity types. For example, McMillion Incorporated would additionally be referred to as McMillion Inc. Since all of our community members are incorporated businesses we believed that “.INC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US Territories denoting the corporate status of an entity. Our research indicates that Inc. as corporate identifier is used in three other jurisdictions (Canada, Australia, and the Philippines) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Canada, Australia and the Philippines. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for nexus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2-B Uniqueness**  

| 0/1 Point(s) |
| The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant |
Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #3: Registration Policies</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A Eligibility</td>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered corporations and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application, etc. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

| 3-B Name Selection | 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

| 3-C Content and Use | 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in...
Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-D Enforcement</th>
<th>0/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, it a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement</th>
<th>2/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-A Support</td>
<td>1/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-B Opposition</th>
<th>1/2 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-17627
Applied-for String: LLC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring 5 Point(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment 0/4 Point(s)

1-A Delineation 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies or (LLC’s) as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLC’s commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation.

An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLC’s are a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLC’s are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLC’s share a key characteristic with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLC’s are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant US state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability companies operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

- LLC’s can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and registered business address. LLC’s are expected to conduct business in conjunction with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates a LLC’s level of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no
documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With the number of registered LLC's in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with an LLC.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word
as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the .LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

### Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

#### 2-A Nexus

0/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (.LLC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

> “.LLC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that “.LLC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

> LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

#### 2-B Uniqueness

0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook.
Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

### Criterion #3: Registration Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-A Eligibility</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-B Name Selection</th>
<th>1/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-C Content and Use</th>
<th>1/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in...
Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-D Enforcement</th>
<th>0/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongly applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement</th>
<th>2/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-A Support</td>
<td>1/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-B Opposition</th>
<th>1/2 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35508
Applied-for String: IJP
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result: Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring 5 Point(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment 0/4 Point(s)

1-A Delineation 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLP") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as Limited Liability Partnerships with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Partnerships or (LLP's) as they are commonly abbreviated, are specifically designed to represent professional service businesses in the US. Limited Liability Partnerships are commonly adopted by businesses which focus on: accounting, attorneys, architects, dentists, doctors and other fields treated as professionals under each state’s law....

A Limited Liability Partnership is defined as a partnership in which some or all partners (depending on jurisdiction) have limited liability. LLP’s therefore exhibit qualities of both partnerships and corporations. In an LLP, one partner is not responsible or liable for another partner’s misconduct or negligence. This distinction is why the LLP is a popular business entity amongst accountants, doctors, and lawyers; which deal heavily with issues that could inspire malpractice lawsuits.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability partnership with the relevant US state (LLPs operate in about 40 US states). In addition, limited liability partnerships must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Having the same legal business structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community between limited liability partnerships operating in different sectors of the economy. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Limited Liability Partnerships can be formed through all but ten states in the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in close to forty US states. LLP formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLP by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLP application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007.
(when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .LLP as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application, “LLPs represent a small but prestigious sector of business in the United States.”

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed merely to a get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the .LLP community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another, and having the same legal structure is not sufficient to forge a sense of community amongst them.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</th>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-A Nexus</td>
<td>0/3 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLP) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLP” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Partnership is primarily shortened to LLP when used to delineate business entity types…

LLP is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that LLP as corporate identifier is used in eleven other jurisdictions (Canada, China, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, and the United Kingdom) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Poland, the UK, Canada and Japan, amongst others. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-B Uniqueness</th>
<th>0/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #3: Registration Policies</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A Eligibility</td>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability partnerships and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

| 3-B Name Selection                  | 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

| 3-C Content and Use                 | 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

| 3-D Enforcement                    | 0/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant.
Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeal mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement</th>
<th>2/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-A Support</td>
<td>1/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. "Recognized" means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. "Relevance" refers to the community’s explicit and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

| 4-B Opposition | 1/2 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.
To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
From: Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>  
   EIU Contact Information Redacted  Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>  
   EIU Contact Information Redacted

Subject: Re: EIU team update

Confidential Third Party Information

Privileged and Confidential

EIU Contact Information Redacted

Here are a few more comments for the corporate identifiers. We have only included LLC and GmbH, but the comments should apply across all reports.

Confidential Third Party Information

One thing to note: When we read the reports, we tried to put ourselves in the mind frame of the applicant to see what areas were controversial or difficult to understand. We want to make sure that any assertions made have some justification to help explain. References to the AGB are great. As are explanations as to why an application fell short of the AGB criteria.

We appreciate the changes made through these revisions and want to thank you and the team for all the hard work. We hope to get the final draft (I hope) back from you by the beginning of next week so we can start the process of getting them approved and posted. Let me know if you see any problems with that timing.

Thanks again,
Chris

From: EIU Contact Information Redacted
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2014 1:41 PM
To: Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org>
Cc: EIU Contact Information Redacted  Christopher Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>

Subject: Re: EIU team update

Hi Russ,

Finalizing results: INC, LLP, LLC,

Confidential Third Party Information; Nonresponsive Information

will be taking on a bigger share of the workload. Here's a quick status update:
Best wishes,

Russ Weinstein
Sr. Manager gTLD Operations
ICANN

On 5 June 2014 11:30, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstei@icann.org> wrote:

Thank you for the update. Sounds like the team is going to be a little short staffed in June, I am optimistic there will be minimal impact to schedule, given where we are with evaluation progress. Will the team be ready to ramp back up for more reviews in early July?

Congratulations on your new position. It has been a pleasure working with you, we appreciate all your hard work and dedication to the success of the CPE so far. Thanks much, best of luck.

Russ Weinstein
Sr. Manager gTLD Operations
ICANN

From: Russ.Weinstein@icann.org
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2014 11:06 AM
To: Chris Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstei@icann.org>,

Hi Russ and Chris,

Hi, after a year working with us on the ICANN project, I will continue to guide the team on evaluations, and will help us train up her replacement. Her last day is TBD, but will likely be Wednesday, June 25th. In the interim, and I will remain on the team and provide continuity.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Russ Weinstein
Sr. Manager gTLD Operations
ICANN

From: Russ.Weinstein@icann.org
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2014 11:06 AM
To: Chris Bare <christopher.bare@icann.org>, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstei@icann.org>,
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
Confidential Third Party Information
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 May 2014

Application ID: 1-880-1/627
Applied-for String: LLC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nems between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 15

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

1-A: Delineation

0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies or (LLC)’s as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLC’s commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation.

An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLC’s are a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLC’s are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLC’s share a key characteristic with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLC’s are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant US state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other determinants related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLC’s from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Poetic Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretaries of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

LLC’s can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and registered business address. LLC’s are expected to conduct business in conformance with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates a LLC’s level of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.
The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string, and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

"With the number of registered LLC’s in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with an LLC."

However, as previously stated the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. [These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.]

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.
The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string and, therefore, the pursuits of the LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the AGB. These limited liability companies would therefore not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

0/4 Point(s)

2-A Nexus

0/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criteria for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that “LLC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. The Panel’s research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.
The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

2-B Uniqueness 0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #3: Registration Policies</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A Eligibility</td>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and
Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

4-A Support

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not
the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

4-B Opposition

1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
Hi Russ and Chris

Please find attached the revised drafts of the four corporate identifiers, which address your comments.

Please let me know if anything is unclear.

Best,

This e-mail may contain confidential material. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. It may also contain personal views which are not the views of The Economist Group. We may monitor e-mail to and from our network.

Sent by a member of The Economist Group. The Group’s parent company is The Economist Newspaper Limited, registered in England with company number 236383 and registered office at 25 St James’s Street, London, SW1A 1HG. For Group company registration details go to http://legal.economistgroup.com
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New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 June 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35979
Applied for String: INC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result
Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring 5 Point(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

1-A Delineation 0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("INC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as corporations within the United States or its territories. This would include Corporations, Incorporated Businesses, Benefit Corporations, Mutual Benefit Corporations and Non-Profit Corporations. Corporations or "INC's" as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most complex business entity structures in the U.S. Corporations commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation.

A corporation is defined as a business created under the laws of a State as a separate legal entity, that has privileges and liabilities that are distinct from those of its members. While corporate law varies in different jurisdictions, there are four characteristics of the business corporation that remain consistent: legal personality, limited liability, transferable shares, and centralized management under a board structure. Corporate statutes typically empower corporations to own property, sign binding contracts, and pay taxes in a capacity separate from that of its shareholders.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined, as membership requires formal registration as a corporation with the relevant US state. In addition, corporations must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on the Panel's research, there is no evidence of INC's from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. There is no evidence that these incorporated firms would associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretaries of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Corporations can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. Corporation formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each State’s regulations. Persons form a corporation by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Incorporation. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of organization, which establish a limited liability company as a legal entity. At minimum, the Articles of Incorporation give a brief description of proposed business activities, shareholders, stock issued and the registered business address.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the INC application, there is no
documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string as these corporations would typically not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. The community therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .INC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With almost 470,000 new corporations registered in the United States in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) resulting in over 8,000,000 total corporations in the US, it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with a corporation.

However, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of INCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These incorporated firms would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.
The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string, as these corporations would typically not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. Therefore, the pursuits of the .INC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because corporations operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an INC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of INCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These incorporated firms would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

### Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-A Nexus</th>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/3 Point(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (.INC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“.INC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language the word incorporation is primarily shortened to Inc. when used to delineate business entity types. For example, McMillion Incorporated would additionally be referred to as McMillion Inc. Since all of our community members are incorporated businesses we believed that “.INC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

Inc. is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US Territories denoting the corporate status of an entity. Our research indicates that Inc. as corporate identifier is used in three other jurisdictions (Canada, Australia, and the Philippines) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the
community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Canada, Australia and the Philippines. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for nexus.

2.B Uniqueness  

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2.B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

### Criterion #3: Registration Policies  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-A Eligibility</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 Point(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered corporations and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application, etc. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20d of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection  

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.
3-C Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherene to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant's abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

4-A Support

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.
The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

4-B Opposition

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 June 2014

Application ID: 1-880-1/627
Applied-for String: LLC
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result

Did Not Prevail

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through other methods described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Necessity between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

1A: Delineation

0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criteria for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLC") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as limited liability companies with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Companies or (LLCs) as they are commonly abbreviated, represent one of the most popular business entity structures in the US. LLC’s commonly participate in acts of commerce, public services, and product creation.

An LLC is defined as a flexible form of enterprise that blends elements of partnership and corporate structures. It is a legal form of company that provides limited liability to its owners in the vast majority of United States jurisdictions. LLC’s are a unique entity type because they are considered a hybrid, having certain characteristics of both a corporation and a partnership or sole proprietorship. LLC’s are closely related to corporations in the sense that they participate in similar activities and provide limited liability to their partners. Additionally, LLC’s share a key characteristic with partnerships through the availability of pass-through income taxation. LLC’s are a more flexible entity type than a corporation and are often well suited for businesses owned by a single owner.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability company with the relevant US state. In addition, limited liability companies must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other determinants related to the content structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLC’s from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. There is no evidence that these limited liability companies would associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Purity Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organisation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretaries of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

LLC’s can be formed through any jurisdiction of the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in all 50 US states and its territories. LLC formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state’s regulations. Persons form an LLC by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State. Most states require the filing of Articles of Organization. These are considered public documents and are similar to articles of incorporation, which establish a corporation as a legal entity. At minimum, the articles of organization give a brief description of the intended business purposes, the registered agent, and the registered business address. LLC’s are expected to conduct business in conjunction with the policies of the state in which they are formed, and the Secretary of State periodically evaluates an LLC’s level of good standing based on their commercial interactions with both the state and consumers.
The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLC application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is intended to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” constructed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string, as these limited liability companies typically do not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. The community therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criteria for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for LLC as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application:

With the number of registered LLC’s in the United States totaling over five million in 2010 (as reported by the International Association of Commercial Administrators) it is hard for the average consumer to not conduct business with an LLC.

However, as previously stated the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability companies would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a “community” construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string as these limited liability companies would typically not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. Therefore, the pursuit of the LLC community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability companies operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another.

Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLC. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLCs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability companies would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community 0/4 Point(s)

2-A Nexus 0/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLC) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLC” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language Limited Liability Company is primarily shortened to LLC when used to delineate business entity types. Since all of our community members are limited liability companies we believed that “LLC” would be the simplest, most straightforward way to accurately represent our community.

LLC is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. The Panel’s research indicates that while other jurisdictions use LLC as a corporate identifier, their definitions are quite different and there are no other known associations or definitions of LLC in the English language.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the
community has, as the corporate identifier is used in other jurisdictions (outside the US). Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.

### 2-B Uniqueness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0/1 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

### Criterion #3: Registration Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 3-A Eligibility

| 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability companies and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20c of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

#### 3-B Name Selection

| 1/1 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20c of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

#### 3-C Content and Use

| 1/1 Point(s) |
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The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeal mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, if a registrant wrongfully applied for and was awarded a second level domain name, the right to hold this domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) However, the application did not outline an appeals process.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

2/4 Point(s)

4-A Support

1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to
constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-B Opposition</th>
<th>4/2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied-for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 June 2014

Application ID: 1-880-35508
Applied-for String: LLP
Applicant Name: Dot Registry LLC

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priority Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Did Not Prevail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>5 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

Criterion #1: Community Establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.A: Delineation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application ("LLP") is:

Members of the community are defined as businesses registered as Limited Liability Partnerships with the United States or its territories. Limited Liability Partnerships (LLPs) are commonly registered with limited liability. LLPs are therefore considered entities which focus on accounting, attorneys, architects, dentists, doctors and other fields treated as professionals under each state's law.

A Limited Liability Partnership is defined as a partnership in which some or all partners (depending on jurisdiction) have limited liability. LLPs therefore exhibit qualities of both partnerships and corporations. In an LLP, one partner is not responsible or liable for another partner's misconduct or negligence. This distinction is why the LLP is a popular business entity amongst accountants, doctors, and lawyers; which deal heavily with issues that could inspire malpractice lawsuits.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly defined, as membership requires formal registration as a limited liability partnership with the relevant US state (LLPs operate in about 40 US states). In addition, limited liability partnerships must comply with US state law and show proof of best practice in commercial dealings to the relevant state authorities.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLP. Based on the Panel's research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. There is no evidence that these limited liability partnerships would associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization:

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Although responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation are vested in each individual US state, these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. In addition, the offices of the Secretary of State of US states are not mainly dedicated to the community as they have other roles/functions beyond processing corporate registrations. According to the application:

Limited Liability Partnerships can be formed through all but ten states in the United States. Therefore members of this community exist in close to forty US states. LLP formation guidelines are dictated by state law and can vary based on each state's regulations. Persons form an LLP by filing required documents with the appropriate state authority, usually the Secretary of State.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the LLP application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.
Pre-existence
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. According to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to a "community" construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string, as these limited liability partnerships would not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. The community therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension
0/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criteria for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of considerable size. The community for LLP as defined in the application is large in terms of number of members. According to the application, "LLPs represent a small but prestigious sector of business in the United States."

However, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entity structure as an LLP. Based on the Panel's research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. As mentioned previously, according to section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook the CPE process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that this application refers to...
a “community” construed to obtain a sought-after corporate identifier as a gTLD string, as these limited liability partnerships would typically not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant. Therefore, the pursuits of the LLP community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature.

Additionally, as previously stated, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition of a community among its members. This is because limited liability partnerships operate in vastly different sectors, which sometimes have little or no association with one another. Research showed that firms are typically organized around specific industries, locales, and other criteria not related to the entities structure as an LLP. Based on the Panel’s research, there is no evidence of LLPs from different sectors acting as a community as defined by the Applicant Guidebook. These limited liability partnerships would therefore not typically associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</th>
<th>6/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-A Nexus</td>
<td>0/3 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string identifies the community, but over-reaches substantially beyond the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community. “Identity” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (LLP) over-reaches substantially, as the string indicates a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part but is not specific to the applicant’s community. According to the application documentation:

“LLP” was chosen as our gTLD string because it is the commonly used abbreviation for the entity type that makes up the membership of our community. In the English language, Limited Liability Partnership is commonly shortened to LLP when used to delineate business entity types.

LLP is a recognized abbreviation in all 50 states and US territories denoting the registration type of a business entity. Our research indicates that LLP as corporate identifier is used in eleven other jurisdictions (Canada, China, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, and the United Kingdom) though their formation regulations are different from the United States and their entity designations would not fall within the boundaries of our community definition.

While the string identifies the name of the community, it captures a wider geographical remit than the community has, as the corporate identifier is used in Poland, the UK, Canada and Japan, amongst others. Therefore, there is a substantial over-reach between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string over-reaches substantially beyond the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for Nexus.
2-B Uniqueness 0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application and it must also score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

Criterion #3: Registration Policies 3/4 Point(s)

3-A Eligibility 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by limiting eligibility to registered limited liability partnerships and by cross-referencing their documentation against the applicable US state’s registration records in order to verify the accuracy of their application. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should match or include a substantial part of the registrant’s legal name, and specifying that registrants will not be able to register product line registrations, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use 1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.
To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting that all registrants must adhere to the content restrictions outlined in the applicant’s abuse policies. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

0/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. For example, a registrant who fails to pay fees will be subject to a second level domain name, the right to hold that domain name will be immediately forfeited. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation.) However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

2/4 Point(s)

4-A Support

1/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from a majority of the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support.

The application included letters from a number of Secretaries of State of US states, which were considered to constitute support from groups with relevance, as each Secretary of State has responsibility for corporate registrations and the regulations pertaining to corporate formation in its jurisdiction. These entities are not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), as these government agencies are fulfilling a function, rather than representing the community. The viewpoints expressed in these letters were not consistent across states. While several US states expressed clear support for the applicant during the Letters of Support verification process, others either provided qualified support, refrained from endorsing one...
particular applicant over another, or did not respond to the verification request. Letters of support from other entities did not meet the requirement for relevance based on the Applicant Guidebook criteria, as they were not from the recognized community institutions/member organizations. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

### 4-B Opposition

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application received relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received several letters of opposition, one of which was determined to be relevant opposition from an organization of non-negligible size. This opposition was from a community that was not identified in the application but which has an association to the applied-for string. Opposition was on the grounds that limiting registration to US registered corporations only would unfairly exclude non-US businesses. The remaining letters were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfied the requirements for Opposition.

Disclaimers: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtld.icann.org>.
Hi Russ,

Here it is:

INC
1 and 2

LLC
3 and 2

LLP
3 and 4

Best,

EIU Contact Information Redacted

On 18 July 2014 16:18, Russ Weinstein <russ.weinstein@icann.org> wrote:

Sorry we got a last minute question from our legal dept as they prepare the report for the board regarding the reconsideration requests for the LLC, LLP, INC evaluations.

Was it the same 2 evaluators who evaluated all 3 apps?

Confidential Third Party Information; Nonresponsive Information

No need to reveal names. If you could help us understand the pairings of be evaluators on each app that would be great. If you want to say eval 1 and 2 did XYZ while 3 & 4 did ABC and 1 & 4 did EFG. That would be fine.

Just need the facts. No wrong answers. Thanks

Russ,

Sent from my mobile
Hi Russ and Chris,

I wanted to check with you as to whether there are any To Dos or changes to the evaluation write ups that we should work on based on feedback from yesterday's meeting? Please let us know of any updates you would like us to make, or what, if any, To Dos there are prior to submitting final versions of the four results (GMBH, INC, LLP, and LLC).

Best,

[Signature]

EIU Contact Information Redacted
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
Little Birch LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (.ECO) & Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, and Radix FZC v. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (.HOTEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Sur-Reply to the Reply of Little Birch, LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited (.ECO) ([en/system/files/files/irp-little-birch-et-al-</td>
<td>10 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 October 2015</td>
<td><strong>Additional Submission Reply to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Response By Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry LLC, and Radix FZC</strong> [PDF, 5.61 MB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Annexes #16 and #17 [PDF, 1.22 MB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reference Materials #32 to #50 [PDF, 25.5 MB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 October 2015</td>
<td><strong>Additional Submission Reply to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Response By Little Birch and Minds + Machines Group Limited</strong> [PDF, 4.92 MB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reference Materials #35 to #53 [PDF, 25.5 MB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2015</td>
<td><strong>Procedural Order No. 1</strong> [PDF, 58 KB]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The page contains links to various documents and exhibits filed as part of the proceedings in the case Little Birch LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited v. ICANN (.ECO) & Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, and Radix FZC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Response to Little Birch and Minds + Machine Group Limited's Request for Independent Review Process</td>
<td>27 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Response to Despegar Online, Donuts, Famous Four Media, Fegistry and Radix's Request for Independent Review Process</td>
<td>17 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Independent Review Process from Little Birch and Minds + Machine Group Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexes 1 to 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials 1 to 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials 1 to 9</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials 10 to 31</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Independent Review Process from Despegar Online, Donuts, Famous Four Media, Fegistry and Radix</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Independent Review Process from Despegar Online, Donuts, Famous Four Media, Fegistry and Radix</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexes 1 to 15</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials 10 to 33</td>
<td>10 March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[PDF, 11.4 MB]

[PDF, 17.9 MB]

[PDF, 793 KB]

[PDF, 3.41 MB]

[PDF, 7.82 MB]

[PDF, 6.73 MB]

[PDF, 13.8 MB]
Subject: Re: [Reconsideration Request] Reconsideration Requests 18-6
Date: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 at 1:59:16 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Herb Waye (sent by reconsider <reconsider-bounces@icann.org>)
To: Reconsideration
CC: ombudsman

Reconsideration Request 18-6

Pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.2(l)(iii), I am recusing myself from consideration of Request 18-6.

Best regards,

Herb Waye
ICANN Ombudsman

https://www.icann.org/ombudsman [icann.org]
https://www.facebook.com/ICANNOmbudsman [facebook.com]
Twitter: @IcannOmbudsman

ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:
Community Anti-Harassment Policy
Confidentiality
All matters brought before the Ombudsman shall be treated as confidential. The Ombudsman shall also take all reasonable steps necessary to preserve the privacy of, and to avoid harm to, those parties not involved in the complaint being investigated by the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall only make inquiries about, or advise staff or Board members of, the existence and identity of, a complainant in order to further the resolution of the complaint. The Ombudsman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to ensure that if staff and Board members are made aware of the existence and identity of a complainant, they agree to maintain the confidential nature of such information, except as necessary to further the resolution of a complaint.

From: Reconsideration <Reconsideration@icann.org>
Date: Saturday, May 19, 2018 at 7:20 PM
To: ombudsman <ombudsman@icann.org>
Cc: Reconsideration <Reconsideration@icann.org>
Subject: Reconsideration Requests 18-4, 18-5, and 18-6

Dear Herb,

On 13 and 14 April 2018, the following Reconsideration Requests were submitted seeking reconsideration of ICANN Board Resolutions 2018.03.15.08 through 2018.03.15.11, which resolved the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Process Review:

- Request 18-4 filed by dotgay LLC
- Request 18-5 filed by DotMusic Limited


• Request 18-6 filed by Travel Reservations SRL, Minds + Machines Group Limited, Radix FZC, dot Hotel Inc., Fegistry LLC

The Requests have been published on the Reconsideration page and are also attached.

The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee (BAMC) has determined that Requests 18-4, 18-5, and 18-6 are sufficiently stated pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.2(k) of the ICANN Bylaws. Pursuant the Article 4, Section 4.2(l) of the ICANN Bylaws, a reconsideration request must be sent to the Ombudsman for consideration and evaluation if the request is not summarily dismissed following review by the BAMC to determine if the request is sufficiently stated. Specifically, Section 4.2(l)[icann.org] states:

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

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

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

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

Please advise whether you are accepting Requests 18-4, 18-5, and 18-6 for evaluation or whether you are recusing yourself pursuant to the grounds for recusal set forth in Section 4.2(l)(iii). If you are accepting Requests 18-4, 18-5, and 18-6 for evaluation, please note that your substantive evaluation must be provided to the BAMC within 15 days of receipt of the Requests.

Best regards,
ICANN
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION
INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL
ICDR No. 01-16-0000-7056

In the Matter of an Independent Review Process

Between:

AMAZON EU S.A.R.L.,
Claimant,

-and-

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS,
Respondent.

ORDER NO. 3: DENYING AMAZON’S OBJECTIONS TO REDACTIONS OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE HEARING TRANSCRIPT AND EXHIBITS

By letter brief dated May 26, 2017, Claimant Amazon EU S. a. r. l. (“Amazon”) objected to certain proposed redactions contained in the transcript of the hearing conducted on May 1-2, 2017. By letter brief dated June 1, 2017, ICANN responded to and opposed Amazon’s objections to the redactions.

All of the redactions involve explicit references to or information contained in certain exhibits, seven in total, that prior to the hearing were designated either CONFIDENTIAL or HIGLY CONFIDENTIAL under a stipulated Protective Order entered by the Panel on January 4, 2017. Amazon br., Ex. 1. The Protective Order, titled Joint Stipulation Against Unauthorized Use or Disclosure of Confidential Information (“Joint Stipulation”), set forth the criteria for confidentiality designations. Thus, it permitted either party to designate certain documents
produced to the other in pre-hearing discovery as either “CONFIDENTAL” based on a good faith belief that such document, *inter alia*, contained non-public “confidential or proprietary information” or contained information covered by a legitimate privacy right or interest” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” based on a good faith belief that the disclosure of same “would result in a serious competitive disadvantage to the producing party or otherwise seriously harm the producing Party.” Ex. 1, paras. 1 and 3. The parties stipulated that CONFIDENTIAL and HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL documents or information derived from them is to be redacted from transcripts of, *inter alia*, the IRP hearing. Ex. 1, para. 9. In making designations, both parties were to have due regard for ICANN’s commitment to operate “to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner”, as provided for under Article III, Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of its By-Laws. Ex., para. 7.

The Joint Stipulation further provided for a procedure for the non-designating party to challenge or object to the producing party’s classification before this Panel, but required that it do so within five days after conferring with the other party concerning its objection. Ex. 1, para. 6. No challenge or objection was filed with this Panel by either party until Amazon’s challenge of May 26, 2017, well after the confidentiality designations had been made as to the seven exhibits in question.

Amazon contends that the redactions and, therefore, the underlying seven exhibits, must be disclosed, pursuant to transparency obligations of ICANN’s By-Laws. In addition, Amazon cites to ICANN’s Publication Practices (Amazon br., Ex. 2) as further support for its position. Among other things, chapter III relates to ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy – Defined Conditions of Disclosure (“DIDP”). Chapter IV relates to Independent Review Process Materials. Amazon argues that the redactions are inconsistent with ICANN’s transparency obligations under the By-Laws and the provisions of the DIDP.

ICANN argues, in essence, that Amazon agreed to the criteria for confidentiality designations in the Joint Stipulation. It also contends that in the context on an IRP, such confidentiality protections may be, and in this case, were necessary to the full exchange of relevant documents. While ICANN has a commitment to transparency, its By-Laws and the DIDP recognize that there are situations where non-disclosure is appropriate.

Having reviewed and considered the letter briefs, the Joint Stipulation, the seven exhibits designated CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL, the redactions of limited portions of the hearing transcript, including the testimony of Akram Atallah and closing argument of counsel and colloquy between counsel and the Panel relating to the CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL exhibits, and ICANN’s Publication Practices, and for the reasons set forth below, the Panel declares that Amazon’s objections to the redactions are not well taken. They are, therefore, denied.

Six of the exhibits used by Amazon in its examination of Mr. Atallah and in closing argument were and are designated as Confidential (two were downgraded from Highly Confidential to Confidential at or near the time of the hearing) and one is still designated Highly Confidential. Upon review, the underlying exhibits appear to have been appropriately designated in the first instance, based upon the criteria agreed to by parties in their Joint Stipulation. (Ex. 1,
The designations appear to have been made in good faith by ICANN, and there is no evidence to the contrary. Moreover, notwithstanding ICANN’s transparency commitment, both ICANN’s By-Laws and its Publication Practices recognize that there are situations where non-public information, e.g., internal staff communications relevant to the deliberative processes of ICANN and sensitive private communications between ICANN and government officials may contain information that is appropriately protected against disclosure. See, e.g., Ex. 2, Chapter III, first and second bullets.

Based on our review, the redactions of hearing transcript appear to be directly related to information contained in the exhibits designated Confidential or Highly Confidential and, therefore, those portions of the transcript are properly redacted, pursuant to the Joint Stipulation. Ex. 1, para. 6; see also, Ex. 2, Chapter IV.C.

In light of our ruling, we do not reach ICANN’s argument that Amazon has waived its objections to some or all of the exhibits and to redactions from the transcript containing information revealed in those exhibits.

After conferring with his co-Panelists, the Chair was authorized to sign this Order on behalf of the entire Panel.

SO ORDERED this 7th day of June, 2017

Robert C. Bonner
Chair and on behalf of the Panel
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy

NOTE: With the exception of personal email addresses, phone numbers and mailing addresses, DIDP Requests are otherwise posted in full on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s website, unless there are exceptional circumstances requiring further redaction.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) is intended to ensure that information contained in documents concerning ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s operational activities, and within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s possession, custody, or control, is made available to the public unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality.

A principal element of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s approach to transparency and information disclosure is the identification of a comprehensive set of materials that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) makes available on its website as a matter of course.

Specifically, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has:

- Identified many of the categories of documents that are already made public as a matter of due course
- Developed a time frame for responding to requests for information not already publicly available
- Identified specific conditions for nondisclosure of information
- Described the mechanism under which requestors may appeal a denial of disclosure
Public Documents

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) posts on its website at www.icann.org, numerous categories of documents in due course. A list of those categories follows:

- Articles of Incorporation –
  [http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/articles](http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/articles)
- Board Meeting Transcripts, Minutes and Resolutions –
  [http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/meetings](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/meetings)
- Bylaws (archives) –
  [http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws/archive](http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws/archive)
- Correspondence – [http://www.icann.org/correspondence/](http://www.icann.org/correspondence/)
- Monthly Registry reports –


- Speeches, Presentations & Publications – [http://www.icann.org/presentations](http://www.icann.org/presentations)

- Strategic Plan – [http://www.icann.org/en/about/planning](http://www.icann.org/en/about/planning)

- Material information relating to the Address Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (ASO (Address Supporting Organization)) – [http://aso.icann.org/docs](http://aso.icann.org/docs) including ASO (Address Supporting Organization) policy documents, Regional Internet Registry (RIR (Regional Internet Registry)) policy documents, guidelines and procedures, meeting agendas and minutes, presentations, routing statistics, and information regarding the RIRs.

- Material information relating to the Generic Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)) – [http://gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org) – including correspondence and presentations, council resolutions, requests for comments, draft documents, policies, reference documents (see [http://gnso.icann.org/reference-documents.htm](http://gnso.icann.org/reference-documents.htm)), and council administration documents (see [http://gnso.icann.org/council/docs.shtml](http://gnso.icann.org/council/docs.shtml)).

- Material information relating to the country code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)) – [http://ccnso.icann.org](http://ccnso.icann.org) – including meeting agendas, minutes, reports, and presentations.

- Material information relating to the At Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee)) –
http://atlarge.icann.org (http://atlarge.icann.org) – including correspondence, statements, and meeting minutes

- Material information relating to the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)) – http://gac.icann.org/web/index.shtml (http://gac.icann.org/web/index.shtml) – including operating principles, gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) principles, ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) principles, principles regarding gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Whois issues, communiqués, and meeting transcripts, and agendas

- Material information relating to the Root Server Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)) – http://www.icann.org/en/groups/rssac (/en/groups/rssac) – including meeting minutes and information surrounding ongoing projects

- Material information relating to the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)) – http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac (/en/groups/ssac) – including its charter, various presentations, work plans, reports, and advisories

Responding to Information Requests

If a member of the public requests information not already publicly available, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will respond, to the extent feasible, to reasonable requests within 30 calendar days of receipt of the request. If that time frame will not be met, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will inform the requester in writing as to when a response will be provided, setting forth the reasons necessary for the extension of time to respond. If ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) denies the information request, it will provide a written statement to the requestor identifying the reasons for the denial.

Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has identified the following set of conditions for the nondisclosure of information:

- 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 (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s relationship with that party.

- Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'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 (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Directors, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Directors' Advisors, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) consultants, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contractors, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) agents.

- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.

- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual's personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of
personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.

- Information provided to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

- Information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to endanger the life, health, or safety of any individual or materially prejudice the administration of justice.

- 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.

- Information that relates in any way to the security and stability of the Internet, including the operation of the L Root or any changes, modifications, or additions to the root zone.

- Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

- Information requests: (i) which are not reasonable; (ii) which are excessive or overly burdensome; (iii) complying with which is not feasible; or (iv) are made with an abusive or vexatious purpose or by a vexatious or querulous individual.

Information that falls within any of the conditions set forth above may still be made public if ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) determines, under the particular circumstances, that the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harm that may be
caused by such disclosure. Further, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) reserves the right to deny disclosure of information under conditions not designated above if ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) determines that the harm in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not be required to create or compile summaries of any documented information, and shall not be required to respond to requests seeking information that is already publicly available.

Appeal of Denials

To the extent a requestor chooses to appeal a denial of information from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the requestor may follow the Reconsideration Request procedures or Independent Review procedures, to the extent either is applicable, as set forth in Article IV, Sections 2 and 3 of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, which can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws.

DIDP Requests and Responses

Request submitted under the DIDP and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) responses are available here: http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency.

Guidelines for the Posting of Board Briefing Materials

To submit a request, send an email to didp@icann.org (mailto:didp@icann.org).
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
8 March 2016

Members of the ICANN Board, and
Mr Akram Atallah,
President, Global Domains Division

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

By e-mail

Dear Members of the ICANN Board of Directors and Mr. Atallah,

Re: .hotel data exposure issue

I am writing to you on behalf of Travel Reservations SRL ("TRS", formerly Despegar Online SRL), Famous Four Media Limited (and its subsidiary applicant dot Hotel Limited), Fegistry LLC, Minds+Machines Group Limited (formerly, Top Level Domain Holdings Limited), Donuts Inc. (and its subsidiary applicants Spring McCook, LLC and Little Birch, LLC), and Radix FZC (and its subsidiary applicant DotHotel Inc.).

My clients are all applicants for the .hotel and/or .eco gTLD and have expressed their concerns about the data exposure issue that occurred in the New gTLD Applicant and GDD portals. My clients expressed their concerns inter alia in a letter of 5 June 2015 and within the IRP proceedings in ICDR Case No. C1-15-002-8061 to which ICANN was a party. Unfortunately however, the Board has so far not addressed this issue.

In its Declaration of 11 February 2016, the IRP Panel denied my clients' requests. However, the IRP Panel considered that my clients had raised legitimate concerns that should be tackled by ICANN. With the present letter, I urge you to address my clients' concerns appropriately, with due respect for the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
On 5 June 2015 my clients asked that there be full transparency and that ICANN adopt appropriate measures regarding the data exposure issue. On 11 February 2016 the IRP Panel ruled that "[t]he approach taken by the ICANN Board so far in relation to this issue does not, in the view of the Panel, comply with Article III(1) of ICANN’s Bylaws."1 According to the Panel, it was not clear if ICANN had properly investigated the allegation of association between HOTEL Top-Level-Domain s.a.r.l. ("HTLD") and Mr. Dirk Krischenowski and, if it had, what conclusions ICANN had reached. The Panel added that ICANN is required to investigate the issue properly and to make public the fact of the investigation and the result thereof. The Panel added that appropriate action should have been taken by the date of the IRP Declaration, the failure of which could well amount to an inexcusable inaction by the Board.

At the hearing of 7 December 2015, counsel to ICANN, in the presence of senior ICANN staff and ICANN’s Deputy General Counsel, assured the panel that the issue was still under consideration by the ICANN Board.2 However, although the Board was first contacted about this on 5 June 2015, there are no indications that the Board ever gave consideration to this matter, either before or after the 7 December hearing. My clients’ request was never put on the agenda of the Board, although there have been numerous Board meetings since.

In addition, it is apparent that ICANN has not investigated the issue properly. On 10 November 2015, ICANN asserted that there is no evidence to show that HTLD is closely linked with individuals who have misused, or who have permitted the misuse of, their user credentials.3 However, the affiliation between Mr. Dirk Krischenowski and HTLD is apparent from public information that is available on the ICANN website. As a matter of fact Mr. Dirk Krischenowski of HTLD represented HTLD in three string confusion objections against applications by Despegar Online SRL and Booking.com (Annexes 1 to 3). ICANN’s own evidence thus shows that Mr. Dirk Krischenowski is part of HTLD and that he has authority to represent HTLD. To paraphrase the IRP Panel4, ICANN’s argument – that the affiliation between Mr. Dirk Krischenowski and HTLD is unsupported – represents, at best, that ICANN’s investigations had not yet revealed this obvious link and, at worst, an attempt to mislead the IRP Panel about the Board’s intent to avoid dealing with what is clearly a serious and sensitive issue that relates to the integrity of the application process for the .hotel gTLD.

The integrity of the application process for the .hotel gTLD is at risk if ICANN allows HTLD’s application to proceed. Allowing HTLD’s application to proceed would go against everything that ICANN stands for. It would amount to an acquiescence in criminal acts that were committed with the obvious intent to obtain an unfair advantage over direct competitors. Such acquiescence would be contrary to ICANN’s obligations under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and to ICANN’s mandate to operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole by carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law, and through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. When the background screening criteria for new gTLD applicants were introduced, ICANN affirmed the right to deny an otherwise qualified application, recognizing ICANN’s duty “to protect the public interest in the allocation of critical Internet resources”. In this respect, ICANN made clear that “applications from any entity with or including any individual [who] has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers [...] or

---

1 ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-8061, Despegar Online SRL et al. v. ICANN, Final Declaration, paras. 133-134.
2 ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-8061, Despegar Online SRL et al. v. ICANN, Final Declaration, para. 137.
3 ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-8061, Despegar Online SRL et al. v. ICANN, ICANN’s Sur-Reply re .hotel of 10 November 2015, para. 25.
4 ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-8061, Despegar Online SRL et al. v. ICANN, Final Declaration, para. 127.
5 gTLD Applicant Guidebook (v. 2012-06-04), Module 1-24.
the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes" were going to be "automatically disqualified from the program".

In the case at hand, ICANN caught a representative of HTLD stealing trade secrets of competing applicants via the use of computers and the Internet. The situation is even more critical as the crime was committed with the obvious intent of obtaining sensitive business information concerning a competing applicant. It is clearly not in the public interest, and the public interest will not be adequately protected, if critical Internet resources are allocated to HTLD. Allocating the .hotel TLD to HTLD is not in accordance with any of the core values that should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN. It would go against ICANN's mandate to act in conformity with, *inter alia*, open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.

As a result, we see no other solution but for ICANN to cancel HTLD's application for .hotel, and to allow the other applications for .hotel to proceed.

*

In view of the above, I reiterate my clients' request that ICANN and its Board cancel the application of HTLD for .hotel at its meeting of 10 March 2016; failing this, I have instructions to bring this matter to the attention of an IRP panel.

This letter is not intended to be a complete statement of the elements of facts or law relevant to this matter and is sent without prejudice and reserving all rights.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Flip Petition

---

*gTLD Applicant Guidebook (v. 2012-06-04), Module, 1-22.
Annexes:

Annex 1: SCO Expert Determination in ICDR Case No. 50-504-T-00237-13

Annex 2: SCO Expert Determination in ICDR Case No. 50-504-T-000211-13

Annex 3: SCO Expert Determination in ICDR Case No. 50-504-T-000212-13
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
1 March 2016

Mr Akram Atallah,
President, Global Domains Division
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cc: Members of the ICANN Board

By e-mail to Akram.Attalah@icann.org

Dear Mr. Atallah,

Re: Data exposure issue

I am writing to you on behalf of Travel Reservations SRL ("TRS", formerly Despegar Online SRL) in response to your letter of 23 February 2016 in which you request evidence that Mr. Dirk Krischenowski is affiliated with HOTEL Top-Level-Domain sàrl ("HTLD") and information demonstrating that TRS was disadvantaged by the accessing of its confidential information.

My client appreciates that you are now addressing the issue.

The answer to your first question, the evidence of affiliation between Mr. Dirk Krischenowski and HTLD, can be found in three string confusion objections initiated by HTLD against applications by Despegar Online SRL and Booking.com. In these cases, HTLD was represented by Mr. Dirk Krischenowski of HTLD (Annexes 1 to 3). The evidence shows that Mr. Dirk Krischenowski is part of HTLD and has authority to represent HTLD.

To answer your second question, TRS has been severely impacted by the unauthorized access of its confidential information, regardless of the CPE result. The unauthorized access of this information is a clear illegal appropriation of trade secrets. These trade secrets contain sensitive business information that is now held by HTLD. As you know, TRS applied for several hotel-related TLDs, including .hotel and .hoteles. HTLD is a competing applicant for .hotel. The fact that this competing applicant’s representative repeatedly accessed confidential information on business plans, contingency planning, the estimated scale of the registry’s technical operation, the technical infrastructure, etc. indicates that HTLD sought to obtain an unfair competitive advantage. If the .hotel TLD is delegated to HTLD, then TRS and HTLD would be competing in the same market of hotel-related TLDs. However, HTLD would have an unfair competitive
advantage because of its access to trade secrets it maliciously obtained. The damage resulting from such unfair competitive advantage can only be undone if HTLD is precluded from operating hotel-related TLDs.

I am confident that the above answers your questions and allows ICANN to take the only action that is appropriate given the circumstances, which is to cancel HTLD’s application for .hotel.

Indeed, allowing for HTLD’s application to proceed would go against everything that ICANN stands for. It would be the acquiescence in criminal acts that were committed with the obvious intent to obtain an unfair advantage over direct competitors. Such acquiescence would be contrary to ICANN’s obligations under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and to ICANN’s mandate 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 through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. When the background screening criteria for new gTLD applicants were introduced, ICANN affirmed the right to deny an otherwise qualified application, recognizing ICANN’s duty “to protect the public interest in the allocation of critical Internet resources” (gTLD Applicant Guidebook (v. 2012-06-04), Module 1-24). In this respect, ICANN made clear that “applications from any entity with or including any individual [who] has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers [...] or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes” were going to be “automatically disqualified from the program” (gTLD Applicant Guidebook (v. 2012-06-04), Module, 1-22).

In the case at hand, ICANN caught a representative of HTLD stealing trade secrets of competing applicants via the use of computers and the Internet. The situation is even more critical as the crime was committed with the obvious intent of obtaining sensitive business information of a competing applicant. It is clearly not in the public interest, and the public interest will not be protected, if critical Internet resources are allocated to HTLD. Allocating the .hotel TLD to HTLD is not in accord with any of the core values that should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN. It would go against ICANN’s mandate to act in conformity with, inter alia, open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.

In this respect, I must admit that your letter has come somewhat as a surprise. There should be no need for applicants to remind ICANN about its core obligations.

My initial request – on behalf of several applicants concerned – for the ICANN Board to take appropriate action on HTLD’s application dates back to 5 June 2015. TRS substantiated the request further on 29 July 2015. Now, seven months later, you write that you finally are considering the issue. I understand from your letter, and from the assurance that was given by counsel to ICANN at the hearing of 9 December 2015 in the IRP on the CPEs regarding .hotel and .eco, that ICANN has abandoned the position that the ICANN Board has no duty to act on the issue. At said hearing counsel to ICANN confirmed that the matter was under consideration by the Board. However, although you were contacted on 5 June 2015, there are no indications that the Board gave consideration to the matter, either before or after said hearing. Our request was never put on the agenda of the Board, although there have been numerous Board meetings since. The questions you now raise in your letter of 23 February 2016 further show that ICANN has done nothing to consider the issue.
As a matter of fact, your request for evidence that Mr. Dirk Krischenowski is affiliated with HTLD shows that ICANN has not done a proper investigation into the matter. Annexes 1 to 3, which show this affiliation, are part of ICANN’s own file on HTLD. The fact that you ask TRS to provide ICANN with this information shows that ICANN has not done any investigation and that you are not in a position to publish any investigation results.

In addition, it is unclear how your request for information that TRS was disadvantaged by the fraudulent actions of Dirk Krischenowski has any bearing on the matter, and the reference you make to the CPE is somewhat disturbing. The fact that HTLD may not have used the sensitive and confidential business plans and information it had stolen with respect to the CPE is irrelevant. As explained above, the result of the CPE has no bearing on the fact that it is inappropriate to allocate a critical Internet resource to a party that has been cheating.

Moreover, the outcome of the CPE on HTLD’s application has been severely criticized. In its IRP Declaration of 11 February 2016, the IRP Panel recognized that SRL’s criticism on the inconsistent outcomes of the CPE had merit, and decided “there needs to be a system in place that ensures that marks are allocated on a consistent and predictable basis by different individual evaluators.” The CPE result on HTLD’s application was inconsistent, and marks were allocated in an inconsistent and unpredictable fashion. Given the serious concerns expressed by the IRP Panel, the inconsistent and erroneous CPE result on HTLD’s application should not be upheld. A recent intervention of the ICANN Board (Annex 4) shows that ICANN can take all steps necessary to address inconsistent and/or unreasonable results of a process that apparently was subject to due process. I fail to see why ICANN is not taking similar steps in a CPE that was void of due process and consistency.

In view of the above, I reiterate the request that ICANN and its Board cancel the application of HTLD for .hotel at its meeting of 10 March 2016, failure of which I have the instruction to bring this matter to the attention of an IRP panel, in which case this correspondence will be made public without further notice.

This letter is not intended to be a complete statement of the elements of facts or law relevant to this matter and is sent without prejudice and reserving all rights.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Flip Petillion
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
REGISTRY AGREEMENT

This REGISTRY AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”) is entered into as of ___________ (the “Effective Date”) between Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (“ICANN”), and __________, a _____________ (“Registry Operator”).

ARTICLE 1.

DELEGATION AND OPERATION OF TOP–LEVEL DOMAIN; REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

1.1 Domain and Designation. The Top-Level Domain to which this Agreement applies is ____ (the “TLD”). Upon the Effective Date and until the earlier of the expiration of the Term (as defined in Section 4.1) or the termination of this Agreement pursuant to Article 4, ICANN designates Registry Operator as the registry operator for the TLD, subject to the requirements and necessary approvals for delegation of the TLD and entry into the root-zone.

1.2 Technical Feasibility of String. While ICANN has encouraged and will continue to encourage universal acceptance of all top-level domain strings across the Internet, certain top-level domain strings may encounter difficulty in acceptance by ISPs and webhosters and/or validation by web applications. Registry Operator shall be responsible for ensuring to its satisfaction the technical feasibility of the TLD string prior to entering into this Agreement.

1.3 Representations and Warranties.

(a) Registry Operator represents and warrants to ICANN as follows:

(i) all material information provided and statements made in the registry TLD application, and statements made in writing during the negotiation of this Agreement, were true and correct in all material respects at the time made, and such information or statements continue to be true and correct in all material respects as of the Effective Date except as otherwise previously disclosed in writing by Registry Operator to ICANN;

(ii) Registry Operator is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the jurisdiction set forth in the preamble hereto, and Registry Operator has all requisite power and authority and has obtained all necessary approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement; and

(iii) Registry Operator has delivered to ICANN a duly executed instrument that secures the funds required to perform registry functions for the TLD in the event of the termination or expiration of this Agreement (the “Continued Operations Instrument”), and such instrument is a binding
obligation of the parties thereto, enforceable against the parties thereto in accordance with its terms.

(b) ICANN represents and warrants to Registry Operator that ICANN is a nonprofit public benefit corporation duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of California, United States of America. ICANN has all requisite power and authority and has obtained all necessary corporate approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement.

ARTICLE 2.

COVENANTS OF REGISTRY OPERATOR

Registry Operator covenants and agrees with ICANN as follows:

2.1 Approved Services; Additional Services. Registry Operator shall be entitled to provide the Registry Services described in clauses (a) and (b) of the first paragraph of Section 2.1 in the Specification 6 attached hereto ("Specification 6") and such other Registry Services set forth on Exhibit A (collectively, the "Approved Services"). If Registry Operator desires to provide any Registry Service that is not an Approved Service or is a material modification to an Approved Service (each, an "Additional Service"), Registry Operator shall submit a request for approval of such Additional Service pursuant to the Registry Services Evaluation Policy at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html, as such policy may be amended from time to time in accordance with the bylaws of ICANN (as amended from time to time, the "ICANN Bylaws") applicable to Consensus Policies (the "RSEP"). Registry Operator may offer Additional Services only with the written approval of ICANN, and, upon any such approval, such Additional Services shall be deemed Registry Services under this Agreement. In its reasonable discretion, ICANN may require an amendment to this Agreement reflecting the provision of any Additional Service which is approved pursuant to the RSEP, which amendment shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to the parties.

2.2 Compliance with Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies. Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies found at <http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm>, as of the Effective Date and as may in the future be developed and adopted in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, provided such future Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies are adopted in accordance with the procedure and relate to those topics and subject to those limitations set forth in Specification 1 attached hereto ("Specification 1").

2.3 Data Escrow. Registry Operator shall comply with the registry data escrow procedures set forth in Specification 2 attached hereto ("Specification 2") within fourteen (14) calendar days after delegation.

2.4 Monthly Reporting. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar month, commencing with the first calendar month in which the TLD is delegated in the root zone, Registry Operator shall deliver to ICANN reports in the format
set forth in Specification 3 attached hereto ("Specification 3"); provided, however, that if the TLD is delegated in the root zone after the fifteenth (15th) calendar day of the calendar month, Registry Operator may defer the delivery of the reports for such first calendar month and instead deliver to ICANN such month's reports no later than the time that Registry Operator is required to deliver the reports for the immediately following calendar month. Registry Operator must include in the Per-Registrar Transactions Report any domain name created during pre-delegation testing that has not been deleted as of the time of delegation (notably but not limited to domains registered by Registrar IDs 9995 and/or 9996).

2.5 Publication of Registration Data. Registry Operator shall provide public access to registration data in accordance with Specification 4 attached hereto ("Specification 4").

2.6 Reserved Names. Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall comply with the requirements set forth in Specification 5 attached hereto ("Specification 5"). Registry Operator may at any time establish or modify policies concerning Registry Operator's ability to reserve (i.e., withhold from registration or allocate to Registry Operator, but not register to third parties, delegate, use, activate in the DNS or otherwise make available) or block additional character strings within the TLD at its discretion. Except as specified in Specification 5, if Registry Operator is the registrant for any domain names in the registry TLD, such registrations must be through an ICANN accredited registrar, and will be considered Transactions (as defined in Section 6.1) for purposes of calculating the Registry-level transaction fee to be paid to ICANN by Registry Operator pursuant to Section 6.1.

2.7 Registry Interoperability and Continuity. Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications as set forth in Specification 6 attached hereto ("Specification 6").

2.8 Protection of Legal Rights of Third Parties. Registry Operator must specify, and comply with, the processes and procedures for launch of the TLD and initial registration-related and ongoing protection of the legal rights of third parties as set forth Specification 7 attached hereto ("Specification 7"). Registry Operator may, at its election, implement additional protections of the legal rights of third parties. Any changes or modifications to the process and procedures required by Specification 7 following the Effective Date must be approved in advance by ICANN in writing. Registry Operator must comply with all remedies imposed by ICANN pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such remedies as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. In responding to such reports, Registry Operator will not be required to take any action in contravention of applicable law.
2.9 Registrars.

(a) All domain name registrations in the TLD must be registered through an ICANN accredited registrar; provided, that Registry Operator need not use a registrar if it registers names in its own name in order to withhold such names from delegation or use in accordance with Section 2.6. Subject to the requirements of Specification 11, Registry Operator must provide non-discriminatory access to Registry Services to all ICANN accredited registrars that enter into and are in compliance with the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD; provided that Registry Operator may establish non-discriminatory criteria for qualification to register names in the TLD that are reasonably related to the proper functioning of the TLD. Registry Operator must use a uniform non-discriminatory agreement with all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD (the “Registry-Registrar Agreement”). Registry Operator may amend the Registry-Registrar Agreement from time to time; provided, however, that any material revisions thereto must be approved by ICANN before any such revisions become effective and binding on any registrar. Registry Operator will provide ICANN and all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD at least fifteen (15) calendar days written notice of any revisions to the Registry-Registrar Agreement before any such revisions become effective and binding on any registrar. During such period, ICANN will determine whether such proposed revisions are immaterial, potentially material or material in nature. If ICANN has not provided Registry Operator with notice of its determination within such fifteen (15) calendar-day period, ICANN shall be deemed to have determined that such proposed revisions are immaterial in nature. If ICANN determines, or is deemed to have determined under this Section 2.9(a), that such revisions are immaterial, then Registry Operator may adopt and implement such revisions. If ICANN determines such revisions are either material or potentially material, ICANN will thereafter follow its procedure regarding review and approval of changes to Registry-Registrar Agreements at <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rra-amendment-procedure>, and such revisions may not be adopted and implemented until approved by ICANN. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section 2.9(a), any change to the Registry-Registrar Agreement that relates exclusively to the fee charged by Registry Operator to register domain names in the TLD will not be subject to the notice and approval process specified in this Section 2.9(a), but will be subject to the requirements in Section 2.10 below.

(b) If Registry Operator (i) becomes an Affiliate or reseller of an ICANN accredited registrar, or (ii) subcontracts the provision of any Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar, registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, then, in either such case of (i) or (ii) above, Registry Operator will give ICANN prompt notice of the contract, transaction or other arrangement that resulted in such affiliation, reseller relationship or subcontract, as applicable, including, if requested by ICANN, copies of any contract relating thereto; provided, that ICANN will treat such contract or related documents that are appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15 (except that ICANN may disclose such contract and related documents to relevant competition authorities). ICANN reserves the right, but not the obligation, to refer any such contract,
related documents, transaction or other arrangement to relevant competition authorities in
the event that ICANN determines that such contract, related documents, transaction or
other arrangement might raise significant competition issues under applicable law. If
feasible and appropriate under the circumstances, ICANN will give Registry Operator
advance notice prior to making any such referral to a competition authority.

(c) For the purposes of this Agreement: (i) “Affiliate” means a person or
entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, or in combination
with one or more other persons or entities, controls, is controlled by, or is under common
control with, the person or entity specified, and (ii) “control” (including the terms
“controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or
indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a
person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by
serving as an employee or a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body,
by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

2.10 Pricing for Registry Services.

(a) With respect to initial domain name registrations, Registry Operator
shall provide each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the Registry-Registrar
Agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result
of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs
which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars, unless such refunds,
rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs are of a limited duration that is clearly
and conspicuously disclosed to the registrar when offered) of no less than thirty (30)
calendar days. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain initial domain
name registrations for periods of one (1) to ten (10) years at the discretion of the registrar,
but no greater than ten (10) years.

(b) With respect to renewal of domain name registrations, Registry
Operator shall provide each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the
Registry-Registrar Agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase
(including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying,
Qualified Marketing Programs or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price
charged to registrars) of no less than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, with respect to renewal of domain name
registrations: (i) Registry Operator need only provide thirty (30) calendar days notice of
any price increase if the resulting price is less than or equal to (A) for the period beginning
on the Effective Date and ending twelve (12) months following the Effective Date, the initial
price charged for registrations in the TLD, or (B) for subsequent periods, a price for which
Registry Operator provided a notice pursuant to the first sentence of this Section 2.10(b)
within the twelve (12) month period preceding the effective date of the proposed price
increase; and (ii) Registry Operator need not provide notice of any price increase for the
imposition of the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3. Registry Operator
shall offer registrars the option to obtain domain name registration renewals at the current
price (i.e., the price in place prior to any noticed increase) for periods of one (1) to ten (10) years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten (10) years.

(c) In addition, Registry Operator must have uniform pricing for renewals of domain name registrations ("Renewal Pricing"). For the purposes of determining Renewal Pricing, the price for each domain registration renewal must be identical to the price of all other domain name registration renewals in place at the time of such renewal, and such price must take into account universal application of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs in place at the time of renewal. The foregoing requirements of this Section 2.10(c) shall not apply for (i) purposes of determining Renewal Pricing if the registrar has provided Registry Operator with documentation that demonstrates that the applicable registrant expressly agreed in its registration agreement with registrar to higher Renewal Pricing at the time of the initial registration of the domain name following clear and conspicuous disclosure of such Renewal Pricing to such registrant, and (ii) discounted Renewal Pricing pursuant to a Qualified Marketing Program (as defined below). The parties acknowledge that the purpose of this Section 2.10(c) is to prohibit abusive and/or discriminatory Renewal Pricing practices imposed by Registry Operator without the written consent of the applicable registrant at the time of the initial registration of the domain name and this Section 2.10(c) will be interpreted broadly to prohibit such practices. For purposes of this Section 2.10(c), a “Qualified Marketing Program” is a marketing program pursuant to which Registry Operator offers discounted Renewal Pricing, provided that each of the following criteria is satisfied: (i) the program and related discounts are offered for a period of time not to exceed one hundred eighty (180) calendar days (with consecutive substantially similar programs aggregated for purposes of determining the number of calendar days of the program), (ii) all ICANN accredited registrars are provided the same opportunity to qualify for such discounted Renewal Pricing; and (iii) the intent or effect of the program is not to exclude any particular class(es) of registrations (e.g., registrations held by large corporations) or increase the renewal price of any particular class(es) of registrations. Nothing in this Section 2.10(c) shall limit Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to Section 2.10(b).

(d) Registry Operator shall provide public query-based DNS lookup service for the TLD (that is, operate the Registry TLD zone servers) at its sole expense.

2.11 Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits.

(a) ICANN may from time to time (not to exceed twice per calendar year) conduct, or engage a third party to conduct, contractual compliance audits to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. Such audits shall be tailored to achieve the purpose of assessing compliance, and ICANN will (a) give reasonable advance notice of any such audit, which notice shall specify in reasonable detail the categories of documents, data and other information requested by ICANN, and (b) use commercially reasonable efforts to conduct such audit during regular business hours and in such a manner as to not unreasonably disrupt the operations of Registry Operator. As part of such audit and upon request by ICANN, Registry Operator shall timely
provide all responsive documents, data and any other information reasonably necessary to demonstrate Registry Operator’s compliance with this Agreement. Upon no less than ten (10) calendar days notice (unless otherwise agreed to by Registry Operator), ICANN may, as part of any contractual compliance audit, conduct site visits during regular business hours to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. ICANN will treat any information obtained in connection with such audits that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15.

(b) Any audit conducted pursuant to Section 2.11(a) will be at ICANN’s expense, unless (i) Registry Operator (A) controls, is controlled by, is under common control or is otherwise Affiliated with, any ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, or (B) has subcontracted the provision of Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, and, in either case of (A) or (B) above, the audit relates to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the portion of the audit related to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, or (ii) the audit is related to a discrepancy in the fees paid by Registry Operator hereunder in excess of 5% in a given quarter to ICANN’s detriment, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the entirety of such audit. In either such case of (i) or (ii) above, such reimbursement will be paid together with the next Registry-Level Fee payment due following the date of transmittal of the cost statement for such audit.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 2.11(a), if Registry Operator is found not to be in compliance with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement or its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement in two consecutive audits conducted pursuant to this Section 2.11, ICANN may increase the number of such audits to one per calendar quarter.

(d) Registry Operator will give ICANN immediate notice of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the commencement of any of the proceedings referenced in Section 4.3(d) or the occurrence of any of the matters specified in Section 4.3(f).


2.13 Emergency Transition. Registry Operator agrees that, in the event that any of the emergency thresholds for registry functions set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 is reached, ICANN may designate an emergency interim registry operator of the registry for the TLD (an “Emergency Operator”) in accordance with ICANN’s registry transition process (available at <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/transition-processes>) (as the same may be amended from time to time, the “Registry Transition Process”) until such
time as Registry Operator has demonstrated to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that it can resume operation of the registry for the TLD without the reoccurrence of such failure. Following such demonstration, Registry Operator may transition back into operation of the registry for the TLD pursuant to the procedures set out in the Registry Transition Process, provided that Registry Operator pays all reasonable costs incurred (i) by ICANN as a result of the designation of the Emergency Operator and (ii) by the Emergency Operator in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, which costs shall be documented in reasonable detail in records that shall be made available to Registry Operator. In the event ICANN designates an Emergency Operator pursuant to this Section 2.13 and the Registry Transition Process, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any such Emergency Operator with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such Emergency Operator. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event that an Emergency Operator is designated pursuant to this Section 2.13. In addition, in the event of such failure, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument.

2.14 **Registry Code of Conduct.** In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Code of Conduct as set forth in Specification 9 attached hereto (“Specification 9”).

2.15 **Cooperation with Economic Studies.** If ICANN initiates or commissions an economic study on the impact or functioning of new generic top-level domains on the Internet, the DNS or related matters, Registry Operator shall reasonably cooperate with such study, including by delivering to ICANN or its designee conducting such study all data related to the operation of the TLD reasonably necessary for the purposes of such study requested by ICANN or its designee, provided, that Registry Operator may withhold (a) any internal analyses or evaluations prepared by Registry Operator with respect to such data and (b) any data to the extent that the delivery of such data would be in violation of applicable law. Any data delivered to ICANN or its designee pursuant to this Section 2.15 that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) shall be treated as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15, provided that, if ICANN aggregates and makes anonymous such data, ICANN or its designee may disclose such data to any third party. Following completion of an economic study for which Registry Operator has provided data, ICANN will destroy all data provided by Registry Operator that has not been aggregated and made anonymous.

2.16 **Registry Performance Specifications.** Registry Performance Specifications for operation of the TLD will be as set forth in Specification 10 attached hereto (“Specification 10”). Registry Operator shall comply with such Performance Specifications and, for a period of at least one (1) year, shall keep technical and operational records sufficient to evidence compliance with such specifications for each calendar year during the Term.
2.17 **Additional Public Interest Commitments.** Registry Operator shall comply with the public interest commitments set forth in Specification 11 attached hereto ("Specification 11").

2.18 **Personal Data.** Registry Operator shall (i) notify each ICANN-accredited registrar that is a party to the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the TLD of the purposes for which data about any identified or identifiable natural person ("Personal Data") submitted to Registry Operator by such registrar is collected and used under this Agreement or otherwise and the intended recipients (or categories of recipients) of such Personal Data, and (ii) require such registrar to obtain the consent of each registrant in the TLD for such collection and use of Personal Data. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to protect Personal Data collected from such registrar from loss, misuse, unauthorized disclosure, alteration or destruction. Registry Operator shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data in a way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

2.19 **[Note: For Community-Based TLDs Only] Obligations of Registry Operator to TLD Community.** Registry Operator shall establish registration policies in conformity with the application submitted with respect to the TLD for: (i) naming conventions within the TLD, (ii) requirements for registration by members of the TLD community, and (iii) use of registered domain names in conformity with the stated purpose of the community-based TLD. Registry Operator shall operate the TLD in a manner that allows the TLD community to discuss and participate in the development and modification of policies and practices for the TLD. Registry Operator shall establish procedures for the enforcement of registration policies for the TLD, and resolution of disputes concerning compliance with TLD registration policies, and shall enforce such registration policies. Registry Operator agrees to implement and be bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure as set forth at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdrrp with respect to disputes arising pursuant to this Section 2.19. Registry Operator shall implement and comply with the community registration policies set forth on Specification 12 attached hereto.

**ARTICLE 3.**

**COVENANTS OF ICANN**

ICANN covenants and agrees with Registry Operator as follows:

3.1 **Open and Transparent.** Consistent with ICANN’s expressed mission and core values, ICANN shall operate in an open and transparent manner.

3.2 **Equitable Treatment.** ICANN shall not apply standards, policies, procedures or practices arbitrarily, unjustifiably, or inequitably and shall not single out Registry Operator for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause.

3.3 **TLD Nameservers.** ICANN will use commercially reasonable efforts to ensure that any changes to the TLD nameserver designations submitted to ICANN by
Registry Operator (in a format and with required technical elements specified by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/ will be implemented by ICANN within seven (7) calendar days or as promptly as feasible following technical verifications.

3.4 Root-zone Information Publication. ICANN’s publication of root-zone contact information for the TLD will include Registry Operator and its administrative and technical contacts. Any request to modify the contact information for the Registry Operator must be made in the format specified from time to time by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/.

3.5 Authoritative Root Database. To the extent that ICANN is authorized to set policy with regard to an authoritative root server system (the “Authoritative Root Server System”), ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to (a) ensure that the authoritative root will point to the top-level domain nameservers designated by Registry Operator for the TLD, (b) maintain a stable, secure, and authoritative publicly available database of relevant information about the TLD, in accordance with ICANN publicly available policies and procedures, and (c) coordinate the Authoritative Root Server System so that it is operated and maintained in a stable and secure manner; provided, that ICANN shall not be in breach of this Agreement and ICANN shall have no liability in the event that any third party (including any governmental entity or internet service provider) blocks or restricts access to the TLD in any jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 4.
TERM AND TERMINATION

4.1 Term. The term of this Agreement will be ten (10) years from the Effective Date (as such term may be extended pursuant to Section 4.2, the “Term”).

4.2 Renewal.

(a) This Agreement will be renewed for successive periods of ten (10) years upon the expiration of the initial Term set forth in Section 4.1 and each successive Term, unless:

(i) Following notice by ICANN to Registry Operator of a fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement, which notice shall include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, and such breach has not been cured within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice, (A) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator has been in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (B) Registry Operator has failed to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction; or
During the then current Term, Registry Operator shall have been found by an arbitrator (pursuant to Section 5.2 of this Agreement) or a court of competent jurisdiction on at least three (3) separate occasions to have been in (A) fundamental and material breach (whether or not cured) of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or (B) breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement.

(b) Upon the occurrence of the events set forth in Section 4.2(a) (i) or (ii), the Agreement shall terminate at the expiration of the then-current Term.

4.3 Termination by ICANN.

(a) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if: (i) Registry Operator fails to cure (A) any fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s representations and warranties set forth in Article 1 or covenants set forth in Article 2, or (B) any breach of Registry Operator’s payment obligations set forth in Article 6 of this Agreement, each within thirty (30) calendar days after ICANN gives Registry Operator notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator is in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if Registry Operator fails to complete all testing and procedures (identified by ICANN in writing to Registry Operator prior to the date hereof) for delegation of the TLD into the root zone within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date. Registry Operator may request an extension for up to additional twelve (12) months for delegation if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that Registry Operator is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for delegation of the TLD. Any fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN prior to such termination date shall be retained by ICANN in full.

(c) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator fails to cure a material breach of Registry Operator’s obligations set forth in Section 2.12 of this Agreement within thirty (30) calendar days of delivery of notice of such breach by ICANN, or if the Continued Operations Instrument is not in effect for greater than sixty (60) consecutive calendar days at any time following the Effective Date, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator is in material breach of such covenant, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.
(d) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or similar act, (ii) attachment, garnishment or similar proceedings are commenced against Registry Operator, which proceedings are a material threat to Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, and are not dismissed within sixty (60) calendar days of their commencement, (iii) a trustee, receiver, liquidator or equivalent is appointed in place of Registry Operator or maintains control over any of Registry Operator’s property, (iv) execution is levied upon any material property of Registry Operator that, if levied, would reasonably be expected to materially and adversely affect Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, (v) proceedings are instituted by or against Registry Operator under any bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization or other laws relating to the relief of debtors and such proceedings are not dismissed within sixty (60) calendar days of their commencement (if such proceedings are instituted by Registry Operator or its Affiliates) or one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days of their commencement (if such proceedings are instituted by a third party against Registry Operator), or (vi) Registry Operator files for protection under the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. Section 101, et seq., or a foreign equivalent or liquidates, dissolves or otherwise discontinues its operations or the operation of the TLD.

(e) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement pursuant to a determination by any PDDRP panel or RRDRP panel under Section 2 of Specification 7 or a determination by any PICDRP panel under Section 2, Section 3 or any other applicable Section of Specification 11, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such termination as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein.

(f) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator knowingly employs any officer who is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such officer is not terminated within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing, or (ii) any member of Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such member is not removed from Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing.

(g) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement as specified in Section 7.5.

(h) [Applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.] ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 7.16.
4.4 Termination by Registry Operator.

(a) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement upon notice to ICANN if (i) ICANN fails to cure any fundamental and material breach of ICANN’s covenants set forth in Article 3, within thirty (30) calendar days after Registry Operator gives ICANN notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that ICANN is in fundamental and material breach of such covenants, and (iii) ICANN fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement for any reason upon one hundred eighty (180) calendar day advance notice to ICANN.

4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any successor registry operator that may be designated by ICANN for the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5 with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process; provided, however, that (i) ICANN will take into consideration any intellectual property rights of Registry Operator (as communicated to ICANN by Registry Operator) in determining whether to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator and (ii) if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (A) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator or its Affiliates for their exclusive use, (B) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (C) transitioning operation of the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest, then ICANN may not transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator upon the expiration or termination of this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed). For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing sentence shall not prohibit ICANN from delegating the TLD pursuant to a future application process for the delegation of top-level domains, subject to any processes and objection procedures instituted by ICANN in connection with such application process intended to protect the rights of third parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument for the maintenance and operation of the TLD, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.
Alternative Section 4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, in connection with ICANN’s designation of a successor registry operator for the TLD, Registry Operator and ICANN agree to consult each other and work cooperatively to facilitate and implement the transition of the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process. In the event ICANN determines to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator, upon Registry Operator’s consent (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed), Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or such successor registry operator for the TLD with any data regarding operations of the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator in addition to data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3 hereof. In the event that Registry Operator does not consent to provide such data, any registry data related to the TLD shall be returned to Registry Operator, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.”

4.6 Effect of Termination. Upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement, the obligations and rights of the parties hereto shall cease, provided that such expiration or termination of this Agreement shall not relieve the parties of any obligation or breach of this Agreement accruing prior to such expiration or termination, including, without limitation, all accrued payment obligations arising under Article 6. In addition, Article 5, Article 7, Section 2.12, Section 4.5, and this Section 4.6 shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, the rights of Registry Operator to operate the registry for the TLD shall immediately cease upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 5.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

5.1 Mediation. In the event of any dispute arising under or in connection with this Agreement, before either party may initiate arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below, ICANN and Registry Operator must attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation in accordance with the following terms and conditions:
(a) A party shall submit a dispute to mediation by written notice to the other party. The mediation shall be conducted by a single mediator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on a mediator within fifteen (15) calendar days of delivery of written notice pursuant to this Section 5.1, the parties will promptly select a mutually acceptable mediation provider entity, which entity shall, as soon as practicable following such entity’s selection, designate a mediator, who is a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law, has no ongoing business relationship with either party and, to the extent necessary to mediate the particular dispute, general knowledge of the domain name system. Any mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, or security holder of ICANN or Registry Operator. If such confirmation is not provided by the appointed mediator, then a replacement mediator shall be appointed pursuant to this Section 5.1(a).

(b) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with the rules and procedures that he or she determines following consultation with the parties. The parties shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator’s assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute. The mediation shall be treated as a settlement discussion and shall therefore be confidential and may not be used against either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute, including any arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2. The mediator may not testify for either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute.

(c) Each party shall bear its own costs in the mediation. The parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator. Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the mediation that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15.

(d) If the parties have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, either party or the mediator may terminate the mediation at any time and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below. If the parties have not resolved the dispute for any reason by the date that is ninety (90) calendar days following the date of the notice delivered pursuant to Section 5.1(a), the mediation shall automatically terminate (unless extended by agreement of the parties) and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below.

5.2 Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement that are not resolved pursuant to Section 5.1, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “ICC”). The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Los Angeles County, California. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators, or (iii) the dispute arises under Section 7.6 or
7.7. In the case of clauses (i), (ii) or (iii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party nominating one arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC and the two selected arbitrators nominating the third arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. For an arbitration in front of a sole arbitrator, Registry Operator and ICANN may, by mutual agreement, nominate the sole arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. If the parties fail to nominate a sole arbitrator or, in the case of an arbitration in front of three arbitrators, either party fails to nominate an arbitrator, in each case within thirty (30) calendar days from the date when a party’s request for arbitration has been received by the other party, or within such additional time as may be allowed by the Secretariat of the Court of the ICC, the arbitrator(s) shall be appointed by the ICC. If any nominated arbitrator is not confirmed by the ICC, the party or persons that appointed such arbitrator shall promptly nominate a replacement arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the arbitration that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15. In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Los Angeles County, California; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.

[Alternative Section 5.2 Arbitration text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement that are not resolved pursuant to Section 5.1, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “ICC”). The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators, or (iii) the dispute arises under Section 7.6 or 7.7. In the case of clauses (i), (ii) or (iii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with
each party nominating one arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC and the two selected arbitrators nominating the third arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. For an arbitration in front of a sole arbitrator, Registry Operator and ICANN may, by mutual agreement, nominate the sole arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. If the parties fail to nominate a sole arbitrator or, in the case of an arbitration in front of three arbitrators, either party fails to nominate an arbitrator, in each case within thirty (30) calendar days from the date when a party’s request for arbitration has been received by the other party, or within such additional time as may be allowed by the Secretariat of the Court of the ICC, the arbitrator(s) shall be appointed by the ICC. If any nominated arbitrator is not confirmed by the ICC, the party or persons that appointed such arbitrator shall promptly nominate a replacement arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the arbitration that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15. In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction."

5.3 Limitation of Liability. ICANN’s aggregate monetary liability for violations of this Agreement will not exceed an amount equal to the Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN within the preceding twelve-month period pursuant to this Agreement (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any). Registry Operator’s aggregate monetary liability to ICANN for breaches of this Agreement will be limited to an amount equal to the fees paid to ICANN during the preceding twelve-month period (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any), and punitive and exemplary damages, if any, awarded in accordance with Section 5.2, except with respect to Registry Operator’s indemnification obligations pursuant to Section 7.1 and Section 7.2. In no event shall either party be liable for special, punitive, exemplary or consequential damages arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or the performance or nonperformance of obligations undertaken in this Agreement, except as provided in Section 5.2. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, neither party
makes any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the services rendered by itself, its
servants or agents, or the results obtained from their work, including, without limitation,
any implied warranty of merchantability, non-infringement or fitness for a particular
purpose.

5.4 **Specific Performance.** Registry Operator and ICANN agree that irreparable
damage could occur if any of the provisions of this Agreement was not performed in
accordance with its specific terms. Accordingly, the parties agree that they each shall be
entitled to seek from the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction specific performance
of the terms of this Agreement (in addition to any other remedy to which each party is
entitled).

**ARTICLE 6.**

**FEES**

6.1 **Registry-Level Fees.**

(a) Registry Operator shall pay ICANN a registry-level fee equal to (i) the
registry fixed fee of US$6,250 per calendar quarter and (ii) the registry-level transaction
fee (collectively, the “Registry-Level Fees”). The registry-level transaction fee will be equal
to the number of annual increments of an initial or renewal domain name registration (at
one or more levels, and including renewals associated with transfers from one
ICANN-accredited registrar to another, each a “Transaction”), during the applicable
calendar quarter multiplied by US$0.25; provided, however that the registry-level
transaction fee shall not apply until and unless more than 50,000 Transactions have
occurred in the TLD during any calendar quarter or any consecutive four calendar quarter
period in the aggregate (the “Transaction Threshold”) and shall apply to each Transaction
that occurred during each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has been met, but
shall not apply to each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has not been met.
Registry Operator’s obligation to pay the quarterly registry-level fixed fee will begin on the
date on which the TLD is delegated in the DNS to Registry Operator. The first quarterly
payment of the registry-level fixed fee will be prorated based on the number of calendar
days between the delegation date and the end of the calendar quarter in which the
delegation date falls.

(b) Subject to Section 6.1(a), Registry Operator shall pay the
Registry-Level Fees on a quarterly basis to an account designated by ICANN within thirty
(30) calendar days following the date of the invoice provided by ICANN.

6.2 **Cost Recovery for RSTEP.** Requests by Registry Operator for the approval
of Additional Services pursuant to Section 2.1 may be referred by ICANN to the Registry
Services Technical Evaluation Panel (“RSTEP”) pursuant to that process at
http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In the event that such requests are referred to
RSTEP, Registry Operator shall remit to ICANN the invoiced cost of the RSTEP review
within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of a copy of the RSTEP invoice from ICANN,
unless ICANN determines, in its sole and absolute discretion, to pay all or any portion of the invoiced cost of such RSTEP review.

6.3 Variable Registry-Level Fee.

(a) If the ICANN accredited registrars (accounting, in the aggregate, for payment of two-thirds of all registrar-level fees (or such portion of ICANN accredited registrars necessary to approve variable accreditation fees under the then-current registrar accreditation agreement), do not approve, pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN, the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for any ICANN fiscal year, upon delivery of notice from ICANN, Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN a variable registry-level fee, which shall be paid on a fiscal quarter basis, and shall accrue as of the beginning of the first fiscal quarter of such ICANN fiscal year (the “Variable Registry-Level Fee”). The fee will be calculated and invoiced by ICANN on a quarterly basis, and shall be paid by Registry Operator within sixty (60) calendar days with respect to the first quarter of such ICANN fiscal year and within twenty (20) calendar days with respect to each remaining quarter of such ICANN fiscal year, of receipt of the invoiced amount by ICANN. The Registry Operator may invoice and collect the Variable Registry-Level Fees from the registrars that are party to a Registry-Registrar Agreement with Registry Operator (which agreement may specifically provide for the reimbursement of Variable Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator pursuant to this Section 6.3); provided, that the fees shall be invoiced to all ICANN accredited registrars if invoiced to any. The Variable Registry-Level Fee, if collectible by ICANN, shall be an obligation of Registry Operator and shall be due and payable as provided in this Section 6.3 irrespective of Registry Operator’s ability to seek and obtain reimbursement of such fee from registrars. In the event ICANN later collects variable accreditation fees for which Registry Operator has paid ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, ICANN shall reimburse the Registry Operator an appropriate amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee, as reasonably determined by ICANN. If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do approve, pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN, the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for a fiscal year, ICANN shall not be entitled to a Variable-Registry Fee hereunder for such fiscal year, irrespective of whether the ICANN accredited registrars comply with their payment obligations to ICANN during such fiscal year.

(b) The amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee will be specified for each registrar, and may include both a per-registrar component and a transactional component. The per-registrar component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year. The transactional component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year but shall not exceed US$0.25 per domain name registration (including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN accredited registrar to another) per year.
6.4 **Pass Through Fees.** Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN (i) a one-time fee equal to US$5,000 for access to and use of the Trademark Clearinghouse as described in Specification 7 (the “RPM Access Fee”) and (ii) US$0.25 per Sunrise Registration and Claims Registration (as such terms are used in Trademark Clearinghouse RPMs incorporated herein pursuant to Specification 7) (the “RPM Registration Fee”). The RPM Access Fee will be invoiced as of the Effective Date of this Agreement, and Registry Operator shall pay such fee to an account specified by ICANN within thirty (30) calendar days following the date of the invoice. ICANN will invoice Registry Operator quarterly for the RPM Registration Fee, which shall be due in accordance with the invoicing and payment procedure specified in Section 6.1.

6.5 **Adjustments to Fees.** Notwithstanding any of the fee limitations set forth in this Article 6, commencing upon the expiration of the first year of this Agreement, and upon the expiration of each year thereafter during the Term, the then-current fees set forth in Section 6.1 and Section 6.3 may be adjusted, at ICANN’s discretion, by a percentage equal to the percentage change, if any, in (i) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, U.S. City Average (1982-1984 = 100) published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor index (the “CPI”) for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the applicable year, over (ii) the CPI published for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the immediately prior year. In the event of any such increase, ICANN shall provide notice to Registry Operator specifying the amount of such adjustment. Any fee adjustment under this Section 6.5 shall be effective as of the first day of the first calendar quarter following at least thirty (30) days after ICANN’s delivery to Registry Operator of such fee adjustment notice.

6.6 **Additional Fee on Late Payments.** For any payments thirty (30) calendar days or more overdue under this Agreement, Registry Operator shall pay an additional fee on late payments at the rate of 1.5% per month or, if less, the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.

6.7 **Fee Reduction Waiver.** In ICANN’s sole discretion, ICANN may reduce the amount of registry fees payable hereunder by Registry Operator for any period of time (“Fee Reduction Waiver”). Any such Fee Reduction Waiver may, as determined by ICANN in its sole discretion, be (a) limited in duration and (b) conditioned upon Registry Operator’s acceptance of the terms and conditions set forth in such waiver. A Fee Reduction Waiver shall not be effective unless executed in writing by ICANN as contemplated by Section 7.6(i). ICANN will provide notice of any Fee Reduction Waiver to Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.9.

**ARTICLE 7.**

**MISCELLANEOUS**

7.1 **Indemnification of ICANN.**
(a) Registry Operator shall indemnify and defend ICANN and its directors, officers, employees, and agents (collectively, “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to indemnify or defend any Indemnitee to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose: (i) due to the actions or omissions of ICANN, its subcontractors, panelists or evaluators specifically related to and occurring during the registry TLD application process (other than actions or omissions requested by or for the benefit of Registry Operator), or (ii) due to a breach by ICANN of any obligation contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court of competent jurisdiction or arbitrator.

[Alternative Section 7.1(a) text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities:

“Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to cooperate with ICANN in order to ensure that ICANN does not incur any costs associated with claims, damages, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to provide such cooperation to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose due to a breach by ICANN of any of its obligations contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court of competent jurisdiction or arbitrator.”]

(b) For any claims by ICANN for indemnification whereby multiple registry operators (including Registry Operator) have engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, Registry Operator’s aggregate liability to indemnify ICANN with respect to such claim shall be limited to a percentage of ICANN’s total claim, calculated by dividing the number of total domain names under registration with Registry Operator within the TLD (which names under registration shall be calculated consistently with Article 6 hereof for any applicable quarter) by the total number of domain names under registration within all top level domains for which the registry operators thereof are
engaging in the same acts or omissions giving rise to such claim. For the purposes of reducing Registry Operator’s liability under Section 7.1(a) pursuant to this Section 7.1(b), Registry Operator shall have the burden of identifying the other registry operators that are engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, and demonstrating, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, such other registry operators’ culpability for such actions or omissions. For the avoidance of doubt, in the event that a registry operator is engaged in the same acts or omissions giving rise to the claims, but such registry operator(s) do not have the same or similar indemnification obligations to ICANN as set forth in Section 7.1(a) above, the number of domains under management by such registry operator(s) shall nonetheless be included in the calculation in the preceding sentence. [Note: This Section 7.1(b) is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.2 Indemnification Procedures. If any third-party claim is commenced that is indemnified under Section 7.1 above, ICANN shall provide notice thereof to Registry Operator as promptly as practicable. Registry Operator shall be entitled, if it so elects, in a notice promptly delivered to ICANN, to immediately take control of the defense and investigation of such claim and to employ and engage attorneys reasonably acceptable to ICANN to handle and defend the same, at Registry Operator’s sole cost and expense, provided that in all events ICANN will be entitled to control at its sole cost and expense the litigation of issues concerning the validity or interpretation of ICANN’s policies, Bylaws or conduct. ICANN shall cooperate, at Registry Operator’s cost and expense, in all reasonable respects with Registry Operator and its attorneys in the investigation, trial, and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom, and may, at its own cost and expense, participate, through its attorneys or otherwise, in such investigation, trial and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom. No settlement of a claim that involves a remedy affecting ICANN other than the payment of money in an amount that is fully indemnified by Registry Operator will be entered into without the consent of ICANN. If Registry Operator does not assume full control over the defense of a claim subject to such defense in accordance with this Section 7.2, ICANN will have the right to defend the claim in such manner as it may deem appropriate, at the cost and expense of Registry Operator and Registry Operator shall cooperate in such defense. [Note: This Section 7.2 is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.3 Defined Terms. For purposes of this Agreement, unless such definitions are amended pursuant to a Consensus Policy at a future date, in which case the following definitions shall be deemed amended and restated in their entirety as set forth in such Consensus Policy, Security and Stability shall be defined as follows:

(a) For the purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Security” shall mean (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.

(b) For purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Stability” shall refer to (1) lack of compliance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the
relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice Requests for Comments (“RFCs”) sponsored by the Internet Engineering Task Force; or (2) the creation of a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs, and relying on Registry Operator’s delegated information or provisioning of services.

7.4 **No Offset.** All payments due under this Agreement will be made in a timely manner throughout the Term and notwithstanding the pendency of any dispute (monetary or otherwise) between Registry Operator and ICANN.

7.5 **Change of Control; Assignment and Subcontracting.** Except as set forth in this Section 7.5, neither party may assign any of its rights and obligations under this Agreement without the prior written approval of the other party, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld. For purposes of this Section 7.5, a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any subcontracting arrangement that relates to any Critical Function (as identified in Section 6 of Specification 10) for the TLD (a “Material Subcontracting Arrangement”) shall be deemed an assignment.

(a) Registry Operator must provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN of any assignment or Material Subcontracting Arrangement, and any agreement to assign or subcontract any portion of the operations of the TLD (whether or not a Material Subcontracting Arrangement) must mandate compliance with all covenants, obligations and agreements by Registry Operator hereunder, and Registry Operator shall continue to be bound by such covenants, obligations and agreements. Registry Operator must also provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN prior to the consummation of any transaction anticipated to result in a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator.

(b) Within thirty (30) calendar days of either such notification pursuant to Section 7.5(a), ICANN may request additional information from Registry Operator establishing (i) compliance with this Agreement and (ii) that the party acquiring such control or entering into such assignment or Material Subcontracting Arrangement (in any case, the “Contracting Party”) and the ultimate parent entity of the Contracting Party meets the ICANN-adopted specification or policy on registry operator criteria then in effect (including with respect to financial resources and operational and technical capabilities), in which case Registry Operator must supply the requested information within fifteen (15) calendar days.

(c) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN’s consent to any assignment, change of control or Material Subcontracting Arrangement will also be subject to background checks on any proposed Contracting Party (and such Contracting Party’s Affiliates).
If ICANN fails to expressly provide or withhold its consent to any assignment, direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any Material Subcontracting Arrangement within thirty (30) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of notice of such transaction (or, if ICANN has requested additional information from Registry Operator as set forth above, thirty (30) calendar days of the receipt of all requested written information regarding such transaction) from Registry Operator, ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to such transaction.

In connection with any such assignment, change of control or Material Subcontracting Arrangement, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Transition Process.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, (i) any consummated change of control shall not be voidable by ICANN; provided, however, that, if ICANN reasonably determines to withhold its consent to such transaction, ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(g), (ii) ICANN may assign this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator upon approval of the ICANN Board of Directors in conjunction with a reorganization, reconstitution or re-incorporation of ICANN upon such assignee’s express assumption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, (iii) Registry Operator may assign this Agreement without the consent of ICANN directly to an Affiliated Assignee, as that term is defined herein below, upon such Affiliated Assignee’s express written assumption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and (iv) ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to any assignment, Material Subcontracting Arrangement or change of control transaction in which the Contracting Party is an existing operator of a generic top-level domain pursuant to a registry agreement between such Contracting Party and ICANN (provided that such Contracting Party is then in compliance with the terms and conditions of such registry agreement in all material respects), unless ICANN provides to Registry Operator a written objection to such transaction within ten (10) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of notice of such transaction pursuant to this Section 7.5. Notwithstanding Section 7.5(a), in the event an assignment is made pursuant to clauses (ii) or (iii) of this Section 7.5(f), the assigning party will provide the other party with prompt notice following any such assignment. For the purposes of this Section 7.5(f), (A) “Affiliated Assignee” means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified, and (B) “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) shall have the same meaning specified in Section 2.9(c) of this Agreement.

7.6 Amendments and Waivers.

If the ICANN Board of Directors determines that an amendment to this Agreement (including to the Specifications referred to herein) and all other registry agreements between ICANN and the Applicable Registry Operators (the “Applicable Registry Agreements”) is desirable (each, a “Special Amendment”), ICANN may adopt a Special Amendment pursuant to the requirements of and process set forth in this Section 7.6; provided that a Special Amendment may not be a Restricted Amendment.
(b) Prior to submitting a Special Amendment for Registry Operator Approval, ICANN shall first consult in good faith with the Working Group regarding the form and substance of such Special Amendment. The duration of such consultation shall be reasonably determined by ICANN based on the substance of the Special Amendment. Following such consultation, ICANN may propose the adoption of a Special Amendment by publicly posting such amendment on its website for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the "Posting Period") and providing notice of such proposed amendment to the Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN will consider the public comments submitted on a Special Amendment during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators).

(c) If, within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days following the expiration of the Posting Period (the "Approval Period"), the ICANN Board of Directors approves a Special Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for public comment, but must address the subject matter of the Special Amendment posted for public comment, as modified to reflect and/or address input from the Working Group and public comments), ICANN shall provide notice of, and submit, such Special Amendment for approval or disapproval by the Applicable Registry Operators. If, during the sixty (60) calendar day period following the date ICANN provides such notice to the Applicable Registry Operators, such Special Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval, such Special Amendment shall be deemed approved (an "Approved Amendment") by the Applicable Registry Operators, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Approved Amendment to Registry Operator (the "Amendment Effective Date"). In the event that a Special Amendment does not receive Registry Operator Approval, the Special Amendment shall be deemed not approved by the Applicable Registry Operators (a "Rejected Amendment"). A Rejected Amendment will have no effect on the terms and conditions of this Agreement, except as set forth below.

(d) If the ICANN Board of Directors reasonably determines that a Rejected Amendment falls within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, the ICANN Board of Directors may adopt a resolution (the date such resolution is adopted is referred to herein as the "Resolution Adoption Date") requesting an Issue Report (as such term is defined in ICANN's Bylaws) by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (the "GNSO") regarding the substance of such Rejected Amendment. The policy development process undertaken by the GNSO pursuant to such requested Issue Report is referred to herein as a "PDP." If such PDP results in a Final Report supported by a GNSO Supermajority (as defined in ICANN’s Bylaws) that either (i) recommends adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy or (ii) recommends against adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy, and, in the case of (i) above, the Board adopts such Consensus Policy, Registry Operator shall comply with its obligations pursuant to Section 2.2 of this Agreement. In either case, ICANN will abandon the Rejected Amendment and it will have no effect on the terms and conditions of this Agreement. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section 7.6(d), the ICANN Board of Directors shall not be required to initiate a PDP with respect to a Rejected Amendment if, at any time in the twelve (12) month period preceding the submission of such Rejected
Amendment for Registry Operator Approval pursuant to Section 7.6(c), the subject matter of such Rejected Amendment was the subject of a concluded or otherwise abandoned or terminated PDP that did not result in a GNSO Supermajority recommendation.

(e) If (a) a Rejected Amendment does not fall within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, (b) the subject matter of a Rejected Amendment was, at any time in the twelve (12) month period preceding the submission of such Rejected Amendment for Registry Operator Approval pursuant to Section 7.6(c), the subject of a concluded or otherwise abandoned or terminated PDP that did not result in a GNSO Supermajority recommendation, or (c) a PDP does not result in a Final Report supported by a GNSO Supermajority that either (A) recommends adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy or (B) recommends against adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy (or such PDP has otherwise been abandoned or terminated for any reason), then, in any such case, such Rejected Amendment may still be adopted and become effective in the manner described below. In order for the Rejected Amendment to be adopted, the following requirements must be satisfied:

(i) the subject matter of the Rejected Amendment must be within the scope of ICANN’s mission and consistent with a balanced application of its core values (as described in ICANN’s Bylaws);

(ii) the Rejected Amendment must be justified by a Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest, must be likely to promote such interest, taking into account competing public and private interests that are likely to be affected by the Rejected Amendment, and must be narrowly tailored and no broader than reasonably necessary to address such Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest;

(iii) to the extent the Rejected Amendment prohibits or requires conduct or activities, imposes material costs on the Applicable Registry Operators, and/or materially reduces public access to domain name services, the Rejected Amendment must be the least restrictive means reasonably available to address the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest;

(iv) the ICANN Board of Directors must submit the Rejected Amendment, along with a written explanation of the reasoning related to its determination that the Rejected Amendment meets the requirements set out in subclauses (i) through (iii) above, for public comment for a period of no less than thirty (30) calendar days; and

(v) following such public comment period, the ICANN Board of Directors must (a) engage in consultation (or direct ICANN management to engage in consultation) with the Working Group, subject matter experts, members of the GNSO, relevant advisory committees and other interested stakeholders with respect to such Rejected Amendment for a period of no
less than sixty (60) calendar days; and (b) following such consultation, reapprove the Rejected Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for Registry Operator Approval, but must address the subject matter of the Rejected Amendment, as modified to reflect and/or address input from the Working Group and public comments) by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the ICANN Board of Directors eligible to vote on such matter, taking into account any ICANN policy affecting such eligibility, including ICANN’s Conflict of Interest Policy (a “Board Amendment”).

Such Board Amendment shall, subject to Section 7.6(f), be deemed an Approved Amendment, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Board Amendment to Registry Operator (which effective date shall be deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder). Notwithstanding the foregoing, a Board Amendment may not amend the registry fees charged by ICANN hereunder, or amend this Section 7.6.

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 7.6(e), a Board Amendment shall not be deemed an Approved Amendment if, during the thirty (30) calendar day period following the approval by the ICANN Board of Directors of the Board Amendment, the Working Group, on the behalf of the Applicable Registry Operators, submits to the ICANN Board of Directors an alternative to the Board Amendment (an “Alternative Amendment”) that meets the following requirements:

(i) sets forth the precise text proposed by the Working Group to amend this Agreement in lieu of the Board Amendment;

(ii) addresses the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest identified by the ICANN Board of Directors as the justification for the Board Amendment; and

(iii) compared to the Board Amendment is: (a) more narrowly tailored to address such Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest, and (b) to the extent the Alternative Amendment prohibits or requires conduct or activities, imposes material costs on Affected Registry Operators, or materially reduces access to domain name services, is a less restrictive means to address the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest.

Any proposed amendment that does not meet the requirements of subclauses (i) through (iii) in the immediately preceding sentence shall not be considered an Alternative Amendment hereunder and therefore shall not supersede or delay the effectiveness of the Board Amendment. If, following the submission of the Alternative Amendment to the ICANN Board of Directors, the Alternative Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval, the Alternative Amendment shall supersede the Board Amendment and shall be
deemed an Approved Amendment hereunder (and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Alternative Amendment to Registry Operator, which effective date shall deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder), unless, within a period of sixty (60) calendar days following the date that the Working Group notifies the ICANN Board of Directors of Registry Operator Approval of such Alternative Amendment (during which time ICANN shall engage with the Working Group with respect to the Alternative Amendment), the ICANN Board of Directors by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the ICANN Board of Directors eligible to vote on such matter, taking into account any ICANN policy affecting such eligibility, including ICANN’s Conflict of Interest Policy, rejects the Alternative Amendment. If (A) the Alternative Amendment does not receive Registry Operator Approval within thirty (30) calendar days of submission of such Alternative Amendment to the Applicable Registry Operators (and the Working Group shall notify ICANN of the date of such submission), or (B) the ICANN Board of Directors rejects the Alternative Amendment by such two-thirds vote, the Board Amendment (and not the Alternative Amendment) shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator (which effective date shall deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder). If the ICANN Board of Directors rejects an Alternative Amendment, the board shall publish a written rationale setting forth its analysis of the criteria set forth in Sections 7.6(f)(i) through 7.6(f)(iii). The ability of the ICANN Board of Directors to reject an Alternative Amendment hereunder does not relieve the Board of the obligation to ensure that any Board Amendment meets the criteria set forth in Section 7.6(e)(i) through 7.6(e)(v).

(g) In the event that Registry Operator believes an Approved Amendment does not meet the substantive requirements set out in this Section 7.6 or has been adopted in contravention of any of the procedural provisions of this Section 7.6, Registry Operator may challenge the adoption of such Special Amendment pursuant to the dispute resolution provisions set forth in Article 5, except that such arbitration shall be conducted by a three-person arbitration panel. Any such challenge must be brought within sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of the Approved Amendment, and ICANN may consolidate all challenges brought by registry operators (including Registry Operator) into a single proceeding. The Approved Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process.

(h) Registry Operator may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from the Approved Amendment (each such request submitted by Registry Operator hereunder, an "Exemption Request") during the thirty (30) calendar day period following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of such Approved Amendment. Each Exemption Request will set forth the basis for such request and provide detailed support for an exemption from the Approved Amendment. An Exemption Request may also include a detailed description and support for any alternatives to, or a variation of, the Approved Amendment proposed by such Registry Operator. An Exemption Request may only be granted upon a clear and convincing showing by Registry Operator that compliance with
the Approved Amendment conflicts with applicable laws or would have a material adverse effect on the long-term financial condition or results of operations of Registry Operator. No Exemption Request will be granted if ICANN determines, in its reasonable discretion, that granting such Exemption Request would be materially harmful to registrants or result in the denial of a direct benefit to registrants. Within ninety (90) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of an Exemption Request, ICANN shall either approve (which approval may be conditioned or consist of alternatives to or a variation of the Approved Amendment) or deny the Exemption Request in writing, during which time the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement. If the Exemption Request is approved by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement; provided, that any conditions, alternatives or variations of the Approved Amendment required by ICANN shall be effective and, to the extent applicable, will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date. If such Exemption Request is denied by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date (or, if such date has passed, such Approved Amendment shall be deemed effective immediately on the date of such denial), provided that Registry Operator may, within thirty (30) calendar days following receipt of ICANN’s determination, appeal ICANN’s decision to deny the Exemption Request pursuant to the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Article 5. The Approved Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process. For avoidance of doubt, only Exemption Requests submitted by Registry Operator that are approved by ICANN pursuant to this Section 7.6(j), agreed to by ICANN following mediation pursuant to Section 5.1 or through an arbitration decision pursuant to Section 5.2 shall exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment, and no Exemption Request granted to any other Applicable Registry Operator (whether by ICANN or through arbitration) shall have any effect under this Agreement or exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment.

(i) Except as set forth in this Section 7.6, Section 7.7 and as otherwise set forth in this Agreement and the Specifications hereto, no amendment, supplement or modification of this Agreement or any provision hereof shall be binding unless executed in writing by both parties, and nothing in this Section 7.6 or Section 7.7 shall restrict ICANN and Registry Operator from entering into bilateral amendments and modifications to this Agreement negotiated solely between the two parties. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding unless evidenced by a writing signed by the party waiving compliance with such provision. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Agreement or failure to enforce any of the provisions hereof shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any other provision hereof, nor shall any such waiver constitute a continuing waiver unless otherwise expressly provided. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Sections 7.6 or 7.7 shall be deemed to limit Registry Operator’s obligation to comply with Section 2.2.

(j) For purposes of this Section 7.6, the following terms shall have the following meanings:
(i) “Applicable Registry Operators” means, collectively, the registry operators of top-level domains party to a registry agreement that contains a provision similar to this Section 7.6, including Registry Operator.

(ii) “Registry Operator Approval” means the receipt of each of the following: (A) the affirmative approval of the Applicable Registry Operators whose payments to ICANN accounted for two-thirds of the total amount of fees (converted to U.S. dollars, if applicable, at the prevailing exchange rate published the prior day in the U.S. Edition of the Wall Street Journal for the date such calculation is made by ICANN) paid to ICANN by all the Applicable Registry Operators during the immediately previous calendar year pursuant to the Applicable Registry Agreements, and (B) the affirmative approval of a majority of the Applicable Registry Operators at the time such approval is obtained. For the avoidance of doubt, with respect to clause (B), each Applicable Registry Operator shall have one vote for each top-level domain operated by such Registry Operator pursuant to an Applicable Registry Agreement.

(iii) “Restricted Amendment” means the following: (A) an amendment of Specification 1, (B) except to the extent addressed in Section 2.10 hereof, an amendment that specifies the price charged by Registry Operator to registrars for domain name registrations, (C) an amendment to the definition of Registry Services as set forth in the first paragraph of Section 2.1 of Specification 6, or (D) an amendment to the length of the Term.

(iv) “Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest” means a reason that is justified by an important, specific, and articulated public interest goal that is within ICANN’s mission and consistent with a balanced application of ICANN’s core values as defined in ICANN’s Bylaws.

(v) “Working Group” means representatives of the Applicable Registry Operators and other members of the community that the Registry Stakeholders Group appoints, from time to time, to serve as a working group to consult on amendments to the Applicable Registry Agreements (excluding bilateral amendments pursuant to Section 7.6(i)).

(k) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.6 to the contrary, (i) if Registry Operator provides evidence to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that the Approved Amendment would materially increase the cost of providing Registry Services, then ICANN will allow up to one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days for Approved Amendment to become effective with respect to Registry Operator, and (ii) no Approved Amendment adopted pursuant to Section 7.6 shall become effective with respect to Registry Operator if Registry Operator provides ICANN with an irrevocable notice of termination pursuant to Section 4.4(b).
7.7 Negotiation Process.

(a) If either the Chief Executive Officer of ICANN ("CEO") or the Chairperson of the Registry Stakeholder Group ("Chair") desires to discuss any revision(s) to this Agreement, the CEO or Chair, as applicable, shall provide written notice to the other person, which shall set forth in reasonable detail the proposed revisions to this Agreement (a "Negotiation Notice"). Notwithstanding the foregoing, neither the CEO nor the Chair may (i) propose revisions to this Agreement that modify any Consensus Policy then existing, (ii) propose revisions to this Agreement pursuant to this Section 7.7 on or before June 30, 2014, or (iii) propose revisions or submit a Negotiation Notice more than once during any twelve (12) month period beginning on July 1, 2014.

(b) Following receipt of the Negotiation Notice by either the CEO or the Chair, ICANN and the Working Group (as defined in Section 7.6) shall consult in good faith negotiations regarding the form and substance of the proposed revisions to this Agreement, which shall be in the form of a proposed amendment to this Agreement (the "Proposed Revisions"), for a period of at least ninety (90) calendar days (unless a resolution is earlier reached) and attempt to reach a mutually acceptable agreement relating to the Proposed Revisions (the "Discussion Period").

(c) If, following the conclusion of the Discussion Period, an agreement is reached on the Proposed Revisions, ICANN shall post the mutually agreed Proposed Revisions on its website for public comment for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the "Posting Period") and provide notice of such revisions to all Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators). Following the conclusion of the Posting Period, the Proposed Revisions shall be submitted for Registry Operator Approval (as defined in Section 7.6) and approval by the ICANN Board of Directors. If such approvals are obtained, the Proposed Revisions shall be deemed an Approved Amendment (as defined in Section 7.6) by the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator.

(d) If, following the conclusion of the Discussion Period, an agreement is not reached between ICANN and the Working Group on the Proposed Revisions, either the CEO or the Chair may provide the other person written notice (the "Mediation Notice") requiring each party to attempt to resolve the disagreements related to the Proposed Revisions through impartial, facilitative (non-evaluative) mediation in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth below. In the event that a Mediation Notice is provided, ICANN and the Working Group shall, within fifteen (15) calendar days thereof, simultaneously post the text of their desired version of the Proposed Revisions and a position paper with respect thereto on ICANN’s website.

   (i) The mediation shall be conducted by a single mediator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on a mediator within fifteen (15)
calendar days following receipt by the CEO or Chair, as applicable, of the Mediation Notice, the parties will promptly select a mutually acceptable mediation provider entity, which entity shall, as soon as practicable following such entity’s selection, designate a mediator, who is a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law, who has no ongoing business relationship with either party and, to the extent necessary to mediate the particular dispute, general knowledge of the domain name system. Any mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, or security holder of ICANN or an Applicable Registry Operator. If such confirmation is not provided by the appointed mediator, then a replacement mediator shall be appointed pursuant to this Section 7.7(d)(i).

(ii) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with the rules and procedures for facilitative mediation that he or she determines following consultation with the parties. The parties shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator’s assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute.

(iii) Each party shall bear its own costs in the mediation. The parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator.

(iv) If an agreement is reached during the mediation, ICANN shall post the mutually agreed Proposed Revisions on its website for the Posting Period and provide notice to all Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the agreed Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators). Following the conclusion of the Posting Period, the Proposed Revisions shall be submitted for Registry Operator Approval and approval by the ICANN Board of Directors. If such approvals are obtained, the Proposed Revisions shall be deemed an Approved Amendment (as defined in Section 7.6) by the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator.

(v) If the parties have not resolved the dispute for any reason by the date that is ninety (90) calendar days following receipt by the CEO or Chair, as applicable, of the Mediation Notice, the mediation shall automatically terminate (unless extended by agreement of the parties). The mediator shall deliver to the parties a definition of the issues that could be considered in future arbitration, if invoked. Those issues are subject to the limitations set forth in Section 7.7(e)(ii) below.

(e) If, following mediation, ICANN and the Working Group have not reached an agreement on the Proposed Revisions, either the CEO or the Chair may provide
the other person written notice (an “Arbitration Notice”) requiring ICANN and the Applicable Registry Operators to resolve the dispute through binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration provisions of Section 5.2, subject to the requirements and limitations of this Section 7.7(e).

(i) If an Arbitration Notice is sent, the mediator’s definition of issues, along with the Proposed Revisions (be those from ICANN, the Working Group or both) shall be posted for public comment on ICANN’s website for a period of no less than thirty (30) calendar days. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators), and information regarding such comments and consideration shall be provided to a three (3) person arbitrator panel. Each party may modify its Proposed Revisions before and after the Posting Period. The arbitration proceeding may not commence prior to the closing of such public comment period, and ICANN may consolidate all challenges brought by registry operators (including Registry Operator) into a single proceeding. Except as set forth in this Section 7.7, the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to Section 5.2.

(ii) No dispute regarding the Proposed Revisions may be submitted for arbitration to the extent the subject matter of the Proposed Revisions (i) relates to Consensus Policy, (ii) falls within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, or (iii) seeks to amend any of the following provisions or Specifications of this Agreement: Articles 1, 3 and 6; Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.16, 2.17, 2.19, 4.1, 4.2, 7.3, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, 7.13, 7.14, 7.16; Section 2.8 and Specification 7 (but only to the extent such Proposed Revisions seek to implement an RPM not contemplated by Sections 2.8 and Specification 7); Exhibit A; and Specifications 1, 4, 6, 10 and 11.

(iii) The mediator will brief the arbitrator panel regarding ICANN and the Working Group’s respective proposals relating to the Proposed Revisions.

(iv) No amendment to this Agreement relating to the Proposed Revisions may be submitted for arbitration by either the Working Group or ICANN, unless, in the case of the Working Group, the proposed amendment has received Registry Operator Approval and, in the case of ICANN, the proposed amendment has been approved by the ICANN Board of Directors.

(v) In order for the arbitrator panel to approve either ICANN or the Working Group’s proposed amendment relating to the Proposed Revisions, the arbitrator panel must conclude that such proposed amendment is consistent with a balanced application of ICANN’s core values (as described in ICANN’s Bylaws) and reasonable in light of the balancing of
the costs and benefits to the business interests of the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN (as applicable), and the public benefit sought to be achieved by the Proposed Revisions as set forth in such amendment. If the arbitrator panel concludes that either ICANN or the Working Group’s proposed amendment relating to the Proposed Revisions meets the foregoing standard, such amendment shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator and deemed an Approved Amendment hereunder.

(f) With respect to an Approved Amendment relating to an amendment proposed by ICANN, Registry may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from such amendment pursuant to the provisions of Section 7.6.

(g) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.7 to the contrary, (a) if Registry Operator provides evidence to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that the Approved Amendment would materially increase the cost of providing Registry Services, then ICANN will allow up to one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days for the Approved Amendment to become effective with respect to Registry Operator, and (b) no Approved Amendment adopted pursuant to Section 7.7 shall become effective with respect to Registry Operator if Registry Operator provides ICANN with an irrevocable notice of termination pursuant to Section 4.4(b).

7.8 No Third-Party Beneficiaries. This Agreement will not be construed to create any obligation by either ICANN or Registry Operator to any non-party to this Agreement, including any registrar or registered name holder.

7.9 General Notices. Except for notices pursuant to Sections 7.6 and 7.7, all notices to be given under or in relation to this Agreement will be given either (i) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (ii) via facsimile or electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, or facsimile number, as provided in this Agreement. All notices under Sections 7.6 and 7.7 shall be given by both posting of the applicable information on ICANN’s web site and transmission of such information to Registry Operator by electronic mail. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within thirty (30) calendar days of such change. Other than notices under Sections 7.6 or 7.7, any notice required by this Agreement will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via facsimile or by electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s facsimile machine or email server, provided that such notice via facsimile or electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within three (3) calendar days. Any notice required by Sections 7.6 or 7.7 will be deemed to have been given when electronically posted on ICANN’s website and upon confirmation of receipt by the email server. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the parties will work together to implement such notice means under this Agreement.
If to ICANN, addressed to:
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536
USA
Telephone: +1-310-301-5800
Facsimile: +1-310-823-8649
Attention: President and CEO

With a Required Copy to: General Counsel
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

If to Registry Operator, addressed to:
[__________]
[__________]
[__________]

Telephone:
With a Required Copy to:
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

7.10 **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement (including those specifications and documents incorporated by reference to URL locations which form a part of it) constitutes the entire agreement of the parties hereto pertaining to the operation of the TLD and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, between the parties on that subject.

7.11 **English Language Controls.** Notwithstanding any translated version of this Agreement and/or specifications that may be provided to Registry Operator, the English language version of this Agreement and all referenced specifications are the official versions that bind the parties hereto. In the event of any conflict or discrepancy between any translated version of this Agreement and the English language version, the English language version controls. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement shall be in the English language.

7.12 **Ownership Rights.** Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed as (a) establishing or granting to Registry Operator any property ownership rights or interests of Registry Operator in the TLD or the letters, words, symbols or other characters making up the TLD string, or (b) affecting any existing intellectual property or ownership rights of Registry Operator.

7.13 **Severability; Conflicts with Laws.** This Agreement shall be deemed severable; the invalidity or unenforceability of any term or provision of this Agreement shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the balance of this Agreement or of any other term hereof, which shall remain in full force and effect. If any of the provisions hereof are determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the parties shall negotiate in good
faith to modify this Agreement so as to effect the original intent of the parties as closely as possible. ICANN and the Working Group will mutually cooperate to develop an ICANN procedure for ICANN's review and consideration of alleged conflicts between applicable laws and non-WHOIS related provisions of this Agreement. Until such procedure is developed and implemented by ICANN, ICANN will review and consider alleged conflicts between applicable laws and non-WHOIS related provisions of this Agreement in a manner similar to ICANN's Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law.

7.14 Court Orders. ICANN will respect any order from a court of competent jurisdiction, including any orders from any jurisdiction where the consent or non-objection of the government was a requirement for the delegation of the TLD. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, ICANN's implementation of any such order will not be a breach of this Agreement.

7.15 Confidentiality

(a) Subject to Section 7.15(c), during the Term and for a period of three (3) years thereafter, each party shall, and shall cause its and its Affiliates' officers, directors, employees and agents to, keep confidential and not publish or otherwise disclose to any third party, directly or indirectly, any information that is, and the disclosing party has marked as, or has otherwise designated in writing to the receiving party as, "confidential trade secret," "confidential commercial information" or "confidential financial information" (collectively, "Confidential Information"), except to the extent such disclosure is permitted by the terms of this Agreement.

(b) The confidentiality obligations under Section 7.15(a) shall not apply to any Confidential Information that (i) is or hereafter becomes part of the public domain by public use, publication, general knowledge or the like through no fault of the receiving party in breach of this Agreement, (ii) can be demonstrated by documentation or other competent proof to have been in the receiving party's possession prior to disclosure by the disclosing party without any obligation of confidentiality with respect to such information, (iii) is subsequently received by the receiving party from a third party who is not bound by any obligation of confidentiality with respect to such information, (iv) has been published by a third party or otherwise enters the public domain through no fault of the receiving party, or (v) can be demonstrated by documentation or other competent evidence to have been independently developed by or for the receiving party without reference to the disclosing party's Confidential Information.

(c) Each party shall have the right to disclose Confidential Information to the extent that such disclosure is (i) made in response to a valid order of a court of competent jurisdiction or, if in the reasonable opinion of the receiving party's legal counsel, such disclosure is otherwise required by applicable law; provided, however, that the receiving party shall first have given notice to the disclosing party and given the disclosing party a reasonable opportunity to quash such order or to obtain a protective order or confidential treatment order requiring that the Confidential Information that is the subject of such order or other applicable law be held in confidence by such court or other third
party recipient, unless the receiving party is not permitted to provide such notice under such order or applicable law, or (ii) made by the receiving party or any of its Affiliates to its or their attorneys, auditors, advisors, consultants, contractors or other third parties for use by such person or entity as may be necessary or useful in connection with the performance of the activities under this Agreement, provided that such third party is bound by confidentiality obligations at least as stringent as those set forth herein, either by written agreement or through professional responsibility standards.

[Note: The following section is applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.]

7.16 Special Provision Relating to Intergovernmental Organizations or Governmental Entities.

(a) ICANN acknowledges that Registry Operator is an entity subject to public international law, including international treaties applicable to Registry Operator (such public international law and treaties, collectively hereinafter the “Applicable Laws”). Nothing in this Agreement and its related specifications shall be construed or interpreted to require Registry Operator to violate Applicable Laws or prevent compliance therewith. The Parties agree that Registry Operator’s compliance with Applicable Laws shall not constitute a breach of this Agreement.

(b) In the event Registry Operator reasonably determines that any provision of this Agreement and its related specifications, or any decisions or policies of ICANN referred to in this Agreement, including but not limited to Temporary Policies and Consensus Policies (such provisions, specifications and policies, collectively hereinafter, “ICANN Requirements”), may conflict with or violate Applicable Law (hereinafter, a “Potential Conflict”), Registry Operator shall provide detailed notice (a “Notice”) of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy. In the event Registry Operator determines that there is Potential Conflict between a proposed Applicable Law and any ICANN Requirement, Registry Operator shall provide detailed Notice of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy.

(c) As soon as practicable following such review, the parties shall attempt to resolve the Potential Conflict by mediation pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 5.1. In addition, Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to eliminate or minimize any impact arising from such Potential Conflict between Applicable Laws and any ICANN Requirement. If, following such mediation, Registry Operator determines that the Potential Conflict constitutes an actual conflict between any ICANN Requirement, on the one hand, and Applicable Laws, on the other hand, then ICANN shall waive compliance with such ICANN Requirement (provided that the parties shall negotiate in good faith on a continuous basis thereafter to mitigate or eliminate the effects of such noncompliance on ICANN), unless ICANN reasonably and objectively determines that the failure of Registry
Operator to comply with such ICANN Requirement would constitute a threat to the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet or the DNS (hereinafter, an “ICANN Determination”). Following receipt of notice by Registry Operator of such ICANN Determination, Registry Operator shall be afforded a period of ninety (90) calendar days to resolve such conflict with an Applicable Law. If the conflict with an Applicable Law is not resolved to ICANN’s complete satisfaction during such period, Registry Operator shall have the option to submit, within ten (10) calendar days thereafter, the matter to binding arbitration as defined in subsection (d) below. If during such period, Registry Operator does not submit the matter to arbitration pursuant to subsection (d) below, ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(d) If Registry Operator disagrees with an ICANN Determination, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2, except that the sole issue presented to the arbitrator for determination will be whether or not ICANN reasonably and objectively reached the ICANN Determination. For the purposes of such arbitration, ICANN shall present evidence to the arbitrator supporting the ICANN Determination. If the arbitrator determines that ICANN did not reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then ICANN shall waive Registry Operator’s compliance with the subject ICANN Requirement. If the arbitrators or pre-arbitral referee, as applicable, determine that ICANN did reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then, upon notice to Registry Operator, ICANN may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(e) Registry Operator hereby represents and warrants that, to the best of its knowledge as of the date of execution of this Agreement, no existing ICANN Requirement conflicts with or violates any Applicable Law.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Section 7.16, following an ICANN Determination and prior to a finding by an arbitrator pursuant to Section 7.16(d) above, ICANN may, subject to prior consultations with Registry Operator, take such reasonable technical measures as it deems necessary to ensure the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet and the DNS. These reasonable technical measures shall be taken by ICANN on an interim basis, until the earlier of the date of conclusion of the arbitration procedure referred to in Section 7.16(d) above or the date of complete resolution of the conflict with an Applicable Law. In case Registry Operator disagrees with such technical measures taken by ICANN, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2 above, during which process ICANN may continue to take such technical measures. In the event that ICANN takes such measures, Registry Operator shall pay all costs incurred by ICANN as a result of taking such measures. In addition, in the event that ICANN takes such measures, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

****

38

38
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

By: _________________________
    [____________]
President and CEO
Date:

[Registry Operator]

By: _________________________
    [________]
    [_______]
Date:
EXHIBIT A

Approved Services

The ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (located at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) and the RSEP specify processes for consideration of proposed registry services. Registry Operator may provide any service that is required by the terms of this Agreement. In addition, the following services (if any) are specifically identified as having been approved by ICANN prior to the effective date of the Agreement, and Registry Operator may provide such services:

1. **DNS Service – TLD Zone Contents**

Notwithstanding anything else in this Agreement, as indicated in section 2.2.3.3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, permissible contents for the TLD’s DNS service are:

1.1. For the "Internet" (IN) Class:

   1.1.1. Apex SOA record

   1.1.2. Apex NS records and in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers

   1.1.3. NS records and in-bailiwick glue for DNS servers of registered names in the TLD

   1.1.4. DS records for registered names in the TLD

   1.1.5. Records associated with signing the TLD zone (e.g., RRSIG, DNSKEY, NSEC, NSEC3PARAM and NSEC3)

   1.1.6. Apex TXT record for zone versioning purposes

   1.1.7. Apex TYPE65534 record for automatic dnssec signing signaling

1.2. For the "Chaos" (CH) Class:

   1.2.1. TXT records for server version/identification (e.g., TXT records for “version.bind.”, “id.server.”, “authors.bind” and/or “hostname.bind.”)

(Note: The above language effectively does not allow, among other things, the inclusion of DNS resource records that would enable a dotless domain name (e.g., apex A, AAAA, MX records) in the TLD zone.)

If Registry Operator wishes to place any DNS resource record type or class into its TLD DNS service (other than those listed in Sections 1.1 or 1.2 above), it must describe in detail its proposal and submit a Registry Services Evaluation Process (RSEP) request. This will be
evaluated per RSEP to determine whether the service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability of the DNS. Registry Operator recognizes and acknowledges that a service based on the use of less-common DNS resource records and/or classes in the TLD zone, even if approved, might not work as intended for all users due to lack of software support.
SPECIFICATION 1

CONSENSUS POLICIES AND TEMPORARY POLICIES SPECIFICATION

1. Consensus Policies

1.1. “Consensus Policies” are those policies established (1) pursuant to the procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and due process, and (2) covering those topics listed in Section 1.2 of this Specification. The Consensus Policy development process and procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws may be revised from time to time in accordance with the process set forth therein.

1.2. Consensus Policies and the procedures by which they are developed shall be designed to produce, to the extent possible, a consensus of Internet stakeholders, including the operators of gTLDs. Consensus Policies shall relate to one or more of the following:

1.2.1 issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or Domain Name System (“DNS”);

1.2.2 functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services;

1.2.3 Security and Stability of the registry database for the TLD;

1.2.4 registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;

1.2.5 resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or

1.2.6 restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

1.3. Such categories of issues referred to in Section 1.2 of this Specification shall include, without limitation:

1.3.1 principles for allocation of registered names in the TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

1.3.2 prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;

42

42
1.3.3 reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration); and

1.3.4 maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

1.4. In addition to the other limitations on Consensus Policies, they shall not:

1.4.1 prescribe or limit the price of Registry Services;

1.4.2 modify the terms or conditions for the renewal or termination of the Registry Agreement;

1.4.3 modify the limitations on Temporary Policies (defined below) or Consensus Policies;

1.4.4 modify the provisions in the registry agreement regarding fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN; or

1.4.5 modify ICANN’s obligations to ensure equitable treatment of registry operators and act in an open and transparent manner.

2. **Temporary Policies.** Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all specifications or policies established by the Board on a temporary basis, if adopted by the Board by a vote of at least two-thirds of its members, so long as the Board reasonably determines that such modifications or amendments are justified and that immediate temporary establishment of a specification or policy on the subject is necessary to maintain the stability or security of Registry Services or the DNS (“Temporary Policies”).

2.1. Such proposed specification or policy shall be as narrowly tailored as feasible to achieve those objectives. In establishing any Temporary Policy, the Board shall state the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted and shall immediately implement the Consensus Policy development process set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws.

2.1.1 ICANN shall also issue an advisory statement containing a detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Policy and why
the Board believes such Temporary Policy should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders.

2.1.2 If the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds ninety (90) calendar days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every ninety (90) calendar days for a total period not to exceed one (1) year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus Policy. If the one (1) year period expires or, if during such one (1) year period, the Temporary Policy does not become a Consensus Policy and is not reaffirmed by the Board, Registry Operator shall no longer be required to comply with or implement such Temporary Policy.

3. **Notice and Conflicts.** Registry Operator shall be afforded a reasonable period of time following notice of the establishment of a Consensus Policy or Temporary Policy in which to comply with such policy or specification, taking into account any urgency involved. In the event of a conflict between Registry Services and Consensus Policies or any Temporary Policy, the Consensus Policies or Temporary Policy shall control, but only with respect to subject matter in conflict.
SPECIFICATION 2

DATA ESCROW REQUIREMENTS

Registry Operator will engage an independent entity to act as data escrow agent ("Escrow Agent") for the provision of data escrow services related to the Registry Agreement. The following Technical Specifications set forth in Part A, and Legal Requirements set forth in Part B, will be included in any data escrow agreement between Registry Operator and the Escrow Agent, under which ICANN must be named a third-party beneficiary. In addition to the following requirements, the data escrow agreement may contain other provisions that are not contradictory or intended to subvert the required terms provided below.

PART A – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Deposits.** There will be two types of Deposits: Full and Differential. For both types, the universe of Registry objects to be considered for data escrow are those objects necessary in order to offer all of the approved Registry Services.

   1.1. “**Full Deposit**” will consist of data that reflects the state of the registry as of 00:00:00 UTC (Coordinated Universal Time) on the day that such Full Deposit is submitted to Escrow Agent.

   1.2. “**Differential Deposit**” means data that reflects all transactions that were not reflected in the last previous Full or Differential Deposit, as the case may be. Each Differential Deposit will contain all database transactions since the previous Deposit was completed as of 00:00:00 UTC of each day, but Sunday. Differential Deposits must include complete Escrow Records as specified below that were not included or changed since the most recent full or Differential Deposit (i.e., all additions, modifications or removals of data).

2. **Schedule for Deposits.** Registry Operator will submit a set of escrow files on a daily basis as follows:

   2.1. Each Sunday, a Full Deposit must be submitted to the Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

   2.2. The other six (6) days of the week, a Full Deposit or the corresponding Differential Deposit must be submitted to Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

3. **Escrow Format Specification.**

   3.1. **Deposit’s Format.** Registry objects, such as domains, contacts, name servers, registrars, etc. will be compiled into a file constructed as described in draft-arias-noguchi-registry-data-escrow, see Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification and draft-arias-noguchi-dnrd-objects-mapping, see Part A, Section 9, reference 2 of this Specification (collectively, the “DNDE Specification”). The DNDE Specification describes some elements as
optional; Registry Operator will include those elements in the Deposits if they are available. If not already an RFC, Registry Operator will use the most recent draft version of the DNDE Specification available at the Effective Date. Registry Operator may at its election use newer versions of the DNDE Specification after the Effective Date. Once the DNDE Specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that version of the DNDE Specification, no later than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after. UTF-8 character encoding will be used.

3.2. Extensions. If a Registry Operator offers additional Registry Services that require submission of additional data, not included above, additional “extension schemas” shall be defined in a case by case basis to represent that data. These “extension schemas” will be specified as described in Part A, Section 9, reference 2 of this Specification. Data related to the “extension schemas” will be included in the deposit file described in Part A, Section 3.1 of this Specification. ICANN and the respective Registry Operator shall work together to agree on such new objects’ data escrow specifications.

4. Processing of Deposit files. The use of compression is recommended in order to reduce electronic data transfer times, and storage capacity requirements. Data encryption will be used to ensure the privacy of registry escrow data. Files processed for compression and encryption will be in the binary OpenPGP format as per OpenPGP Message Format - RFC 4880, see Part A, Section 9, reference 3 of this Specification. Acceptable algorithms for Public-key cryptography, Symmetric-key cryptography, Hash and Compression are those enumerated in RFC 4880, not marked as deprecated in OpenPGP IANA Registry, see Part A, Section 9, reference 4 of this Specification, that are also royalty-free. The process to follow for the data file in original text format is:

1. The XML file of the deposit as described in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification must be named as the containing file as specified in Section 5 but with the extension xml.

2. The data file(s) are aggregated in a tarball file named the same as (1) but with extension tar.

3. A compressed and encrypted OpenPGP Message is created using the tarball file as sole input. The suggested algorithm for compression is ZIP as per RFC 4880. The compressed data will be encrypted using the escrow agent’s public key. The suggested algorithms for Public-key encryption are Elgamal and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithms for Symmetric-key encryption are TripleDES, AES128 and CAST5 as per RFC 4880.

4. The file may be split as necessary if, once compressed and encrypted, it is larger than the file size limit agreed with the escrow agent. Every part of a
split file, or the whole file if not split, will be called a processed file in this section.

(5) A digital signature file will be generated for every processed file using the Registry Operator's private key. The digital signature file will be in binary OpenPGP format as per RFC 4880 Section 9, reference 3, and will not be compressed or encrypted. The suggested algorithms for Digital signatures are DSA and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithm for Hashes in Digital signatures is SHA256.

(6) The processed files and digital signature files will then be transferred to the Escrow Agent through secure electronic mechanisms, such as, SFTP, SCP, HTTPS file upload, etc. as agreed between the Escrow Agent and the Registry Operator. Non-electronic delivery through a physical medium such as CD-ROMs, DVD-ROMs, or USB storage devices may be used if authorized by ICANN.

(7) The Escrow Agent will then validate every (processed) transferred data file using the procedure described in Part A, Section 8 of this Specification.

5. **File Naming Conventions.** Files will be named according to the following convention: \{gTLD\}_{YYYY-MM-DD}_{type}_{#}_{R{rev}}_{.ext} where:

5.1. \{gTLD\} is replaced with the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the ASCII-compatible form (A-Label) must be used;

5.2. \{YYYY-MM-DD\} is replaced by the date corresponding to the time used as a timeline watermark for the transactions; i.e. for the Full Deposit corresponding to 2009-08-02T00:00Z, the string to be used would be “2009-08-02”;

5.3. \{type\} is replaced by:

   (1) “full”, if the data represents a Full Deposit;
   (2) “diff”, if the data represents a Differential Deposit;
   (3) “thin”, if the data represents a Bulk Registration Data Access file, as specified in Section 3 of Specification 4;
   (4) "thick-{gurid}", if the data represent Thick Registration Data from a specific registrar, as defined in Section 3.2 of Specification 4. The \{gurid\} element must be replaced with the IANA Registrar ID associated with the data.

5.4. \{#\} is replaced by the position of the file in a series of files, beginning with “1”; in case of a lone file, this must be replaced by “1”.
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5.5. \{rev\} is replaced by the number of revision (or resend) of the file beginning with “0”:

5.6. \{ext\} is replaced by “sig” if it is a digital signature file of the quasi-homonymous file. Otherwise it is replaced by “ryde”.

6. **Distribution of Public Keys.** Each of Registry Operator and Escrow Agent will distribute its public key to the other party (Registry Operator or Escrow Agent, as the case may be) via email to an email address to be specified. Each party will confirm receipt of the other party’s public key with a reply email, and the distributing party will subsequently reconfirm the authenticity of the key transmitted via offline methods, like in person meeting, telephone, etc. In this way, public key transmission is authenticated to a user able to send and receive mail via a mail server operated by the distributing party. Escrow Agent, Registry Operator and ICANN will exchange public keys by the same procedure.

7. **Notification of Deposits.** Along with the delivery of each Deposit, Registry Operator will deliver to Escrow Agent and to ICANN (using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification (the “Interface Specification”)) a written statement from Registry Operator (which may be by authenticated e-mail) that includes a copy of the report generated upon creation of the Deposit and states that the Deposit has been inspected by Registry Operator and is complete and accurate. The preparation and submission of this statement must be performed by the Registry Operator or its designee, provided that such designee may not be the Escrow Agent or any of Escrow Agent’s Affiliates. Registry Operator will include the Deposit’s “id” and “resend” attributes in its statement. The attributes are explained in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification.

If not already an RFC, Registry Operator will use the most recent draft version of the Interface Specification at the Effective Date. Registry Operator may at its election use newer versions of the Interface Specification after the Effective Date. Once the Interface Specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that version of the Interface Specification, no later than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after such publishing.

8. **Verification Procedure.**

(1) The signature file of each processed file is validated.

(2) If processed files are pieces of a bigger file, the latter is put together.

(3) Each file obtained in the previous step is then decrypted and uncompressed.

(4) Each data file contained in the previous step is then validated against the format defined in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification.
(5) The data escrow agent extended verification process, as defined below in reference 2 of Part A of this Specification 2, as well as any other data escrow verification process contained in such reference.

If any discrepancy is found in any of the steps, the Deposit will be considered incomplete.

9. References


(4) OpenPGP parameters, http://www.iana.org/assignments/pgp-parameters/pgp-parameters.xhtml

PART B - LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Escrow Agent. Prior to entering into an escrow agreement, the Registry Operator must provide notice to ICANN as to the identity of the Escrow Agent, and provide ICANN with contact information and a copy of the relevant escrow agreement, and all amendments thereto. In addition, prior to entering into an escrow agreement, Registry Operator must obtain the consent of ICANN to (a) use the specified Escrow Agent, and (b) enter into the form of escrow agreement provided. ICANN must be expressly designated as a third-party beneficiary of the escrow agreement. ICANN reserves the right to withhold its consent to any Escrow Agent, escrow agreement, or any amendment thereto, all in its sole discretion.

2. Fees. Registry Operator must pay, or have paid on its behalf, fees to the Escrow Agent directly. If Registry Operator fails to pay any fee by the due date(s), the Escrow Agent will give ICANN written notice of such non-payment and ICANN may pay the past-due fee(s) within fifteen (15) calendar days after receipt of the written notice from Escrow Agent. Upon payment of the past-due fees by ICANN, ICANN shall have a claim for such amount against Registry Operator, which Registry Operator shall be required to submit to ICANN together with the next fee payment due under the Registry Agreement.

3. Ownership. Ownership of the Deposits during the effective term of the Registry Agreement shall remain with Registry Operator at all times. Thereafter, Registry Operator shall assign any such ownership rights (including intellectual property rights, as the case may be) in such Deposits to ICANN. In the event that during the term of the Registry Agreement any Deposit is released from escrow to ICANN, any intellectual property rights held by Registry Operator in the Deposits will automatically be licensed to ICANN or to a party designated in writing by ICANN on a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, paid-up basis, for any use related to the operation, maintenance or transition of the TLD.

4. Integrity and Confidentiality. Escrow Agent will be required to (i) hold and maintain the Deposits in a secure, locked, and environmentally safe facility, which is accessible only to authorized representatives of Escrow Agent, (ii) protect the integrity and confidentiality of the Deposits using commercially reasonable measures and (iii) keep and safeguard each Deposit for one (1) year. ICANN and Registry Operator will be provided the right to inspect Escrow Agent’s applicable records upon reasonable prior notice and during normal business hours. Registry Operator and ICANN will be provided with the right to designate a third-party auditor to audit Escrow Agent’s compliance with the technical specifications and maintenance requirements of this Specification 2 from time to time.

If Escrow Agent receives a subpoena or any other order from a court or other judicial tribunal pertaining to the disclosure or release of the Deposits, Escrow Agent will promptly notify the Registry Operator and ICANN unless prohibited by law. After notifying the Registry Operator and ICANN, Escrow Agent shall allow
sufficient time for Registry Operator or ICANN to challenge any such order, which shall be the responsibility of Registry Operator or ICANN; provided, however, that Escrow Agent does not waive its rights to present its position with respect to any such order. Escrow Agent will cooperate with the Registry Operator or ICANN to support efforts to quash or limit any subpoena, at such party’s expense. Any party requesting additional assistance shall pay Escrow Agent’s standard charges or as quoted upon submission of a detailed request.

5. **Copies.** Escrow Agent may be permitted to duplicate any Deposit, in order to comply with the terms and provisions of the escrow agreement.

6. **Release of Deposits.** Escrow Agent will make available for electronic download (unless otherwise requested) to ICANN or its designee, within twenty-four (24) hours, at the Registry Operator’s expense, all Deposits in Escrow Agent’s possession in the event that the Escrow Agent receives a request from Registry Operator to effect such delivery to ICANN, or receives one of the following written notices by ICANN stating that:

6.1. the Registry Agreement has expired without renewal, or been terminated; or

6.2. ICANN has not received a notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent within five (5) calendar days after the Deposit’s scheduled delivery date; (a) ICANN gave notice to Escrow Agent and Registry Operator of that failure; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after such notice, received the notification from Escrow Agent; or

6.3. ICANN has received notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent of failed verification of the latest escrow deposit for a specific date or a notification of a missing deposit, and the notification is for a deposit that should have been made on Sunday (i.e., a Full Deposit); (a) ICANN gave notice to Registry Operator of that receipt; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after such notice, received notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Full Deposit; or

6.4. ICANN has received five notifications from Escrow Agent within the last thirty (30) calendar days notifying ICANN of either missing or failed escrow deposits that should have been made Monday through Saturday (i.e., a Differential Deposit), and (x) ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of the receipt of such notifications; and (y) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after delivery of such notice to Registry Operator, received notification from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Differential Deposit; or
6.5. Registry Operator has: (i) ceased to conduct its business in the ordinary course; or (ii) filed for bankruptcy, become insolvent or anything analogous to any of the foregoing under the laws of any jurisdiction anywhere in the world; or

6.6. Registry Operator has experienced a failure of critical registry functions and ICANN has asserted its rights pursuant to Section 2.13 of the Agreement; or

6.7. a competent court, arbitral, legislative, or government agency mandates the release of the Deposits to ICANN; or

6.8. pursuant to Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits as specified under Section 2.11 of the Agreement.

Unless Escrow Agent has previously released the Registry Operator’s Deposits to ICANN or its designee, Escrow Agent will deliver all Deposits to ICANN upon expiration or termination of the Registry Agreement or the Escrow Agreement.

7. **Verification of Deposits.**

7.1. Within twenty-four (24) hours after receiving each Deposit or corrected Deposit, Escrow Agent must verify the format and completeness of each Deposit and deliver to ICANN a notification generated for each Deposit. Reports will be delivered electronically using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification.

7.2. If Escrow Agent discovers that any Deposit fails the verification procedures or if Escrow Agent does not receive any scheduled Deposit, Escrow Agent must notify Registry Operator either by email, fax or phone and ICANN (using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification) of such nonconformity or non-receipt within twenty-four (24) hours after receiving the non-conformant Deposit or the deadline for such Deposit, as applicable. Upon notification of such verification or delivery failure, Registry Operator must begin developing modifications, updates, corrections, and other fixes of the Deposit necessary for the Deposit to be delivered and pass the verification procedures and deliver such fixes to Escrow Agent as promptly as possible.

8. **Amendments.** Escrow Agent and Registry Operator shall amend the terms of the Escrow Agreement to conform to this Specification 2 within ten (10) calendar days of any amendment or modification to this Specification 2. In the event of a conflict between this Specification 2 and the Escrow Agreement, this Specification 2 shall control.
9. **Indemnity.** Escrow Agent shall indemnify and hold harmless Registry Operator and ICANN, and each of their respective directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Indemnitees") absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Indemnitee in connection with the misrepresentation, negligence or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees and contractors.
SPECIFICATION 3

FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR REGISTRY OPERATOR MONTHLY REPORTING

Registry Operator shall provide one set of monthly reports per gTLD, using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Specification 2, Part A, Section 9, reference 5, with the following content.

ICANN may request in the future that the reports be delivered by other means and using other formats. ICANN will use reasonable commercial efforts to preserve the confidentiality of the information reported until three (3) months after the end of the month to which the reports relate. Unless set forth in this Specification 3, any reference to a specific time refers to Coordinated Universal Time (UTC). Monthly reports shall consist of data that reflects the state of the registry at the end of the month (UTC).

1. **Per-Registrar Transactions Report.** This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-transactions-yyyymm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields per registrar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>registrar-name</td>
<td>Registrar’s full corporate name as registered with IANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>iana-id</td>
<td>For cases where the registry operator acts as registrar (i.e., without the use of an ICANN accredited registrar) either 9998 or 9999 should be used depending on registration type (as described in Specification 5), otherwise the sponsoring Registrar IANA id should be used as specified in <a href="http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids">http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>total-domains</td>
<td>total domain names under sponsorship in any EPP status but pendingCreate that have not been purged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>total-nameservers</td>
<td>total name servers (either host objects or name server hosts as domain name attributes) associated with domain names registered for the TLD in any EPP status but pendingCreate that have not been purged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>net-adds-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of one (1) year (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>net-adds-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of two (2) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>net-adds-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of three (3) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>net-adds-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of four (4) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>net-adds-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of five (5) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>net-adds-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of six (6) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>net-adds-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of seven (7) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>net-adds-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of eight (8) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>net-adds-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of nine (9) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>net-adds-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>term of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>net-renews-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of one (1) year (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>net-renews-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of two (2) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>net-renews-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of three (3) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>net-renews-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of four (4) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>net-renews-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of five (5) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>net-renews-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of six (6) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>net-renews-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of seven (7) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>net-renews-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of eight (8) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>net-renews-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of nine (9) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>net-renews-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-successful</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by this registrar that were successfully completed (either explicitly or automatically approved) and not deleted within the transfer grace period. A transaction must be reported in the month the transfer grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-nacked</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by this registrar that were rejected (e.g., EPP transfer op=&quot;reject&quot;) by the other registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>transfer-losing-successful</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by another registrar that were successfully completed (either explicitly or automatically approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>transfer-losing-nacked</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar rejected (e.g., EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-won</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes in which this registrar prevailed (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-lost</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes this registrar lost (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-nodecision</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes involving this registrar with a split or no decision (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>deleted-domains-grace</td>
<td>domains deleted within the add grace period (does not include names deleted while in EPP pendingCreate status). A deletion must be reported in the month the name is purged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>deleted-domains-nograce</td>
<td>domains deleted outside the add grace period (does not include names deleted while in EPP pendingCreate status). A deletion must be reported in the month the name is purged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>restored-domains</td>
<td>domain names restored during reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>restored-noreport</td>
<td>total number of restored names for which a restore report is required by the registry, but the registrar failed to submit it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>agp-exemption-requests</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>agp-exemptions-granted</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>agp-exempted-domains</td>
<td>total number of names affected by granted AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>attempted-adds</td>
<td>number of attempted (both successful and failed) domain name create commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a "header line" as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. The last line of each report shall include totals for each column across all registrars; the first field of this line shall read "Totals" while the second field shall be left empty in that line. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be \&lt;U+000D, U+000A&gt; as described in RFC 4180.

2. **Registry Functions Activity Report.** This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named "gTLD-activity-yyyymm.csv", where "gTLD" is the gTLD name; in case of an
IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>operational-registrars</td>
<td>number of operational registrars in the production system at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>zfa-passwords</td>
<td>number of active zone file access passwords at the end of the reporting period; &quot;CZDS&quot; may be used instead of the number of active zone file access passwords, if the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) is used to provide the zone file to the end user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>whois-43-queries</td>
<td>number of WHOIS (port-43) queries responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>web-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of Web-based Whois queries responded during the reporting period, not including searchable Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>searchable-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of searchable Whois queries responded during the reporting period, if offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>srs-dom-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>srs-dom-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>srs-dom-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>srs-dom-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field #</td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>srs-dom-renew</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “renew” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-report</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests delivering a restore report responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>srs-dom-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “update” requests (not including RGP restore requests) responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>srs-host-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>srs-host-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “create” requests responded during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field #</td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>srs-host-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>srs-host-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>srs-host-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>srs-cont-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>srs-cont-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>srs-cont-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>srs-cont-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>srs-cont-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be <U+000D, U+000A> as described in RFC 4180.

For gTLDs that are part of a single-instance Shared Registry System, the Registry Functions Activity Report may include the total contact or host transactions for all the gTLDs in the system.
SPECIFICATION 4

REGISTRATION DATA PUBLICATION SERVICES

1. **Registration Data Directory Services.** Until ICANN requires a different protocol, Registry Operator will operate a WHOIS service available via port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912, and a web-based Directory Service at <whois.nic.TLD> providing free public query-based access to at least the following elements in the following format. ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols, and upon such specification, the Registry Operator will implement such alternative specification as soon as reasonably practicable.

Registry Operator shall implement a new standard supporting access to domain name registration data (SAC 051) no later than one hundred thirty-five (135) days after it is requested by ICANN if: 1) the IETF produces a standard (i.e., it is published, at least, as a Proposed Standard RFC as specified in RFC 2026); and 2) its implementation is commercially reasonable in the context of the overall operation of the registry.

1.1. The format of responses shall follow a semi-free text format outline below, followed by a blank line and a legal disclaimer specifying the rights of Registry Operator, and of the user querying the database.

1.2. Each data object shall be represented as a set of key/value pairs, with lines beginning with keys, followed by a colon and a space as delimiters, followed by the value.

1.3. For fields where more than one value exists, multiple key/value pairs with the same key shall be allowed (for example to list multiple name servers). The first key/value pair after a blank line should be considered the start of a new record, and should be considered as identifying that record, and is used to group data, such as hostnames and IP addresses, or a domain name and registrant information, together.

1.4. The fields specified below set forth the minimum output requirements. Registry Operator may output data fields in addition to those specified below, subject to approval by ICANN, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

1.5. **Domain Name Data:**

   1.5.1  **Query format:** whois EXAMPLE.TLD

   1.5.2  **Response format:**

   Domain Name: EXAMPLE.TLD
   Domain ID: D1234567-TLD
WHOIS Server: whois.example.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example.tld
Updated Date: 2009-05-29T20:13:00Z
Creation Date: 2000-10-08T00:45:00Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2010-10-08T00:44:59Z
Sponsoring Registrar: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 5555555
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientRenewProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: serverUpdateProhibited
Registrant ID: 5372808-ERL
Registrant Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT
Registrant Organization: EXAMPLE ORGANIZATION
Registrant Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Registrant City: ANYTOWN
Registrant State/Province: AP
Registrant Postal Code: A1A1A1
Registrant Country: EX
Registrant Phone: +1.5555551212
Registrant Phone Ext: 1234
Registrant Fax: +1.5555551213
Registrant Fax Ext: 4321
Registrant Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Admin ID: 5372809-ERL
Admin Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ADMINISTRATIVE
Admin Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ORGANIZATION
Admin Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Admin City: ANYTOWN
Admin State/Province: AP
Admin Postal Code: A1A1A1
Admin Country: EX
Admin Phone: +1.5555551212
Admin Phone Ext: 1234
Admin Fax: +1.5555551213
Admin Fax Ext:
Admin Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Tech ID: 5372811-ERL
Tech Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR TECHNICAL
Tech Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Tech Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Tech City: ANYTOWN
Tech State/Province: AP
Tech Postal Code: A1A1A1
Tech Country: EX
Tech Phone: +1.1235551234
Tech Phone Ext: 1234
Tech Fax: +1.5555551213
Tech Fax Ext: 93
Tech Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Name Server: NS01.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
Name Server: NS02.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
DNSSEC: signedDelegation
DNSSEC: unsigned
>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.6. Registrar Data:

1.6.1 Query format: whois “registrar Example Registrar, Inc.”

1.6.2 Response format:

Registrar Name: Example Registrar, Inc.
Street: 1234 Admiralty Way
City: Marina del Rey
State/Province: CA
Postal Code: 90292
Country: US
Phone Number: +1.3105551212
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: registrar@example.tld
WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Joe Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551213
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: joeregistrar@example.registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Jane Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551214
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: janeregistrar@example-registrar.tld
Technical Contact: John Geek
Phone Number: +1.3105551215
Fax Number: +1.3105551216
Email: johngeek@example-registrar.tld
>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.7. Nameserver Data:

1.7.1 Query format: whois “nameserver (nameserver name)”, or whois “nameserver (IP Address).” For example: whois “nameserver NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD”.
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1.7.2 Response format:

Server Name: NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD  
IP Address: 192.0.2.123  
IP Address: 2001:0DB8::1  
Registrar: Example Registrar, Inc.  
WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld  
Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.8. The format of the following data fields: domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state/province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers (the extension will be provided as a separate field as shown above), email addresses, date and times should conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFCs 5730-5734 so that the display of this information (or values return in WHOIS responses) can be uniformly processed and understood.

1.9. In order to be compatible with ICANN’s common interface for WHOIS (InterNIC), WHOIS output shall be in the format outline above.

1.10. Searchability. Offering searchability capabilities on the Directory Services is optional but if offered by the Registry Operator it shall comply with the specification described in this section.

1.10.1 Registry Operator will offer searchability on the web-based Directory Service.

1.10.2 Registry Operator will offer partial match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: domain name, contacts and registrant’s name, and contact and registrant’s postal address, including all the sub-fields described in EPP (e.g., street, city, state or province, etc.).

1.10.3 Registry Operator will offer exact-match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: Registrar ID, name server name, and name server’s IP address (only applies to IP addresses stored by the registry, i.e., glue records).

1.10.4 Registry Operator will offer Boolean search capabilities supporting, at least, the following logical operators to join a set of search criteria: AND, OR, NOT.

1.10.5 Search results will include domain names matching the search criteria.

1.10.6 Registry Operator will: 1) implement appropriate measures to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., permitting access only to legitimate
authorized users); and 2) ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies.

1.11. Registry Operator shall provide a link on the primary website for the TLD (i.e., the website provided to ICANN for publishing on the ICANN website) to a webpage designated by ICANN containing WHOIS policy and educational materials.

2. Zone File Access

2.1. Third-Party Access

2.1.1 Zone File Access Agreement. Registry Operator will enter into an agreement with any Internet user, which will allow such user to access an Internet host server or servers designated by Registry Operator and download zone file data. The agreement will be standardized, facilitated and administered by a Centralized Zone Data Access Provider, which may be ICANN or an ICANN designee (the “CZDA Provider”). Registry Operator (optionally through the CZDA Provider) will provide access to zone file data per Section 2.1.3 of this Specification and do so using the file format described in Section 2.1.4 of this Specification. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) the CZDA Provider may reject the request for access of any user that does not satisfy the credentialing requirements in Section 2.1.2 below; (b) Registry Operator may reject the request for access of any user that does not provide correct or legitimate credentials under Section 2.1.2 below or where Registry Operator reasonably believes will violate the terms of Section 2.1.5. below; and, (c) Registry Operator may revoke access of any user if Registry Operator has evidence to support that the user has violated the terms of Section 2.1.5 below.

2.1.2 Credentialing Requirements. Registry Operator, through the facilitation of the CZDA Provider, will request each user to provide it with information sufficient to correctly identify and locate the user. Such user information will include, without limitation, company name, contact name, address, telephone number, facsimile number, email address and IP address.

2.1.3 Grant of Access. Each Registry Operator (optionally through the CZDA Provider) will provide the Zone File SFTP (or other Registry supported) service for an ICANN-specified and managed URL (specifically, <TLD>.zda.icann.org where <TLD> is the TLD for which the registry is responsible) for the user to access the Registry’s zone data archives. Registry Operator will grant the user a non-exclusive, nontransferable, limited right to access Registry Operator’s (optionally CZDA Provider’s) Zone File hosting server, and to transfer
a copy of the top-level domain zone files, and any associated cryptographic checksum files no more than once per 24 hour period using SFTP, or other data transport and access protocols that may be prescribed by ICANN. For every zone file access server, the zone files are in the top-level directory called <zone>.zone.gz, with <zone>.zone.gz.md5 and <zone>.zone.gz.sig to verify downloads. If the Registry Operator (or the CZDA Provider) also provides historical data, it will use the naming pattern <zone>-yyyymmdd.zone.gz, etc.

2.1.4 File Format Standard. Registry Operator (optionally through the CZDA Provider) will provide zone files using a subformat of the standard Master File format as originally defined in RFC 1035, Section 5, including all the records present in the actual zone used in the public DNS. Sub-format is as follows:

1. Each record must include all fields in one line as: 
   <domain-name> <TTL> <class> <type> <RDATA>.

2. Class and Type must use the standard mnemonics and must be in lower case.

3. TTL must be present as a decimal integer.

4. Use of \X and \DDD inside domain names is allowed.

5. All domain names must be in lower case.

6. Must use exactly one tab as separator of fields inside a record.

7. All domain names must be fully qualified.

8. No $ORIGIN directives.

9. No use of “@” to denote current origin.

10. No use of “blank domain names” at the beginning of a record to continue the use of the domain name in the previous record.

11. No $INCLUDE directives.

12. No $TTL directives.

13. No use of parentheses, e.g., to continue the list of fields in a record across a line boundary.

14. No use of comments.

15. No blank lines.
16. The SOA record should be present at the top and (duplicated at) the end of the zone file.

17. With the exception of the SOA record, all the records in a file must be in alphabetical order.

18. One zone per file. If a TLD divides its DNS data into multiple zones, each zone goes into a separate file named as above, with all the files combined using tar into a file called <tld>.zone.tar.

2.1.5 **Use of Data by User.** Registry Operator will permit user to use the zone file for lawful purposes; provided that (a) user takes all reasonable steps to protect against unauthorized access to, use of, and disclosure of the data, and (b) under no circumstances will Registry Operator be required or permitted to allow user to use the data to (i) allow, enable or otherwise support any marketing activities to entities other than the user’s existing customers, regardless of the medium used (such media include but are not limited to transmission by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, postal mail, SMS, and wireless alerts of mass unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations to entities), (ii) enable high volume, automated, electronic processes that send queries or data to the systems of Registry Operator or any ICANN-accredited registrar, or (iii) interrupt, disrupt or interfere in the normal business operations of any registrant.

2.1.6 **Term of Use.** Registry Operator, through CZDA Provider, will provide each user with access to the zone file for a period of not less than three (3) months. Registry Operator will allow users to renew their Grant of Access.

2.1.7 **No Fee for Access.** Registry Operator will provide, and CZDA Provider will facilitate, access to the zone file to user at no cost.

2.2. **Co-operation**

2.2.1 **Assistance.** Registry Operator will co-operate and provide reasonable assistance to ICANN and the CZDA Provider to facilitate and maintain the efficient access of zone file data by permitted users as contemplated under this Schedule.

2.3. **ICANN Access.** Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to ICANN or its designee on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time. Access will be provided at least daily. Zone files will include SRS data committed as close as possible to 00:00:00 UTC.
2.4. **Emergency Operator Access.** Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to the Emergency Operators designated by ICANN on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.

3. **Bulk Registration Data Access to ICANN**

3.1. **Periodic Access to Thin Registration Data.** In order to verify and ensure the operational stability of Registry Services as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars, Registry Operator will provide ICANN on a weekly basis (the day to be designated by ICANN) with up-to-date Registration Data as specified below. Data will include data committed as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day previous to the one designated for retrieval by ICANN.

3.1.1 **Contents.** Registry Operator will provide, at least, the following data for all registered domain names: domain name, domain name repository object id (roid), Registrar ID (IANA ID), statuses, last updated date, creation date, expiration date, and name server names. For sponsoring registrars, at least, it will provide: registrar name, registrar id (IANA ID), hostname of registrar Whois server, and URL of registrar.

3.1.2 **Format.** The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow (including encryption, signing, etc.) but including only the fields mentioned in the previous section, i.e., the file will only contain Domain and Registrar objects with the fields mentioned above. Registry Operator has the option to provide a full deposit file instead as specified in Specification 2.

3.1.3 **Access.** Registry Operator will have the file(s) ready for download as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day designated for retrieval by ICANN. The file(s) will be made available for download by SFTP, though ICANN may request other means in the future.

3.2. **Exceptional Access to Thick Registration Data.** In case of a registrar failure, deaccreditation, court order, etc. that prompts the temporary or definitive transfer of its domain names to another registrar, at the request of ICANN, Registry Operator will provide ICANN with up-to-date data for the domain names of the losing registrar. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow. The file will only contain data related to the domain names of the losing registrar. Registry Operator will provide the data as soon as commercially practicable, but in no event later than five (5) calendar days following ICANN's request. Unless otherwise agreed by Registry Operator and ICANN, the file will be made available for
download by ICANN in the same manner as the data specified in Section 3.1 of this Specification.
SPECIFICATION 5

SCHEDULE OF RESERVED NAMES

Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, and subject to
the terms and conditions of this Specification, Registry Operator shall reserve the following
labels from initial (i.e., other than renewal) registration within the TLD. If using
self-allocation, the Registry Operator must show the registration in the RDDS. In the case of
IDN names (as indicated below), IDN variants will be identified according to the registry
operator IDN registration policy, where applicable.

1. **Example.** The ASCII label “EXAMPLE” shall be withheld from registration or
allocated to Registry Operator at the second level and at all other levels within the
TLD at which Registry Operator offers registrations (such second level and all other
levels are collectively referred to herein as, “All Levels”). Such label may not be
activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or
entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s
designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, such withheld or allocated label
shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and
renew such name without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be
considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

2. **Two-character labels.** All two-character ASCII labels shall be withheld from
registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD.
Such labels may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for
registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator, provided that
such two-character label strings may be released to the extent that Registry
Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code
manager of the string as specified in the ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 standard. The Registry
Operator may also propose the release of these reservations based on its
implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country
codes, subject to approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s
designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such labels that remain
withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as
specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names
without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered
Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

3. **Reservations for Registry Operations.**

3.1. The following ASCII labels must be withheld from registration or allocated to
Registry Operator at All Levels for use in connection with the operation of
the registry for the TLD: WWW, RDDS and WHOIS. The following ASCII label
must be allocated to Registry Operator upon delegation into the root zone at
All Levels for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD:
NIC. Registry Operator may activate WWW, RDDS and WHOIS in the DNS,
but must activate NIC in the DNS, as necessary for the operation of the TLD (in accordance with the provisions of Exhibit A, the ASCII label NIC must be provisioned in the DNS as a zone cut using NS resource records). None of WWW, RDDS, WHOIS or NIC may be released or registered to any person (other than Registry Operator) or third party. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the TLD all such withheld or allocated names shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement. Such domains shall be identified by Registrar ID 9999.

3.1.1 If Exhibit A to the Agreement specifically provides that Registry Operator may offer registration of IDNs, Registry Operator may also activate a language-specific translation or transliteration of the term "NIC" or an abbreviation for the translation of the term "Network Information Center" in the DNS in accordance with Registry Operator's IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules. Such translation, transliteration or abbreviation may be reserved by Registry Operator and used in addition to the label NIC to provide any required registry functions. For the avoidance of doubt, Registry Operator is required to activate the ASCII label NIC pursuant to Section 3.1 of this Specification 3.

3.2. Registry Operator may activate in the DNS at All Levels up to one hundred (100) names (plus their IDN variants, where applicable) necessary for the operation or the promotion of the TLD. Registry Operator must act as the Registered Name Holder of such names as that term is defined in the then-current ICANN Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). These activations will be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement. Registry Operator must either (i) register such names through an ICANN accredited registrar; or (ii) self-allocate such names and with respect to those names submit to and be responsible to ICANN for compliance with ICANN Consensus Policies and the obligations set forth in Subsections 3.7.7.1 through 3.7.7.12 of the then-current RAA (or any other replacement clause setting out the terms of the registration agreement between a registrar and a registered name holder). If Registry Operator chooses option (ii) above, it shall identify these transactions using Registrar ID 9998. At Registry Operator's discretion and in compliance with all other terms of this Agreement, including the RPMs set forth in Specification 7, such names may be released for registration to another person or entity.

3.3. Registry Operator may withhold from registration or allocate to Registry Operator names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) at All Levels in accordance with Section 2.6 of the Agreement. Such names may not be activated in the DNS, but may be released for registration to Registry
Operator or another person or entity at Registry Operator’s discretion, subject to compliance with all the terms of this Agreement, including applicable RPMs set forth in Specification 7. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Upon ICANN’s request, Registry Operator shall provide a listing of all names withheld or allocated to Registry Operator pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Agreement. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

3.4. Effective upon the conclusion of the No-Activation Period specified in Section 6.1 of Specification 6, Registry Operator shall allocate the domain name "icann-sla-monitoring.<tld>" to the ICANN testing registrar (as such registrar is described in Section 8.2 of Specification 10). If such domain name is not available for registration in the TLD or is otherwise inconsistent with the registration policies of the TLD, Registry Operator may allocate a different domain name to the ICANN testing registrar in consultation with ICANN. The allocation of any such alternative domain name will be communicated to ICANN following such consultation. The allocation of the domain name "icann-sla-monitoring.<tld>" to the ICANN testing registrar will not (i) be considered a Transaction for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement, (ii) count towards the one hundred domain names available to Registry Operator under Section 3.2 of this Specification 5, or (iii) adversely affect Registry Operator’s qualification as a .BRAND TLD pursuant to Specification 13 (.BRAND TLD Provisions) hereto (as applicable).

4. **Country and Territory Names.** The country and territory names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) contained in the following internationally recognized lists shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at All Levels:

4.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union <http://www.iso.org/iso/support/country_codes/iso_3166_code_lists/iso-3166-1_decoding_table.htm>;

4.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and

provided, that the reservation of specific country and territory names (including their IDN variants according to the registry operator IDN registration policy, where applicable) may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s). Registry Operator must not activate such names in the DNS; provided, that Registry Operator may propose the release of these reservations, subject to review by ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee and approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

5. **International Olympic Committee; International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.** As instructed from time to time by ICANN, the names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) relating to the International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement listed at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/reserved shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD. Additional International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement names (including their IDN variants) may be added to the list upon ten (10) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator. Such names may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

6. **Intergovernmental Organizations.** As instructed from time to time by ICANN, Registry Operator will implement the protections mechanism determined by the ICANN Board of Directors relating to the protection of identifiers for Intergovernmental Organizations. A list of reserved names for this Section 6 is available at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/reserved. Additional names (including their IDN variants) may be added to the list upon ten (10) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator. Any such protected identifiers for Intergovernmental Organizations may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such protected identifiers shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use
of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.
SPECIFICATION 6

REGISTRY INTEROPERABILITY AND CONTINUITY SPECIFICATIONS

1. Standards Compliance

1.1. DNS. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the DNS and name server operations including without limitation RFCs 1034, 1035, 1123, 1982, 2181, 2182, 3226, 3596, 3597, 4343, 5966 and 6891. DNS labels may only include hyphens in the third and fourth position if they represent valid IDNs (as specified above) in their ASCII encoding (e.g., “xn--ndk061n”).

1.2. EPP. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the provisioning and management of domain names using the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) in conformance with RFCs 5910, 5730, 5731, 5732 (if using host objects), 5733 and 5734. If Registry Operator implements Registry Grace Period (RGP), it will comply with RFC 3915 and its successors. If Registry Operator requires the use of functionality outside the base EPP RFCs, Registry Operator must document EPP extensions in Internet-Draft format following the guidelines described in RFC 3735. Registry Operator will provide and update the relevant documentation of all the EPP Objects and Extensions supported to ICANN prior to deployment.

1.3. DNSSEC. Registry Operator shall sign its TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (“DNSSEC”). For the absence of doubt, Registry Operator shall sign the zone file of <TLD> and zone files used for in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers. During the Term, Registry Operator shall comply with RFCs 4033, 4034, 4035, 4509 and their successors, and follow the best practices described in RFC 6781 and its successors. If Registry Operator implements Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence for DNS Security Extensions, it shall comply with RFC 5155 and its successors. Registry Operator shall accept public-key material from child domain names in a secure manner according to industry best practices. Registry shall also publish in its website the DNSSEC Practice Statements (DPS) describing critical security controls and procedures for key material storage, access and usage for its own keys and secure acceptance of registrants’ public-key material. Registry Operator shall publish its DPS following the format described in RFC 6841. DNSSEC validation must be active and use the IANA DNS Root Key Signing Key set (available at https://www.iana.org/dnssec/files) as a trust anchor for Registry Operator’s Registry Services making use of data obtained via DNS responses.
1.4. **IDN.** If the Registry Operator offers Internationalized Domain Names ("IDNs"), it shall comply with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 and their successors. Registry Operator shall comply with the ICANN IDN Guidelines at <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm>, as they may be amended, modified, or superseded from time to time. Registry Operator shall publish and keep updated its IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices.

1.5. **IPv6.** Registry Operator shall be able to accept IPv6 addresses as glue records in its Registry System and publish them in the DNS. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for, at least, two of the Registry’s name servers listed in the root zone with the corresponding IPv6 addresses registered with IANA. Registry Operator should follow “DNS IPv6 Transport Operational Guidelines” as described in BCP 91 and the recommendations and considerations described in RFC 4472. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Registration Data Publication Services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement; e.g., Whois (RFC 3912), Web based Whois. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Shared Registration System (SRS) to any Registrar, no later than six (6) months after receiving the first request in writing from a gTLD accredited Registrar willing to operate with the SRS over IPv6.

1.6. **IANA Rootzone Database.** In order to ensure that authoritative information about the TLD remains publicly available, Registry Operator shall submit a change request to the IANA functions operator updating any outdated or inaccurate DNS or WHOIS records of the TLD. Registry Operator shall use commercially reasonable efforts to submit any such change request no later than seven (7) calendar days after the date any such DNS or WHOIS records becomes outdated or inaccurate. Registry Operator must submit all change requests in accordance with the procedures set forth at <http://www.iana.org/domains/root>.

1.7. **Network Ingress Filtering.** Registry Operator shall implement network ingress filtering checks for its Registry Services as described in BCP 38 and BCP 84, which ICANN will also implement.

2. **Registry Services**

2.1. **Registry Services.** “Registry Services” are, for purposes of the Agreement, defined as the following: (a) those services that are operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry DNS servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by this Agreement; (b) other
products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy as defined in Specification 1; (c) any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator; and (d) material changes to any Registry Service within the scope of (a), (b) or (c) above.

2.2. **Wildcard Prohibition.** For domain names which are either not registered, or the registrant has not supplied valid records such as NS records for listing in the DNS zone file, or their status does not allow them to be published in the DNS, the use of DNS wildcard Resource Records as described in RFCs 1034 and 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS Resources Records or using redirection within the DNS by the Registry is prohibited. When queried for such domain names the authoritative name servers must return a “Name Error” response (also known as NXDOMAIN), RCODE 3 as described in RFC 1035 and related RFCs. This provision applies for all DNS zone files at all levels in the DNS tree for which the Registry Operator (or an affiliate engaged in providing Registration Services) maintains data, arranges for such maintenance, or derives revenue from such maintenance.

3. **Registry Continuity**

3.1. **High Availability.** Registry Operator will conduct its operations using network and geographically diverse, redundant servers (including network-level redundancy, end-node level redundancy and the implementation of a load balancing scheme where applicable) to ensure continued operation in the case of technical failure (widespread or local), or an extraordinary occurrence or circumstance beyond the control of the Registry Operator. Registry Operator’s emergency operations department shall be available at all times to respond to extraordinary occurrences.

3.2. **Extraordinary Event.** Registry Operator will use commercially reasonable efforts to restore the critical functions of the registry within twenty-four (24) hours after the termination of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator and restore full system functionality within a maximum of forty-eight (48) hours following such event, depending on the type of critical function involved. Outages due to such an event will not be considered a lack of service availability.

3.3. **Business Continuity.** Registry Operator shall maintain a business continuity plan, which will provide for the maintenance of Registry Services in the event of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator or business failure of Registry Operator, and may include the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider. If such plan includes the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider, Registry Operator shall provide
the name and contact information for such Registry Services continuity provider to ICANN. In the case of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator where the Registry Operator cannot be contacted, Registry Operator consents that ICANN may contact the designated Registry Services continuity provider, if one exists. Registry Operator shall conduct Registry Services Continuity testing at least once per year.

4. Abuse Mitigation

4.1. Abuse Contact. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquiries related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details.

4.2. Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operator shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

5. Supported Initial and Renewal Registration Periods

5.1. Initial Registration Periods. Initial registrations of registered names may be made in the registry in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, initial registrations of registered names may not exceed ten (10) years.

5.2. Renewal Periods. Renewal of registered names may be made in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, renewal of registered names may not extend their registration period beyond ten (10) years from the time of the renewal.

6. Name Collision Occurrence Management

6.1. No-Activation Period. Registry Operator shall not activate any names in the DNS zone for the Registry TLD (except for "NIC") until at least 120 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement. Registry Operator may allocate names (subject to subsection 6.2 below) during this period only if Registry Operator causes registrants to be clearly informed of the inability to activate names until the No-Activation Period ends.

6.2. Name Collision Occurrence Assessment

6.2.1 Registry Operator shall not activate any names in the DNS zone for the Registry TLD except in compliance with a Name Collision Occurrence Assessment provided by ICANN regarding the Registry TLD. Registry
Operator will either (A) implement the mitigation measures described in its Name Collision Occurrence Assessment before activating any second-level domain name, or (B) block those second-level domain names for which the mitigation measures as described in the Name Collision Occurrence Assessment have not been implemented and proceed with activating names that are not listed in the Assessment.

6.2.2 Notwithstanding subsection 6.2.1, Registry Operator may proceed with activation of names in the DNS zone without implementation of the measures set forth in Section 6.2.1 only if (A) ICANN determines that the Registry TLD is eligible for this alternative path to activation of names; and (B) Registry Operator blocks all second-level domain names identified by ICANN and set forth at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-2-17nov13-en> as such list may be modified by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator may activate names pursuant to this subsection and later activate names pursuant to subsection 6.2.1.

6.2.3 The sets of names subject to mitigation or blocking pursuant to Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 will be based on ICANN analysis of DNS information including "Day in the Life of the Internet" data maintained by the DNS Operations, Analysis, and Research Center (DNS-OARC) <https://www.dns-oarc.net/oarc/data/ditl>.

6.2.4 Registry Operator may participate in the development by the ICANN community of a process for determining whether and how these blocked names may be released.

6.2.5 If ICANN determines that the TLD is ineligible for the alternative path to activation of names, ICANN may elect not to delegate the TLD pending completion of the final Name Collision Occurrence Assessment for the TLD, and Registry Operator’s completion of all required mitigation measures. Registry Operator understands that the mitigation measures required by ICANN as a condition to activation of names in the DNS zone for the TLD may include, without limitation, mitigation measures such as those described in Section 3.2 of the New gTLD Name Collision Occurrence Management Plan approved by the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) on 7 October 2013 as found at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-07oct13-en.pdf>.

6.3. **Name Collision Report Handling**

6.3.1 During the first two years after delegation of the TLD, Registry Operator’s emergency operations department shall be available to
receive reports, relayed by ICANN, alleging demonstrably severe harm from collisions with overlapping use of the names outside of the authoritative DNS.

6.3.2 Registry Operator shall develop an internal process for handling in an expedited manner reports received pursuant to subsection 6.3.1 under which Registry Operator may, to the extent necessary and appropriate, remove a recently activated name from the TLD zone for a period of up to two years in order to allow the affected party to make changes to its systems.
SPECIFICATION 7

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

1. **Rights Protection Mechanisms.** Registry Operator shall implement and adhere to the rights protection mechanisms ("RPMs") specified in this Specification. In addition to such RPMs, Registry Operator may develop and implement additional RPMs that discourage or prevent registration of domain names that violate or abuse another party's legal rights. Registry Operator will include all RPMs required by this Specification 7 and any additional RPMs developed and implemented by Registry Operator in the Registry-Registrar Agreement entered into by ICANN-accredited registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Registry Operator shall implement in accordance with requirements set forth therein each of the mandatory RPMs set forth in the Trademark Clearinghouse as of the date hereof, as posted at [http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/tmch-requirements](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/tmch-requirements) (the "Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements"), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator shall not mandate that any owner of applicable intellectual property rights use any other trademark information aggregation, notification, or validation service in addition to or instead of the ICANN-designated Trademark Clearinghouse. If there is a conflict between the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements, the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall control. Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar authorizing such registrar(s) to register domain names in the TLD as follows:

   a. if Registry Operator conducts a Qualified Launch Program or is authorized by ICANN to conduct an Approved Launch Program (as those terms are defined in the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements), Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar prior to allocating any domain names pursuant to such Qualified Launch Program or Approved Launch Program, as applicable;

   b. if Registry Operator does not conduct a Qualified Launch Program or is not authorized by ICANN to conduct an Approved Launch Program, Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the expiration date of the Sunrise Period (as defined in the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements) for the TLD; or

   c. if this Agreement contains a Specification 13, Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar prior to the Claims Commencement Date (as defined in Specification 13).
Nothing in this Specification 7 shall limit or waive any other obligations or requirements of this Agreement applicable to Registry Operator, including Section 2.9(a) and Specification 9.

2. **Dispute Resolution Mechanisms.** Registry Operator will comply with the following dispute resolution mechanisms as they may be revised from time to time:

   a. the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) and the Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) adopted by ICANN (posted at [http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/pddrp](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/pddrp) and [http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdrp](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdrp), respectively). Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PDDRP or RRDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination; and

   b. the Uniform Rapid Suspension system ("URS") adopted by ICANN (posted at [http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/urs](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/urs), including the implementation of determinations issued by URS examiners.
SPECIFICATION 8

CONTINUED OPERATIONS INSTRUMENT

1. The Continued Operations Instrument shall (a) provide for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (b) be in the form of either (i) an irrevocable standby letter of credit, or (ii) an irrevocable cash escrow deposit, each meeting the requirements set forth in item 50(b) of Attachment to Module 2 – Evaluation Questions and Criteria – of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, as published and supplemented by ICANN prior to the date hereof (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8). Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to take all actions necessary or advisable to maintain in effect the Continued Operations Instrument for a period of six (6) years from the Effective Date, and to maintain ICANN as a third party beneficiary thereof. If Registry Operator elects to obtain an irrevocable standby letter of credit but the term required above is unobtainable, Registry Operator may obtain a letter of credit with a one-year term and an “evergreen provision,” providing for annual extensions, without amendment, for an indefinite number of additional periods until the issuing bank informs ICANN of its final expiration or until ICANN releases the letter of credit as evidenced in writing, if the letter of credit otherwise meets the requirements set forth in item 50(b) of Attachment to Module 2 – Evaluation Questions and Criteria – of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, as published and supplemented by ICANN prior to the date hereof; provided, however, that if the issuing bank informs ICANN of the expiration of such letter of credit prior to the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, such letter of credit must provide that ICANN is entitled to draw the funds secured by the letter of credit prior to such expiration. The letter of credit must require the issuing bank to give ICANN at least thirty (30) calendar days’ notice of any such expiration or non-renewal. If the letter of credit expires or is terminated at any time prior to the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator will be required to obtain a replacement Continued Operations Instrument. ICANN may draw the funds under the original letter of credit, if the replacement Continued Operations Instrument is not in place prior to the expiration of the original letter of credit. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN copies of all final documents relating to the Continued Operations Instrument and shall keep ICANN reasonably informed of material developments relating to the Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall not agree to, or permit, any amendment of, or waiver under, the Continued Operations Instrument or other documentation relating thereto without the prior written consent of ICANN (such consent not to be unreasonably withheld).
2. If, notwithstanding the use of best efforts by Registry Operator to satisfy its obligations under the preceding paragraph, the Continued Operations Instrument expires or is terminated by another party thereto, in whole or in part, for any reason, prior to the sixth anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator shall promptly (i) notify ICANN of such expiration or termination and the reasons therefor and (ii) arrange for an alternative instrument that provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date (an “Alternative Instrument”). Any such Alternative Instrument shall be on terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and shall otherwise be in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN.

3. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Specification 8, at any time, Registry Operator may replace the Continued Operations Instrument with an Alternative Instrument that (i) provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (ii) contains terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and is otherwise in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN. In the event Registry Operator replaces the Continued Operations Instrument either pursuant to paragraph 2 or this paragraph 3, the terms of this Specification 8 shall no longer apply with respect to the original Continuing Operations Instrument, but shall thereafter apply with respect to such Alternative Instrument(s), and such instrument shall thereafter be considered the Continued Operations Instrument for purposes of this Agreement.
SPECIFICATION 9

REGISTRY OPERATOR CODE OF CONDUCT

1. In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator will not, and will not allow any parent, subsidiary, Affiliate, subcontractor or other related entity, to the extent such party is engaged in the provision of Registry Services with respect to the TLD (each, a "Registry Related Party"), to:
   
a. directly or indirectly show any preference or provide any special consideration to any registrar with respect to operational access to registry systems and related registry services, unless comparable opportunities to qualify for such preferences or considerations are made available to all registrars on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions;

   b. register domain names in its own right, except for names registered through an ICANN accredited registrar; provided, however, that Registry Operator may (a) reserve names from registration pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Agreement and (b) may withhold from registration or allocate to Registry Operator up to one hundred (100) names pursuant to Section 3.2 of Specification 5;

   c. register names in the TLD or sub-domains of the TLD based upon proprietary access to information about searches or resolution requests by consumers for domain names not yet registered (commonly known as, “front-running”); or

   d. allow any Affiliated registrar to disclose Personal Data about registrants to Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, except as reasonably necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such user data on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions.

2. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will, or will cause such Registry Related Party to, ensure that such services are offered through a legal entity separate from Registry Operator, and maintain separate books of accounts with respect to its registrar or registrar-reseller operations.

3. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will conduct internal reviews at least once per calendar year to ensure compliance with this Code of Conduct. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar year, Registry Operator will provide the results of the internal review, along with a certification executed by an executive officer of Registry Operator certifying as to
Registry Operator’s compliance with this Code of Conduct, via email to an address to be provided by ICANN. (ICANN may specify in the future the form and contents of such reports or that the reports be delivered by other reasonable means.) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may publicly post such results and certification; provided, however, ICANN shall not disclose Confidential Information contained in such results except in accordance with Section 7.15 of the Agreement.

4. Nothing set forth herein shall: (i) limit ICANN from conducting investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct; or (ii) provide grounds for Registry Operator to refuse to cooperate with ICANN investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct.

5. Nothing set forth herein shall limit the ability of Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, to enter into arms-length transactions in the ordinary course of business with a registrar or reseller with respect to products and services unrelated in all respects to the TLD.

6. Registry Operator may request an exemption to this Code of Conduct, and such exemption may be granted by ICANN in ICANN's reasonable discretion, if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN's reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator for the exclusive use of Registry Operator or its Affiliates, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (iii) application of this Code of Conduct to the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest.
SPECIFICATION 10

REGISTRY PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Definitions**

1.1. **DNS.** Refers to the Domain Name System as specified in RFCs 1034, 1035, and related RFCs.

1.2. **DNSSEC proper resolution.** There is a valid DNSSEC chain of trust from the root trust anchor to a particular domain name, e.g., a TLD, a domain name registered under a TLD, etc.

1.3. **EPP.** Refers to the Extensible Provisioning Protocol as specified in RFC 5730 and related RFCs.

1.4. **IP address.** Refers to IPv4 or IPv6 addresses without making any distinction between the two. When there is need to make a distinction, IPv4 or IPv6 is used.

1.5. **Probes.** Network hosts used to perform (DNS, EPP, etc.) tests (see below) that are located at various global locations.

1.6. **RDDS.** Registration Data Directory Services refers to the collective of WHOIS and Web-based WHOIS services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement.

1.7. **RTT.** Round-Trip Time or RTT refers to the time measured from the sending of the first bit of the first packet of the sequence of packets needed to make a request until the reception of the last bit of the last packet of the sequence needed to receive the response. If the client does not receive the whole sequence of packets needed to consider the response as received, the request will be considered unanswered.

1.8. **SLR.** Service Level Requirement is the level of service expected for a certain parameter being measured in a Service Level Agreement (SLA).

2. **Service Level Agreement Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SLR (monthly basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS service availability</td>
<td>0 min downtime = 100% availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS name server availability</td>
<td>≤ 432 min of downtime (≈ 99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>≤ 1500 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>≤ 500 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS update time</td>
<td>≤ 60 min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS availability</td>
<td>≤ 864 min of downtime (≈ 98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDDS query RTT</strong></td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDDS update time</strong></td>
<td>≤ 60 min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP service availability</strong></td>
<td>≤ 864 min of downtime (≈ 98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP session-command RTT</strong></td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP query-command RTT</strong></td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP transform-command RTT</strong></td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registry Operator is encouraged to do maintenance for the different services at the times and dates of statistically lower traffic for each service. However, note that there is no provision for planned outages or similar periods of unavailable or slow service; any downtime, be it for maintenance or due to system failures, will be noted simply as downtime and counted for SLA purposes.

3. **DNS**

3.1. **DNS service availability.** Refers to the ability of the group of listed-as-authoritative name servers of a particular domain name (e.g., a TLD), to answer DNS queries from DNS probes. For the service to be considered available at a particular moment, at least, two of the delegated name servers registered in the DNS must have successful results from “DNS tests” to each of their public-DNS registered “IP addresses” to which the name server resolves. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes see the service as unavailable during a given time, the DNS service will be considered unavailable.

3.2. **DNS name server availability.** Refers to the ability of a public-DNS registered “IP address” of a particular name server listed as authoritative for a domain name, to answer DNS queries from an Internet user. All the public DNS-registered “IP address” of all name servers of the domain name being monitored shall be tested individually. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes get undefined/unanswered results from “DNS tests” to a name server “IP address” during a given time, the name server “IP address” will be considered unavailable.

3.3. **UDP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of two packets, the UDP DNS query and the corresponding UDP DNS response. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.4. **TCP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the DNS response for only one DNS query. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.5. **DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to either “UDP DNS resolution RTT” or “TCP DNS resolution RTT”.
3.6. **DNS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, until the name servers of the parent domain name answer “DNS queries” with data consistent with the change made. This only applies for changes to DNS information.

3.7. **DNS test.** Means one non-recursive DNS query sent to a particular “IP address” (via UDP or TCP). If DNSSEC is offered in the queried DNS zone, for a query to be considered answered, the signatures must be positively verified against a corresponding DS record published in the parent zone or, if the parent is not signed, against a statically configured Trust Anchor. The answer to the query must contain the corresponding information from the Registry System, otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. A query with a “DNS resolution RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR, will be considered unanswered. The possible results to a DNS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “DNS resolution RTT” or, undefined/unanswered.

3.8. **Measuring DNS parameters.** Every minute, every DNS probe will make an UDP or TCP “DNS test” to each of the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the name servers of the domain name being monitored. If a “DNS test” result is undefined/unanswered, the tested IP will be considered unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

3.9. **Collating the results from DNS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 20 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

3.10. **Distribution of UDP and TCP queries.** DNS probes will send UDP or TCP “DNS test” approximating the distribution of these queries.

3.11. **Placement of DNS probes.** Probes for measuring DNS parameters shall be placed as near as possible to the DNS resolvers on the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

4. **RDDS**

4.1. **RDDS availability.** Refers to the ability of all the RDDS services for the TLD, to respond to queries from an Internet user with appropriate data from the relevant Registry System. If 51% or more of the RDDS testing probes see any of the RDDS services as unavailable during a given time, the RDDS will be considered unavailable.
4.2. **WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the **RTT** of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the WHOIS response. If the **RTT** is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the **RTT** will be considered undefined.

4.3. **Web-based-WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the **RTT** of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the HTTP response for only one HTTP request. If Registry Operator implements a multiple-step process to get to the information, only the last step shall be measured. If the **RTT** is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the **RTT** will be considered undefined.

4.4. **RDDS query RTT.** Refers to the collective of “**WHOIS query RTT**” and “**Web-based- WHOIS query RTT**”.

4.5. **RDDS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, host or contact, up until the servers of the RDDS services reflect the changes made.

4.6. **RDDS test.** Means one query sent to a particular “**IP address**” of one of the servers of one of the RDDS services. Queries shall be about existing objects in the Registry System and the responses must contain the corresponding information otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. Queries with an **RTT** 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. The possible results to an RDDS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the **RTT** or undefined/unanswered.

4.7. **Measuring RDDS parameters.** Every 5 minutes, RDDS probes will select one IP address from all the public-DNS registered “**IP addresses**” of the servers for each RDDS service of the TLD being monitored and make an “**RDDS test**” to each one. If an “**RDDS test**” result is undefined/unanswered, the corresponding RDDS service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

4.8. **Collating the results from RDDS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 10 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

4.9. **Placement of RDDS probes.** Probes for measuring RDDS parameters shall be placed inside the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.
5. **EPP**

5.1. **EPP service availability.** Refers to the ability of the TLD EPP servers as a group, to respond to commands from the Registry accredited Registrars, who already have credentials to the servers. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. An EPP command with “**EPP command RTT**” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. If 51% or more of the EPP testing probes see the EPP service as unavailable during a given time, the EPP service will be considered unavailable.

5.2. **EPP session-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a session command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP session command. For the login command it will include packets needed for starting the TCP session. For the logout command it will include packets needed for closing the TCP session. EPP session commands are those described in section 2.9.1 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.3. **EPP query-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a query command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP query command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP query commands are those described in section 2.9.2 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.4. **EPP transform-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a transform command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP transform command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP transform commands are those described in section 2.9.3 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.5. **EPP command RTT.** Refers to “**EPP session-command RTT**, “**EPP query-command RTT**” or “**EPP transform-command RTT**”.

5.6. **EPP test.** Means one EPP command sent to a particular “**IP address**” for one of the EPP servers. Query and transform commands, with the exception of “create”, shall be about existing objects in the Registry System. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. The possible results to an EPP test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “**EPP command RTT**” or undefined/unanswered.
5.7. **Measuring EPP parameters.** Every 5 minutes, EPP probes will select one "IP address" of the EPP servers of the TLD being monitored and make an “EPP test”; every time they should alternate between the 3 different types of commands and between the commands inside each category. If an “EPP test” result is undefined/unanswered, the EPP service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

5.8. **Collating the results from EPP probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 5 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

5.9. **Placement of EPP probes.** Probes for measuring EPP parameters shall be placed inside or close to Registrars points of access to the Internet across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

6. **Emergency Thresholds**

The following matrix presents the emergency thresholds that, if reached by any of the services mentioned above for a TLD, would cause the emergency transition of the Registry for the TLD as specified in Section 2.13 of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Function</th>
<th>Emergency Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS Service</td>
<td>4-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNSSEC proper resolution</td>
<td>4-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>24-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDGS</td>
<td>24-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Escrow</td>
<td>Reaching any of the criteria for the release of deposits described in Specification 2, Part B, Section 6.2 through Section 6.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Emergency Escalation**

Escalation is strictly for purposes of notifying and investigating possible or potential issues in relation to monitored services. The initiation of any escalation and the subsequent cooperative investigations do not in themselves imply that a monitored service has failed its performance requirements.

Escalations shall be carried out between ICANN and Registry Operators, Registrars and Registry Operator, and Registrars and ICANN. Registry Operators and ICANN must provide said emergency operations departments. Current contacts must be maintained between
ICANN and Registry Operators and published to Registrars, where relevant to their role in escalations, prior to any processing of an Emergency Escalation by all related parties, and kept current at all times.

7.1. **Emergency Escalation initiated by ICANN**

Upon reaching 10% of the Emergency thresholds as described in Section 6 of this Specification, ICANN’s emergency operations will initiate an Emergency Escalation with the relevant Registry Operator. An Emergency Escalation consists of the following minimum elements: electronic (i.e., email or SMS) and/or voice contact notification to the Registry Operator’s emergency operations department with detailed information concerning the issue being escalated, including evidence of monitoring failures, cooperative trouble-shooting of the monitoring failure between ICANN staff and the Registry Operator, and the commitment to begin the process of rectifying issues with either the monitoring service or the service being monitoring.

7.2. **Emergency Escalation initiated by Registrars**

Registry Operator will maintain an emergency operations department prepared to handle emergency requests from registrars. In the event that a registrar is unable to conduct EPP transactions with the registry for the TLD because of a fault with the Registry Service and is unable to either contact (through ICANN mandated methods of communication) the Registry Operator, or the Registry Operator is unable or unwilling to address the fault, the registrar may initiate an emergency escalation to the emergency operations department of ICANN. ICANN then may initiate an emergency escalation with the Registry Operator as explained above.

7.3. **Notifications of Outages and Maintenance**

In the event that a Registry Operator plans maintenance, it will provide notice to the ICANN emergency operations department, at least, twenty-four (24) hours ahead of that maintenance. ICANN’s emergency operations department will note planned maintenance times, and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services during the expected maintenance outage period.

If Registry Operator declares an outage, as per its contractual obligations with ICANN, on services under a service level agreement and performance requirements, it will notify the ICANN emergency operations department. During that declared outage, ICANN’s emergency operations department will note and suspend emergency escalation services for the monitored services involved.

8. **Covenants of Performance Measurement**

8.1. **No interference.** Registry Operator shall not interfere with measurement Probes, including any form of preferential treatment of the requests for the monitored services. Registry Operator shall respond to the measurement...
tests described in this Specification as it would to any other request from an Internet user (for DNS and RDDS) or registrar (for EPP).

8.2. **ICANN testing registrar.** Registry Operator agrees that ICANN will have a testing registrar used for purposes of measuring the SLRs described above. Registry Operator agrees to not provide any differentiated treatment for the testing registrar other than no billing of the transactions. ICANN shall not use the registrar for registering domain names (or other registry objects) for itself or others, except for the purposes of verifying contractual compliance with the conditions described in this Agreement. Registry Operator shall identify these transactions using Registrar ID 9997.
SPECIFICATION 11

PUBLIC INTEREST COMMITMENTS

1. Registry Operator will use only ICANN accredited registrars that are party to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on 27 June 2013 in registering domain names. A list of such registrars shall be maintained by ICANN on ICANN’s website.

2. Registry Operator will operate the registry for the TLD in compliance with all commitments, statements of intent and business plans stated in the following sections of Registry Operator’s application to ICANN for the TLD, which commitments, statements of intent and business plans are hereby incorporated by reference into this Agreement. Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to this paragraph shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process established by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resourcesregistries/picdrp), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time (the “PICDRP”). Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

[Registry Operator to insert specific application sections here, if applicable]

3. Registry Operator agrees to perform the following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process established by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resourcesregistries/picdrp), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time (the “PICDRP”). Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

   a. Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive
practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name.

b. Registry Operator will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. Registry Operator will maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operator will maintain these reports for the term of the Agreement unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN, and will provide them to ICANN upon request.

c. Registry Operator will operate the TLD in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination by establishing, publishing and adhering to clear registration policies.

d. Registry Operator of a “Generic String” TLD may not impose eligibility criteria for registering names in the TLD that limit registrations exclusively to a single person or entity and/or that person's or entity’s “Affiliates” (as defined in Section 2.9(c) of the Registry Agreement). “Generic String” means a string consisting of a word or term that denominates or describes a general class of goods, services, groups, organizations or things, as opposed to distinguishing a specific brand of goods, services, groups, organizations or things from those of others.
SPECIFICATION 12

COMMUNITY REGISTRATION POLICIES

Registry Operator shall implement and comply with all community registration policies described below and/or attached to this Specification 12.

[Insert registration policies]
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This page is available in:
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Definitions

For purposes of this document the following terms are defined as follows:

**Back-End Registry Operator**: An organization contracted by a registry to run one or more of the Critical Functions of a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry.

**Critical Functions**: Functions that are critical to the operation of a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry:

1. DNS (Domain Name System) resolution
2. DNSSEC (DNS Security Extensions) properly signed zone (if DNSSEC (DNS Security Extensions) is offered by the registry)
3. Shared Registration System (SRS (Shared Registry System)), usually by means of the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (Protocol) (EPP)

4. Registration Data Directory Services (RDDS), e.g., WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) provided over both port 43 and through a web based service.

5. Registry Data Escrow

Registry Transition: A change in the contracting party of a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registry Agreement with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Examples of circumstances leading to a Registry Transition are: name change of the organization running the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), a sale or transfer of the registry, current registry is in breach of Registry Agreement, etc.

Successor Registry: The new contracting party of a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registry Agreement with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) after a Registry Transition.

Registry Transition Processes

Affirmation of Commitments, section 9.2, states as one the commitments of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):

Preserving security, stability and resiliency [of the DNS (Domain Name System)].

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) bylaws identify the core values of the organization. Core value #1 is as follows:

Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

The 2006-2007 ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Operating Plan (section 1.1.2) states that ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will:

Establish a comprehensive plan to be followed in the event of financial, technical, or business failure of a registry operator, including full compliance with data escrow requirements and recovery testing.¹

The process was created in FY06 07 and has been continuously updated; it is now called the Registry Continuity Framework.⁴ The Incident and Event Management Process depicted in the Registry Continuity Framework identifies the need for handling situations where Critical Registry Functions are negatively affected.

In pursuit of its core value #1, and as a result of the development of the Registry Continuity Framework, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has identified the need to define processes to transition a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) in a secure, stable and reliable manner; while minimizing the impact on registrants and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) users, and providing transparency to the parties involved in the transition.

The following three processes have been developed and are described in this document:

1. Registry Transition Process with proposed successor
2. Registry Transition Process with Request For Proposals (RFP)
3. Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Temporary Transition Process

1. Registry Transition Process with Proposed Successor

This process will be used when a registry requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) assign its Registry Agreement to a prospective successor (e.g., the registry is
being acquired, there is a name change in the organization, a transition to the registry services continuity provider). This process will also be used if at the end of the registry agreement term, or by means of a court order by a legal authority with jurisdiction, the relevant Government or Public authority withdraws its support to the registry operator of a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) that is a geographic name, and proposes a successor registry. A flowchart of this process is in Appendix 2.

The appropriate level of scrutiny will be exercised at all times when evaluating the proposed successor. For example, in the case of a name change, the evaluation will focus on ensuring it is legitimate to guarantee there is no opportunity for hijacking the TLD (Top Level Domain).

Upon receipt of the request from the current registry or relevant government or public authority (in the case of geographic gTLDs), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will assess the situation from the gathered facts, conversations with the current registry, and government or public authority (if applicable), and an analysis of the Registry Agreement. The assessment will focus on the following questions:

- Would there be a change in an entity providing any of the Back-End Registry functions?
- Does the TLD (Top Level Domain) have a relevant community that must be consulted?
- Is this a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) a geographic name according to the definition in the Applicant Guidebook? (Or, was government support required at the time of the application?)
- Are there any restrictions in the Registry Agreement that might affect a transition?

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will also perform a risk assessment of the gTLD (generic Top Level
Domain), current registry, and Back-End Registry Operator (if there is a change in that respect) The assessment will focus on particularities of the triple as a whole and the triplets themselves. For example, it will be checked if the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) is heavily used by financial institutions or for electronic commerce, which may lead to stricter measures about the security of the transition.

After these assessments are complete, the proposed successor registry will be checked to ensure that it has the required outside support, if that is required If the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) is a geographic name, as defined in the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Applicant Guidebook, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will direct the proposed successor to solicit the relevant government or public authority for support for the prospective successor and collect documentation of support/non-objection. If the Registry Agreement defines any community that must be consulted at time of transition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will consult them at this stage. In these cases, there must be support for the proposed successor from the relevant community for the process to continue to transition.

If the proposed successor has the required support or if no support is required, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will then proceed to evaluate the applicant using the processes defined in the Applicant Guidebook for new gTLDs. Based on criteria set forth in the Prospective Registry Evaluation Matrix described in Appendix 1, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will determine which evaluations are necessary and collect the information and evaluation fee. The fee will cover the cost of the evaluations that are conducted by external providers.

Evaluations performed internally by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will be at no cost for the applicant.
The scope of the evaluations will vary for each case depending on the required and appropriate level of scrutiny. The three levels of scrutiny are presented in Appendix 1. The most extensive level (i.e., *Full*) will be similar in scope to the review of new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) applicants. The assessment will be performed by one of the firms engaged in evaluating applications for new gTLDs. The next level (i.e., *Limited*) represents a more narrow scope of review. For example, the Technical and Operations evaluation could consist of ensuring that the new organization has similar arrangements in place with the existing Back-End Registry Operator. The third level (i.e., *Minimal*) represents a very narrow scope of review that would be performed internally by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

The evaluation provider will then perform the required evaluations and provide a report to the applicant and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). If the applicant does not pass the evaluation, there will be a chance for the applicant to cure the deficiencies within three weeks of the failed evaluation (an extended evaluation). If the applicant does not pass evaluation in the second opportunity, the process will end with no transition and a refund will be provided to the applicant equal to what was collected less actual evaluation costs.

If the prospective successor passes the evaluation, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will seek the necessary approvals and enter into a Registry Agreement with the successor if approved. If the prospective successor is not approved, the process will end without transition.

Once the successor is approved, this outcome will be communicated internally and externally as necessary and appropriate. If the transition does not involve a change in Back-End Registry Operator, the successor must then request the change in sponsoring organization with IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority).

If there is a change in the entity providing Back-End Registry Operator services, the successor will have to pass pre-delegation
testing as defined in the Applicant Guidebook for new gTLDs. This is the case whether the Back–End provider is the Registry Operator or a contractor to the Registry Operator. Once the testing is successfully completed, the new registry operator must proceed to change the sponsoring organization with IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) root zone database. After the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) step has been completed, the successor registry operator will then carry out the migration of data and services, and will request changes to DNS (Domain Name System) and RDDS (WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym))) records with IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority).

The final steps in the transition process will be to communicate internally and externally as necessary and appropriate and for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to update its public and internal information about the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry.

2. Registry Transition Process with RFP

This process will be used primarily when a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry is in breach of its Registry Agreement (leading to termination) and does not identify a successor registry. This process will also be used if at the end of the registry agreement term, or by means of a court order by a legal authority with jurisdiction, the relevant Government or Public Authority withdraws its support to the registry of a geographic gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) and does not provide a proposed successor registry. A flowchart of this process is in Appendix 3.

This process is similar to a Registry Transition Process with proposed successor described above, except that it includes a Request for Proposals (RFP) subprocess. The purpose of the RFP is to identify and solicit applications from prospective, successor registries.
The RFP process will be launched following the risk assessment of the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), as it may produce findings that might be important to disclose in the RFP. The RFP will describe the necessary services to be provided by the successor registry. In addition, expected costs for evaluation services will be included in the RFP and will serve as the minimum acceptable economic proposal from an applicant.

If the registry is operating a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) that is a geographic name, as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will consult with the relevant Government or Public Authority for their input in the RFP. Further, if the Registry Agreement contains a provision that requires ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to consult with a specified community about a potential successor before a transition, it will be done at this stage in the process.

Once the RFP has been approved, it will be posted for 45 days, and applicants will have until the end of the posting period to provide a response.

The applicant proposing the highest payment to the original registry will then be checked for necessary support and will be evaluated as described in the Registry Transition process with proposed successor. This selection mechanism provides the maximum return for the original registry and minimizes unnecessary expenses for the non-winner applicants while still ensuring the winner is qualified.

If the applicant has the necessary support (or if no support is required) and passes the evaluation, the process will continue as described in the aforementioned process. If the applicant does not have the required support or does not pass the evaluation, the next highest proposal applicant will be considered and so on, until there is a successfully supported and evaluated applicant or there are no more proposals.
If there are no proposals received during the RFP process, or there are no qualified applicants, due to lack of appropriate support or inability to pass the evaluation, the TLD (Top Level Domain) sunset process will be invoked in order to close the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain). If a viable candidate is identified after a closed RFP process that did not identify a successor, that candidate might be considered based upon circumstances present at the time and that such a decision serves the public interest.

If there is a qualified successor registry identified through this process, any funds collected from this applicant less evaluation costs and outstanding fees due will go to the registry operator disposing of the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain).

3. Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Temporary Transition Process

This process will be used for new gTLDs primarily when two conditions are met: (1) the registry is in breach of its Registry Agreement and (2) a Critical Function is being performed below the Emergency Thresholds, as defined in the Registry Agreement, resulting in a situation of unacceptable risk as defined below. In such a case, operations can be transferred to an emergency provider of Back-End services until the registry operator can restore normal operations. This temporary transition could also be initiated at the request of the registry operator if they are aware of or anticipate an inability to adequately provide the Critical Functions.

Measurements to detect the Emergency Threshold for Critical Functions (except Data Escrow) will be drawn from the registry SLA (Service Level Agreement) monitoring system used by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as described in the Registry Agreement.

It is also worth noting that this transition process is intended to be a temporary measure to protect registrants and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) users. The temporary transition of Critical Functions will remain in effect until the underlying issues are resolved, or the
gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) is transitioned to another operator using one of the previously described Registry Transition processes. In order to allow this temporary transition, Registry Agreement for new gTLDs includes pre-authorization from the registry operator to changes in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) database for DNS (Domain Name System) and RDDS (WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym))) records, in case of emergency.

Once the registry operator is ready to resume operations and has remedied all issues that may have caused it to be in breach, it can initiate a **Registry Transition Process with proposed successor** in order to regain control of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) operations. This option will be available to the registry operator until the expiry of the cure period for the breach. The registry operator will identify itself as the proposed successor in that process.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will maintain, at least, two pre-selected Emergency Back-End Registry Operators (Emergency Operators) under contract. An Emergency-Operator RFP process will be issued every five years to renew the contracts and/or identify and select new Emergency Operators. Emergency Operators that are selected will be from geographically diverse regions in order to increase the reliability of the Emergency Operators as a whole; should there be a catastrophe in a region affecting one Emergency-Operator's ability to function, the other would still be ready to operate. The basic eligibility requirements for Emergency Operators are at least three years of experience operating DNS (Domain Name System) and one year of experience operating RDSS (e.g., WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym))) and EPP services.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will select Emergency Operators based on value; the best mix of service and price. Funding for use of the Emergency-Operator's services for each case will be drawn from the respective Continued Operations Instruments required for new gTLD (generic Top Level Domain).
registry operators as specified in Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement.

Emergency Operator applicants will be evaluated using similar processes for new gTLDs, including pre-delegation testing on the infrastructure to be used in an emergency. Infrastructure must be ready to operate during the evaluation. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may, from time to time, require testing the Emergency Operator capabilities and readiness to accept and act upon an emergency transition.

As soon as ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) selects the Emergency Operators, they will offer a lightweight Registry-Registrar Agreement to all registrars that will enable the Emergency Operators to perform SRS (Shared Registratry System) functions during a temporary transition process. Registrars will be encouraged to engage the Emergency Operators before any emergency happens so they are ready to operate (e.g., an agreement is in place, credentials for accessing the SRS (Shared Registratry System) are already distributed, operational testing with the Emergency Operators is done, etc.) should an emergency transition happen for a particular gTLD (generic Top Level Domain).

When an emergency occurs and Emergency Operator services are required, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will seek to engage one of the Emergency Operators. If the selected provider is not able to take the operation or if there is a conflict of interest, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will engage another provider. An active Emergency Operator will be eligible to apply to become the definitive successor registry or Back-End operator of the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) in the event there is a Registry Transition, according to the normal rules of the RFP. In order to have a balanced bidding process, an active Emergency Operator will provide operational informational to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) required to be included in an RFP for the operation of the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain).
There may be cases in which the current Back-End Registry Operator may serve as the Emergency Operator, that is, if:

- the registry operator requested to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) the emergency transition to the Back-End Registry Operator as the Emergency Operator;

- the current Back-End Registry Operator is operating the Critical Functions within the terms of the Service Levels defined in the Registry Agreement;

- the Back-End Registry Operator company is not related to or affiliated with the registry operator; and

- the Back-End Registry Operator accepts to operate the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) under better or equal terms than those agreed by the Emergency Operators.

Then ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), at its sole discretion, may offer to the Back-End Registry Operator to perform the registry functions for the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain). In such a case, the Back-End Registry Operator serving as Emergency Operator will be paid out of the proceeds from the Continued Operations Instrument.

Emergency Operators will have Service Level Requirements (SLR) for activation of each of the Critical Functions as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Function</th>
<th>Service Level Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS (Domain Name System) / DNSSEC (DNS Security Extensions)</td>
<td>4 hours upon request from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS</td>
<td>24 hours upon receipt of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS (Shared Registratry)</td>
<td>72 hours upon receipt of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System) (EPP)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Escrow</td>
<td>24 hours upon start of SRS (Shared Registratry System) operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SRS (Shared Registratry System) servers ready to accept requests from registrars.

Emergency Operators will maintain an archive of, at least, daily zone files for all gTLDs to allow the selected Emergency Operator to quickly resume DNS (Domain Name System) service in case of emergency. For the other Critical Functions, data will be obtained from the current registry and/or data escrow deposits.

Escrow Agents for new gTLDs will be required to agree to a requirement for release of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) data within 24 hours upon request, in case of emergency.

During emergency operation of Critical Functions for a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), an Emergency Operator will not bill SRS (Shared Registratry System) operations from registrars.

Typically, the Emergency Operator will not accept new domains, domain renewals, domain transfers, or domain name deletions from registrars. However, under certain exceptional cases the aforementioned operations will be accepted, e.g., under the Expedited Registry Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) Request, UDRP (Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy), or any other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) domain name dispute resolution procedures. Bulk domain transfers can be approved by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for domains sponsored by registrars that no longer can service them (e.g., registrar has been de-accredited). Emergency Operator will not expire registrations or auto-renew them; and will include in the RDDS (e.g., WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is";
not an acronym))) output a short explanation (approved by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) atop the legal disclaimer (if any) as described in section 1.1 of Specification 4 of the Registry Agreement of why the expiry date is in the past. The rest of the standard domain name, contact, and host (RFC (Request for Comments) 5730-34, 5910) SRS (Shared Registrar System) operations will be allowed. The Emergency Operator will work with all the accredited registrars that have domains under sponsorship in the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain).

A successor registry will be permitted to charge renewal or fractional renewals as of the effective date of the start of its operations. Successor registry will inherit the fees of the failed registry and will have to follow the process defined in the registry agreement in order to change them.

A flowchart of the process to be followed in case of emergency is in Appendix 4.

When transitioning from an Emergency Operator back to the previous registry operator or to a new registry operator, the Emergency Operator will collaborate and cooperate with the new operator in order to achieve an orderly transition with minimum impact to registrants and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) users.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will monitor and document emergency transition processes when/if they happen. Metrics will be developed including registry operator and EBERO (Emergency Back-End Registry Operator) performance in the five critical functions. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will note what worked well and what could be improved in order to propose modifications to this process.

- Appendix 1 | Prospective Registry Evaluation Matrix (/resources/registries/transition-processes/prospective-evaluation)
- Appendix 2-1 | Registry Transition Process with Proposed Successor
  (/resources/registries/transition-processes/proposed-successor)

- Appendix 2-2 | Registry Transition Process with Proposed Successor
  - Check Support (/resources/registries/transition-processes/proposed-
    successor-check-support)

- Appendix 2-3 | Registry Transition Process with Proposed Successor
  - Evaluate (/resources/registries/transition-processes/proposed-
    successor-evaluate)

- Appendix 2-4 | Registry Transition Process with Proposed Successor
  - Communicate (/resources/registries/transition-processes/proposed-
    successor-communicate)

- Appendix 3-1 | Registry Transition Process with Request for
  Proposals (/resources/registries/transition-processes/rfp)

- Appendix 3-2 | Registry Transition Process with Request for
  Proposals - Check Support (/resources/registries/transition-
  processes/rfp-check-support)

- Appendix 3-3 | Registry Transition Process with Request for
  Proposals - Evaluate (/resources/registries/transition-processes/rfp-
  evaluate)

- Appendix 3-4 | Registry Transition Process with Request for
  Proposals - RFP (/resources/registries/transition-processes/rfp2)

- Appendix 3-5 | Registry Transition Process with Request for
  Proposals - Communicate (/resources/registries/transition-
  processes/rfp-communicate)

- Appendix 4-1 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Temporary
  Transition Process (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-
  ttp)

- Appendix 4-2 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Transition
  Process - DNS (Domain Name System)
  (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-ttp-dns)
• **Appendix 4-3 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Transition Process - RDDS** (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-ttp-rdds)

• **Appendix 4-4 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Transition Process - SRS (Shared Registrar System)** (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-ttp-srs)

• **Appendix 4-5 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Transition Process - Data Escrow** (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-ttp-data-escrow)

• **Appendix 4-6 | Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Transition Process - Communicate** (/resources/registries/transition-processes/ebero-ttp-communicate)
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l

Application Downloaded On: 24 Dec 2014

String  hotel

Application ID: 1-1032-95136

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l

2. Address of the principal place of business
Contact Information Redacted

3. Phone number
Contact Information Redacted

4. Fax number
Contact Information Redacted

5. If applicable, website or URL
http://www.dothotel.info

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
Johannes Lenz Hawliczek

6(b) Title
Chief Executive Officer

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Katrin Ohlmer

7(b). Title
Chief Executive Officer

7(c). Address

7(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

7(e). Fax Number
Contact Information Redacted

7(f). Email Address
Contact Information Redacted

Proof of Legal Establishment

8(a). Legal form of the Applicant
Societe a responsabilite limitée (S.a.r.l.)

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).

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.
Not Applicable. / Not Applicable.

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Not Applicable.

9(c). If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.
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>Johannes Lenz-Hawliczek</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrin Ohlmer</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afilias PLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL Top-Level-Domain GmbH</td>
<td>Not Applicable</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.

hotel

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).
ing whether to issue specific regulations relating to particular products, or after the FDA, for whatever reason, has “decided,” through inaction, not to regulate particular products. Such a holding would contradict Congress’s stated intent of providing consumer protection from unsafe medical devices when it enacted the MDA. See 45 Fed.Reg. 18,663 (May 2, 1978).

CONCLUSION

As set forth above, the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs is reversed. We conclude that California’s Proposition 65 is not preempted by the MDA.

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

The COMMITTEE FOR IDAHO’S HIGH DESERT, INC., Plaintiff–Appellee,
v.
Jim YOST, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.; Ted Hoffman, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.; Quay Johns, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc., Defendants–Appellants.

The COMMITTEE FOR IDAHO’S HIGH DESERT, INC., Plaintiff–Appellant,
v.
Jim YOST, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.; Ted Hoffman, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.; Quay Johns, individually and dba Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc., Defendants–Appellees.
Nos. 95–35439, 95–35472.
United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.
Argued and Submitted March 6, 1996.
Decided Aug. 6, 1996.

Nonprofit environmental organization brought action against defendants who adopted organization’s name after organization inadvertently forfeited its corporate status, alleging trademark infringement and unfair competition under Lanham Act. Following bench trial, the United States District Court for the District of Idaho, Larry M. Boyle, United States Magistrate Judge, 881 F.Supp. 1457, enjoined defendants from using name. On cross-appeals, the Court of Appeals, Fletcher, Circuit Judge, held that: (1) organization’s name, “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert,” was not generic; (2) name acquired secondary meaning so as to be protected as trademark; and (3) individual defendants’ actions would be sufficient to render them liable under Lanham Act.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

1. Federal Courts ⇨ 853

    Factual findings are reviewed for clear error; reviewing court must accept finding unless it is left with definite and firm conviction that mistake has been committed.

2. Trade Regulation ⇨ 586

    Finding that plaintiff had organized and began conducting business as nonprofit environmental membership organization under name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” as early as late 1970s and had conducted such activity and business continuously until time of trademark infringement suit was supported by organization’s articles of incorporation and certificate of incorporation, detailed minutes of meetings of organization’s board of directors, copies of organization’s newsletters, and testimony concerning nature, purpose, activities, and membership of organization. Lanham Trademark Act, § 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. § 1125(a).

3. Federal Courts ⇨ 712

    Issue raised for first time in reply brief is waived.

4. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨ 115

    Determination of what constitutes unincorporated association, for purposes of rule
COMMITTEE v. YOST
Cite as 92 F.3d 814 (9th Cir. 1996)


5. Associations ⇔ 20(1)

Nonprofit environmental organization which had inadvertently forfeited corporate status by failing to file required annual report with state agency was "unincorporated association" that could bring federal trademark infringement and unfair competition action against defendants who had adopted organization's name, regardless of organization's capacity to sue under state law. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, § 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. § 1125(a); Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 17(b)(1), 28 U.S.C.A.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

6. Trade Regulation ⇔ 377

Third party's prior use of trademark is not defense in infringement action.

7. Trade Regulation ⇔ 377

Fact that some individuals may have used name "Committee for Idaho's High Desert" prior to nonprofit environmental organization was no defense in trademark infringement action against defendants who had adopted name upon organization's inadvertent forfeiture of corporate status, given organization's continuous and exclusive use of name for at least 12 years before defendants' use. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, § 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. § 1125(a).

8. Trade Regulation ⇔ 704, 726

Genericness of trade name is question of fact and thus subject to clear error review.

9. Trade Regulation ⇔ 23


10. Trade Regulation ⇔ 23

"Generic term" is one that refers to genus of which particular product is species.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

11. Trade Regulation ⇔ 33, 726

District court's implicit determination that environmental organization's tradename "Committee for Idaho's High Desert" was not generic was not clearly erroneous where court identified relevant public and environmentally related services and goods provided by organization in connection with its tradename. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, § 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. § 1125(a).

12. Trade Regulation ⇔ 726

Trial court's finding that product or device has acquired secondary meaning so as to be protected as trademark may be reversed only upon showing of clear error.

13. Trade Regulation ⇔ 10, 11

Factors considered in determining whether product or device has acquired secondary meaning so as to be protected as trademark include whether actual purchasers of product bearing claimed trademark associate trademark with producer, degree and manner of advertising under claimed trademark, length and manner of use of claimed trademark, and whether use of claimed trademark has been exclusive.

14. Trade Regulation ⇔ 33

Nonprofit environmental organization's name "Committee for Idaho's High Desert" acquired secondary meaning so as to be protected as trademark, given that public officials, conservationist groups, and individuals associated name with organization, that organization had conducted significant amount of advertising of its name and business activities through media and public presentations, that organization had continuously and exclusively used name for at least 12 years before defendants' use, and that defendants knowingly and deliberately adopted and used name.
15. Federal Courts \(\Rightarrow 776\)

Grant of summary judgment is reviewed de novo.

16. Trade Regulation \(\Rightarrow 682\)

Plaintiff's time spent in litigation over trademark infringement is not compensable as damages for infringement.

17. Trade Regulation \(\Rightarrow 350.1\)

Individuals' acts of intentionally incorporating with environmental organization's name to cause confusion and thus obtain advantage in their small delisting litigation and individual's act of testifying at hearing on proposed United States Air Force training range using name to foster credibility as "environmentalist" would be sufficient to render individuals liable under Lanham Act for using in commerce, in connection with services, name which is likely to confuse. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, § 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. § 1125(a).

18. Corporations \(\Rightarrow 306\)

Corporate officer or director is, in general, personally liable for all torts which he authorizes or directs or in which he participates, notwithstanding that he acted as agent of corporation and not on his own behalf.

19. Federal Courts \(\Rightarrow 830\)


20. Federal Civil Procedure \(\Rightarrow 2742.5\)


See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

1. This case appears to involve an instance of "greenscanning", a "practice of giving environmentally friendly names to groups whose agen-

21. Trade Regulation \(\Rightarrow 729\)

Generally, trademark case is "exceptional," for purposes of award of attorney fees, when infringement is malicious, fraudulent, deliberate or willful. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, §§ 35(a), 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 1117(a), 1125(a).

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

22. Trade Regulation \(\Rightarrow 729\)

Prevailing environmental organization was entitled to reasonable attorney fees on appeal of its trademark infringement case against defendants who had adopted organization's name after organization inadvertently forfeited its corporate status where defendants intentionally adopted and used name in order to cause confusion in small delisting litigation and to otherwise obstruct organization's pursuit of its environmental agenda. Lanham Trade-Mark Act, §§ 35(a), 43(a), 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 1117(a), 1125(a).


Gary D. Babbitt, Hawley, Troxell, Ennis & Hawley, Boise, Idaho, for the defendants-appellants-appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Idaho Larry M. Boyle, Magistrate Judge, Presiding; Nos. CV-94-00089-LMB, CV-94-00089-LMB.

Before: FLETCHER, NOONAN, and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

FLETCHER, Circuit Judge:

James Yost, Ted Hoffman, Quey Johns, and their corporation Committee for Idaho's High Desert, Inc. (hereinafter "appellants") appeal from the district court's decision, published at 881 F.Supp. 1457, finding that they violated § 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051-1128, by infringing appellee's protected trademark "Committee for Idaho's High Desert" and enjoining them from using that name.¹ The Committee for Idaho's das have little to do with the welfare of the environment'. Jane Fritsch, "Friend or Foe?
COMMITTEE v. YOST
Cite as 92 F.3d 814 (9th Cir. 1996)

High Desert, Inc. (CIHD, pronounced “kid”) cross-appeals from the district court’s grant of summary judgment dismissing its damages claim and its claims against the individual appellants, as well as from the court’s order denying an extension of time in which to file a motion for attorney’s fees. We have jurisdiction over this timely appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

CIHD is a non-profit environmental education and advocacy organization, concerned with issues of grazing, range-land reform, water use, recreation, endangered species, and resource use affecting the desert of southwest Idaho and parts of Nevada, Oregon, and Utah. CIHD’s position on these issues is “to encourage limited use of public lands with an emphasis on conservation and preservation of the natural state of the desert ecosystem”. 881 F.Supp. at 1463.

CIHD was organized in the late 1970s by a number of individuals. In 1981, the organization incorporated under Idaho law. Throughout its history, the organization has operated very informally, “due to the voluntary, changing, and diverse nature of its membership”. Id. at 1464. In 1985, CIHD failed to file a required annual report with the Idaho secretary of state and forfeited its corporate charter. The organization’s leaders and members were unaware of this forfeiture and continued to operate as if CIHD were a corporation in good standing.

In 1992, CIHD and the Idaho Conservation League sued the federal government to have the Bruneau snail, which lives in the Idaho desert, listed as an endangered species; as a result of the suit, the snail was listed in January 1993. A coalition of agriculture and cattle organizations called the Bruneau Valley Coalition then sued to have the snail de-listed. See Idaho Farm Bureau Federation v. Babbitt, 889 F.Supp. 739 (D.Idaho 1993), vacated and remanded, 58 F.3d 1392 (9th Cir.1995). James Yost was, at the time, the director of public affairs at the Idaho Farm Bureau; Ted Hoffman was president of the Owyhee Cattlemen’s Association; and Quey Johns was president of the Owyhee Farm Bureau. All three organizations, which were members of the Bruneau Valley Coalition, had opposed CIHD’s positions on the use of public lands. The individual appellants’ viewpoints on these issues are “virtually antithetical” to those of CIHD. 881 F.Supp. at 1466. In 1993, Hoffman, in a letter to the editor, accused CIHD’s long-time chairman, Randy Morris, of using “enviro-nazi tactics” and “environmentalist flim-flam”. Id.

After CIHD and others moved in September 1993 to intervene in the de-listing suit in order to defend the listing, Yost had a colleague check with the Idaho secretary of state to determine whether the prospective intervenors were corporations in good standing. Within 24 hours of learning that CIHD had forfeited its charter in 1985, the individual appellants formed a new Idaho corporation under the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.” (hereinafter “appellant corporation”). The individual appellants had been considering forming an organization to advance their views on environmental issues for several years and had discussed possible names, but took no action until they learned of CIHD’s corporate forfeiture and did not seriously consider using the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” until they learned of the forfeited charter. The appellant corporation’s articles of incorporation were modeled after CIHD’s, and the statement of purposes was copied virtually verbatim from CIHD’s, with “a few minor, subtle changes where necessary to represent what are distinct differences between [the appellants’] and [CIHD’s] environmental philosophies”. Id. at 1467. The appellant corporation was capitalized with only $120. Yost, Hoffman, and Johns are the appellant corporation’s officers, directors, and only members, and the appellant corporation’s articles listed its principal place of business as the Boise office of the Idaho Farm Bureau.

2. This recitation of the facts is drawn primarily from the district court’s findings of fact, virtually all of which go unchallenged by the appellants.
CIHD learned of its earlier inadvertent forfeiture when the Bruneau Valley Coalition opposed CIHD’s intervention in the de-listing suit on the basis of incapacity. When CIHD promptly sought to be reinstated, however, the secretary of state denied reinstatement because the appellant corporation was already registered under the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert”.

In January 1994, Hoffman testified at a public hearing held by the U.S. Air Force on a proposal for a training range on public land in Idaho. “Hoffman stated that he was president of the Committee for Idaho’s High Desert which was supportive of the proposal, a position he knew to be diametrically and publicly opposed by [CIHD].” 881 F.Supp. at 1467. At trial, Hoffman “acknowledged that he made this statement to add to his credibility as an environmentalist to support the training range proposal”. Id.

**PROCEEDINGS BELOW**

On March 1, 1994, CIHD filed a complaint against Yost, Hoffman, Johns, and their corporation, alleging *inter alia* violations of federal and state trademark and unfair competition law. After the filing of an amended complaint, the parties consented to have the case assigned to a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

After appellants moved for summary judgment, the district court dismissed CIHD’s state-law claims, finding that as a forfeited corporation it could bring those claims only through its statutory trustees. The court refused to dismiss CIHD’s federal claims, ruling that any corporate disability under state law did not preclude CIHD from suing in federal court to vindicate rights under federal trademark and unfair competition laws. The court also found that CIHD had not created a genuine issue of material fact as to the dollar amount of any damages sustained, so it dismissed CIHD’s damage claims and struck CIHD’s request for a jury trial. The court then ruled that since it had dismissed all damage claims, and since the individual appellants, as officers of the appellant corporation, would be bound under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b) by an injunction against the corporation, the individual appellants were entitled to summary judgment and to dismissal of the action as against them.

In January 1995, a four-day bench trial was held. The district court made findings as to the nature of CIHD’s goods and services, its continuous and exclusive use of its tradename in connection with those goods and services from at least 1980 until the appellant corporation’s incorporation in 1993, and the association by relevant “consumers” of the name with appellee CIHD. The court found that the relevant “consumers” of the services of CIHD and appellant corporation were similar, that some of those consumers had actually been confused by appellants’ use of the name, and that the appellants “knowingly, intentionally and deliberately adopted and used [the CIHD name] in order to cause confusion, obstruct [CIHD’s] pursuit of its environmental agenda, and thereby to obtain an advantage in the snail de-listing litigation by preventing [CIHD’s] intervention”. 881 F.Supp. at 1468.

The district court then concluded that CIHD had capacity to bring its suit as an unincorporated association under Rule 17(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and that § 43(a) of the Lanham Act allowed suits for infringement of an unregistered trademark or tradename. After setting forth the relevant standards for trademark and tradename protection, the court ruled that the tradename “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” was neither merely geographically descriptive nor arbitrary. It concluded instead that the name was suggestive, and therefore inherently distinctive and entitled to protection without a showing of secondary meaning. Recognizing, however, the difficulty in drawing the line between suggestive and descriptive marks, the court went on to conclude that, even if the name was only descriptive, CIHD had demonstrated that the name had acquired secondary meaning. Finally, the court concluded that the evidence clearly established a likelihood of confusion as a result of appellants’ use of CIHD’s name and that appellants had thus infringed CIHD’s tradename. Therefore, the court enjoined appellant corporation, and “its officers, directors, agents, attorneys, em-
DISCUSSION

No. 95-35439

1. Legal Nature of CIHD

[1] Appellants argue that the district court erred in finding that CIHD was an “unincorporated and non-profit association”. Factual findings are reviewed for clear error, so a reviewing court must accept a finding unless it “is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 293, 395, 68 S.Ct. 525, 542, 92 L.Ed. 746 (1948). The district court did not make the finding appellants seek to challenge. It found only that CIHD “is a non-profit environmentalist membership organization” and that it has operated “as a non-profit environmental membership organization under the name ‘Committee for Idaho’s High Desert’ ” since its organization in the late 1970s. 881 F.Supp. at 1463. It also found that CIHD incorporated in 1981, forfeited its corporate charter in 1985 for failure to file an annual report, and thereafter “operated under the mistaken assumption that it was a corporation in good standing” until it first learned of its forfeiture when the appellants attempted to prevent CIHD’s intervention in the de-listing lawsuit. Id. at 1464. Those findings are not clearly erroneous.

[2] Appellants also challenge the finding that CIHD “organized and began conducting business as a non-profit environmental membership organization under the name ‘Committee for Idaho’s High Desert’ as early as the late 1970s ... and has conducted such activity and business continuously until the time of trial.” Id. at 1463. This finding is also not clearly erroneous. The record contains a copy of CIHD’s Articles of Incorporation dated July 1981, as well as a certificate of incorporation dated July 15, 1981. The record also contains copies of minutes of meetings of CIHD’s board of directors from September 1981 to June 1994, and these minutes contain extensive detail as to the organization’s activities during those years. Copies of CIHD newsletters published between 1982 and 1994 were admitted into evidence. In addition, Randy Morris, long-time chairman of CIHD, and Pamela Marcum, a past officer and active member of CIHD, both testified about the nature of the organization, its operations, purposes, activities, and membership.

[3-5] In challenging this finding, the appellants repeatedly attack the lack of evidentiary support for the founding or operation of an “unincorporated association”. The district court, however, made no factual finding that CIHD was an “unincorporated association”. It found only that CIHD was, at all times since its founding, “a non-profit environmentalist membership organization”. As noted, this finding was not clearly erroneous. The court did then conclude as a matter of law that CIHD was an “unincorporated association” with the capacity to sue in its common name under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). 881 F.Supp. at 1469. If appellants’ brief can be read to challenge this conclusion of law,2 the challenge fails. Rule 17(b)(1) allows an “unincorporated association” to sue in federal court, regardless of its capacity to sue under the law of the state in which the court sits, when the association is suing “for the purpose of enforcing ... a substantive right existing under the ... laws of the United States”. Fed. R.Civ.P. 17(b)(1). See, e.g., Sierra Association for Environment v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 744 F.2d 661, 662 (9th Cir.1984) (“[B]ecause this action arises under federal law, [plaintiff] had capacity to sue as an unincorporated association, Fed. R.Civ.P. 17(b)(1), and any incapacity under California law is accordingly irrelevant.”).

Appellants’ challenge to the district court’s nonexistent “finding” that CIHD was an “unincorporated and non-profit association” might, however, be read to state a challenge to the district court’s conclusion that CIHD could sue under Rule 17(b) as an unincorporated association.
For purposes of Rule 17(b)(1), the determination of what constitutes an "unincorporated association" is a question of federal law. Associated Students of the University of California at Riverside v. Kleindienst, 60 F.R.D. 65, 67 (C.D.Cal.1973) (citing cases). Courts have generally defined an "unincorporated association" as "a voluntary group of persons, without a charter, formed by mutual consent for the purpose of promoting a common objective". Local 4076, United Steelworkers v. United Steelworkers, 327 F.Supp. 1400, 1403 (W.D.Pa.1971). CIHD, in the period after the forfeiture of its corporate charter, clearly meets this definition.

Appellants’ contention that the district court somehow erred in allowing Morris and Marcum to testify “as if they were officers of an association” is unavailing. Those witnesses testified that they believed at all times, until appellants moved to bar CIHD’s intervention in the snail litigation, that CIHD was a corporation. After learning of the forfeiture and being unable to reinstate the corporation, the organization continued to act as what can only be described as an unincorporated association under the definition noted above. The district court did not err in allowing Morris and Marcum to testify.

II. First Use and Ownership

Appellants next argue that CIHD never established that it was the first user of the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert”, pointing to Randy Morris’ testimony at trial that some people used the name as early as 1978, three years before CIHD was incorporated; the testimony suggests that Bruce Boccard, one of CIHD’s incorporators and initial directors, was using the name in the pre-incorporation period. Appellants argue that CIHD produced no evidence of CIHD’s acquisition of the trademark from the first user.

The lack of evidence as to CIHD’s acquisition of the trademark from the first user is irrelevant. Appellants do not challenge the district court’s finding that CIHD’s “continuous use” of the name in connection with its business “has been exclusive since at least 1980, until [appellants] incorporated under that name on September 14, 1983”. 881 F.Supp. at 1466 (emphasis added). As a practical matter, CIHD appears to be the direct and immediate successor of any individuals who used the name between 1978 and 1981. It also seems likely that anyone who used the name before CIHD did has long since legally abandoned the name, since CIHD’s use was exclusive between 1980 and 1993. See 15 U.S.C. § 1127 (“A mark shall be deemed to be ‘abandoned’ ... [w]hen its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume such use.... Nonuse for 3 consecutive years shall be prima facie evidence of abandonment.”); J. Thomas McCarthy, McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition § 17.03 (3d ed.) (hereinafter McCarthy).

[6, 7] Most importantly, however, a third party’s prior use of a trademark is not a defense in an infringement action. A number of cases from the 1920s so hold, including Ward Baking Co. v. Potter-Wrightington, Inc., in which the court wrote that “even if, for some purposes and in some territory, [a third party] may have a right in the trademark superior to that of the plaintiff, the defendant is not thereby exonerated from responsibility for an attempt to appropriate to itself a good will created by the plaintiff during a long course of business.” 298 F. 398, 402 (1st Cir.1924). See also Del Monte Special Food Co. v. California Packing Corp., 34 F.2d 774, 777 (9th Cir.1929) (holding in unfair competition case that “whatever may be the respective rights of the appellee and ... other users of the name ‘Del Monte,’ such use does not justify the appellant in its more recent use of appellee’s well-known mark upon a new and different product recently produced by it”). This rule is nothing more than the application to the field of trademarks of the familiar real-property doctrine that “[p]ossession is nine-tents of the law but the true owner”. McCarthy, § 31.39[2]. Modern trial courts have adhered to this rule—see Specialty Measurements, Inc. v. Measurement Systems, Inc., 763 F.Supp. 91, 95 (D.N.J.1991); Bambu Sales, Inc. v. Sultana Crackers, Inc., 883 F.Supp. 899, 909–10 (E.D.N.Y.1993); Marshak v. Sheppard, 666 F.Supp. 500, 599 (S.D.N.Y. 1987); Eagle Snacks, Inc. v. Nabisco
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Brands, Inc., 625 F.Supp. 571, 578–79
(D.N.J.1985)—and a prominent commentator in the field supports it. McCarthy,
§ 31.39[4] ("[A third-party's rights] should not be allowed as a defense in any trademark
case. So long as plaintiff proves rights superior to defendant, that is enough. Defendant
is no less an infringer because it is brought to account by a plaintiff whose rights may or
may not be superior to the whole world. The plaintiff's speculative dispute with a third
party does not concern the defendant."). In accordance with this rule, the question of
whether some individuals used the name “Committee for Idaho's High Desert” prior
to CIHD is no defense for appellants given CIHD's continuous and exclusive use of the
name for at least 12 years before appellants' use, and the trial court did not err in failing
to find that CIHD either was the first user of the name or had acquired ownership from
some other first user.

III. Genericsness

[8] Genericsness is a question of fact, In
fr Northland Aluminum Products, Inc., 777
F.2d 1556, 1559 (Fed.Cir.1985), and therefore
subject to clear-error review, In re Merrill
Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., 828
F.2d 1567, 1569 (Fed.Cir.1987). See also
A.J. Canfield Co. v. Honickman, 808 F.2d
291, 307 n. 24 (8d Cir.1986).

The district court made no express find-
ings of fact or conclusions of law as to the
genericsness of the tradename CIHD. Its
finding that the name is not generic is in-
stead implicit in its finding that the phrase
“Idaho high desert” is geographically des-
criptive, in its finding that relevant con-
sumers associate the name “Committee for Ida-
ho's High Desert” with the appelee and not
merely with its goods and services, in its
conclusion that the name taken as a whole is
not primarily geographically descriptive, and
in its conclusions that the name is a sugges-
tive one or, in the alternative, a descriptive
one that has acquired secondary meaning.

[9] Appellants argue that the phrase
“Idaho's high desert” and the word “commit-
tee” are both generic. The district court was
clearly correct in evaluating the genericsness
of the name as a whole, rather than looking
to its constituent parts individually. See,
e.g., California Cooler, Inc. v. Loretto Win-
ery, Ltd., 774 F.2d 1451, 1455 (9th Cir.1985)
([‘Plaintiff’s] mark is a composite term, and
its validity is not judged by an examination of
its parts. Rather, the validity of a trade-
mark is to be determined by viewing the
trademark as a whole."); Bank of Texas v.
Commerce Southwest, Inc., 741 F.2d 785, 787
(5th Cir.1984) (finding name “Bank of Tex-
as”, which “combines the generic term ‘bank’
with the geographical term ‘Texas’”, to be
descriptive rather than generic). The rele-
vant question therefore is whether the entire
name “Committee for Idaho's High Desert”
is generic.

[10] “A generic term is one that refers to
the genus of which the particular product is a
species.” Park 'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park
658, 661, 83 L.Ed.2d 582 (1985). The Lan-
ham Act sets out the test for genericsness:
“The primary significance of the . . . mark to
the relevant public . . . shall be the test for
determining whether the . . . mark has be-
come the generic name of goods or services
on or in connection with which it has been
Circuit has interpreted this statement as co-
difying “the time-honored test for generics-
ness articulated by Judge Learned Hand . . . :
“What do the buyers understand by the
word for whose use the parties are contending?”’. Magic Wand, Inc. v. RDB, Inc., 940
F.2d 638, 640 (Fed.Cir.1991).

[11] By these standards, the district
court’s determination that the name “Com-
mittee for Idaho's High Desert” is not gener-
ic is not clearly erroneous. The district
court identified the relevant public: CIHD's
“members and potential members, public of-
icials and agencies involved in making policy
decisions on [public] lands, conservationist
groups and individuals, and other members
of the interested public”. 881 F.Supp. at 1465.
It also identified the services and
goods provided by CIHD, in connection with
which it has used its tradename. These ser-
sives include primarily dissemination of in-
formation on environmental issues through a
variety of channels, advocacy of a conserva-
tionist agenda on its members’ behalf, and education of the public about the desert, id.; the goods include primarily newsletters, bandanas, t-shirts, and bumper stickers, id. The district court’s implicit finding that the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” is not the generic name for these goods and services, or for their producer, is not clearly erroneous. It is not at all “difficult to imagine another term of reasonable conciseness and clarity by which the public [could] refer[ ] to these goods and services and their producer. Blinded Veterans Association v. Blinded American Veterans Foundation, 872 F.2d 1035, 1041 (D.C.Cir.1989). The name for the genus to which these particular services belong would probably be “environmental education and advocacy,” and the generic names for the goods are those actually used by the court to describe them (“newsletter”, “bandana”, “t-shirt”, “bumper sticker”). The name for a supplier of these services and goods might well be “environmental advocacy organization”. The district court’s implicit finding that the tradename “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” is not generic is not clearly erroneous.

IV. Secondary Meaning

[12, 13] A trial court’s finding of secondary meaning may be reversed only upon a showing of clear error. Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc., 778 F.2d 1352, 1355 (9th Cir.1985) (en banc). “Factors considered in determining whether a secondary meaning has been achieved include: (1) whether actual purchase[r]s of the product bearing the claimed trademark associate the trademark with the producer, (2) the degree and manner of advertising under the claimed trademark, (3) the length and manner of use of the claimed trademark, and (4) whether use of the claimed trademark has been exclusive.” Id. at 1358 quoting Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp., 765 F.2d 1001, 1015 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 1059, 106 S.Ct. 802, 88 L.Ed.2d 778 (1986).

[14] The district court clearly identified “the relevant ‘consumer’ group” as CIHD’s “members and potential members, public officials and agencies involved in making policy decisions on [the] lands [in question], conservationist groups and individuals, and other members of the interested public”. 881 F.Supp. at 1465. The court’s finding that this group associates the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” with appellee CIHD, and not merely with its goods and services, is not clearly erroneous. A reporter on environmental issues, a former state senator and environmentalist, a political science professor specializing in environmental politics, and a fifteen-year Bureau of Land Management employee all testified as to their association of the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” with appellee CIHD.

The district court found that CIHD “has conducted a significant amount of advertising of its name and business activities through public television, radio, newsletters, public hearings, and various meetings, lectures, hikes, school presentations and slide shows”. 881 F.Supp. at 1465–66. While appellants appear to be correct in stating that the district court had no evidence of advertising budgets or expenses, appellants’ assertion that “[e]vidence of advertising was limited to one conference in 1985 and one public to contract [sic]” is incorrect. While the type of “advertising” identified by the district court would be unusual in a trademark dispute involving competing for-profit businesses, it is not inappropriate in a dispute between two non-profit advocacy groups, and the evidence in the record amply demonstrates that the finding of “significant” advertising is not clearly erroneous.

The trial court’s findings on the length, manner, and exclusivity of CIHD’s use of the trademark are also not clearly erroneous.

Appellants are correct that no survey evidence was before the district court and that this court has noted that “[a]n expert survey of purchasers can provide the most persuasive evidence of secondary meaning”. Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp., 888 F.2d 609, 615 (9th Cir.1989). It is clear from this very statement, however, that survey evidence is only one of the most persuasive ways to prove secondary meaning, and not a requirement for such proof.

Finally, the lower court’s finding that the appellants “knowingly, intentionally and deliberately adopted and used” the CIHD name offers strong support for the finding of sec-
ondary meaning. “Proof of exact copying, without any opposing proof, can be sufficient to establish a secondary meaning.” *Transago*, 768 F.2d at 1016.

The district court’s finding that the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert” had acquired secondary meaning is thus not clearly erroneous.

No. 95–35472 (CIHD’s Cross Appeal)

I. Summary Judgment


A. Damages

The court granted summary judgment to appellants on CIHD’s claims for monetary recovery, ruling that CIHD had not established any genuine issue of material fact as to monetary damage.

[16] The Lanham Act allows a plaintiff who establishes a violation of § 43(a) of that act “to recover (1) defendant’s profits, (2) any damages sustained by the plaintiff, and (3) the costs of the action”. 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a). In opposing appellants’ motion for summary judgment, CIHD offered no evidence to dispute appellants’ claim that they had earned no profits. As to damages, CIHD conceded that it was not seeking “lost revenues from declining membership or contributions that [might] have been made to CIHD”. The only evidence of damages pointed to by CIHD in opposition to summary judgment was evidence of “the amount of hours that representatives of [CIHD] have had to spend on this lawsuit, valued at some reasonable hourly rate”. CIHD’s attorney explained that to prove damages, his intention was “to put on each of these guys to say I spent 20, 50, or whatever hours on this case, here’s what I did, I met with the lawyers, I had to locate documents, I had to do this, that, and the other” (emphasis added). It is therefore clear that the amounts CIHD was alleging as damages were simply costs of litigation. No authority suggests that a plaintiff’s time spent in litigation over trademark infringement is compensable as damages for the infringement. The district court was therefore correct in granting summary judgment to the appellants’ on CIHD’s claim for damages.

B. Dismissal of Individual Appellants

[17] Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act imposes liability on “[a]ny person who, on or in connection with any goods or services . . . uses in commerce any . . . name . . . which . . . is likely to cause confusion”. 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). The district court found after trial that Yost, Hoffman and Johns “knowingly, intentionally and deliberately adopted and used [appellee’s] name . . . in order to cause confusion, obstruct [appellee’s] pursuit of its environmental agenda, and thereby to obtain an advantage in the snail de-listing litigation by preventing [appellee’s] intervention therein”. 881 F.Supp. at 1468. The acts that the individual appellants performed included the formation of the appellant corporation under the name “Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc.”, id. at 1464, 1466, and Hoffman’s testimony—under the title of president of CIHD, with the intent “to add to his credibility as an environmentalist”—at a U.S. Air Force hearing in favor of an air force training range in southern Idaho, id. at 1467. Sufficient evidence of these acts would have been available at the summary judgment stage to create genuine issues of fact, and these acts would have been sufficient to render the individual appellants liable under § 43(a) for using in commerce, in connection with services, a name which is likely to confuse.

[18] Moreover, “[a] corporate officer or director is, in general, personally liable for all torts which he authorizes or directs or in which he participates, notwithstanding that he acted as an agent of the corporation and not on his own behalf”. *Transago, Inc.*, 768 F.2d at 1021 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). While the particular act of unfair competition involved in that stage of *Transago* was a conspiracy to pass off goods, the Fourth Circuit has recognized the applicability of the principle to trademark infringement generally. *Polo Fashions, Inc. v. Craftex, Inc.*, 816 F.2d 145, 149 (4th Cir.1987) (“A corporate official may be held personally
liable for tortious conduct committed by him, though committed primarily for the benefit of the corporation. This is true in trademark infringement and unfair trade practices cases.”) (citing Transgo). See also Donoso, Inc. v. Casper Corp., 587 F.2d 602, 606 (3d Cir.1978) (corporate president who authorized and approved corporation’s act of unfair competition liable under § 43(a); a corporate officer who knowingly and substantially participates in corporation’s act of infringement is personally liable); Electronic Laboratory Supply Co. v. Cullen, 977 F.2d 798, 807–808 (3d Cir.1992).

The district court was correct that an injunction against appellant corporation would, under Rule 65, bind the individual appellants as corporate officers. It nonetheless erred in dismissing the individual appellants even though it correctly dismissed CIHD’s damages claims. If the individual appellants were to be found liable for their acts under § 43(a), CIHD would be entitled, under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), to recover “(1) defendant’s profits, (2) any damages sustained by the plaintiff, and (3) the costs of the action”, and, “in exceptional cases . . . reasonable attorney fees”. Even though CIHD failed to create a genuine issue of material fact as to the individual appellant’s profits or CIHD’s actual damages, the individuals could still be liable for the costs of the action and any attorney’s fees that might be awarded. Therefore, the district court should not have dismissed CIHD’s claims against the individual appellants.

II. Time For Filing Motion for Attorney’s Fees

CIHD challenges the district court’s denial of its motion to extend the time for the filing of a motion for attorney’s fees. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2)(A) and (B), as amended effective December 1, 1993, require a claim for attorney’s fees to be made by motion “filed and served no later than 14 days after entry of judgment”; a court can by order provide a different deadline. Although CIHD moved the court for an extension of time pursuant to Rule 54(d) itself, the district court noted that CIHD appeared to be seeking a retroactive extension of time, since the 14-day deadline had already expired. The court properly treated the motion as one under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) to allow filing after the expiration of the deadline because the failure to timely file was the result of excusable neglect. Because Rule 6(b) commits the question to the court’s discretion, we review a decision under Rule 6(b) for abuse of discretion. Kyle v. Campbell Soup Co., 28 F.3d 928, 930 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, — U.S. —, 115 S.Ct. 185, 130 L.Ed.2d 119 (1994).

Judgment below was rendered on April 7, 1995 and entered on April 10, 1995. CIHD’s counsel filed a petition seeking an award of attorney’s fees on April 28, 1995. On May 9, 1995, CIHD filed a motion to extend the time for the filing of its petition. In the affidavit in support of that motion, Laird Lucas, one of CIHD’s attorneys, stated that the motion was filed late because he and his co-counsel had been unaware of the relevant changes in the federal and local rules.

The district court denied appellee’s motion. The court ruled that appellee was “requesting relief based solely on counsel’s unfamiliarity with the amended Local and Federal Rules” and held that this did not constitute excusable neglect. The court quoted from the Supreme Court opinion in Pioneer Investment Services Co. v. Brunswick Associates Limited Partnership, 507 U.S. 380, 113 S.Ct. 1459, 123 L.Ed.2d 74 (1993), which stated that “inadvertence, ignorance of the rules, or mistakes construing the rules do not usually constitute ‘excusable neglect’”. Id. at 392, 113 S.Ct. at 1496. The district court noted that “[i]f compelling circumstances had been presented such as illness, injury or death of counsel, or members of his family, or fire, flood, vandalism or destruction of counsel’s law office or word processing equipment, the Court would be more inclined to seriously consider the motion for an extension of time”.

On May 23, 1995, CIHD filed a motion to reconsider with an accompanying affidavit by Lucas. Lucas declared that he had undergone outpatient surgery on April 20, 1995 and was confined to bed rest through April 22, 1995. He also declared that he was unable to devote any substantial time to preparing the fee application from April 13, 1995 to April 16, 1995 because his wife’s illness with flu and strep throat required him to care for his two children during that period.
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The court denied the motion, finding that "the sole reason for Plaintiff's failure to timely file the Petition was unfamiliarity with the Local Rules in effect at that time". The court also noted that CIHD "was also represented by another capable and competent attorney who was lead trial counsel and presumably available to assist during the time in question".

CIHD argues, essentially, that the court abused its discretion by not applying the proper legal standard for "excusable neglect", which it argues is set forth in Pioneer, where the Court concluded that the question "is at bottom an equitable one, taking account of all relevant circumstances surrounding the party's omission. These include ... the danger of prejudice to the [other party], the length of delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings, the reason for the delay, including whether it was within the reasonable control of the movant, and whether the movant acted in good faith." 507 U.S. at 395, 113 S.Ct. at 1498.

[20] The district court did not abuse its discretion in holding that CIHD's counsel's ignorance of the amended procedural requirements for the filing of a request for attorney's fees was not excusable neglect. Although the court did not discuss the factors set forth in Pioneer, it did follow this court's decision in Kyle. In that case, the court interpreted Pioneer as not changing "the general rule that a mistake of law does not constitute excusable neglect". 28 F.3d at 982. The court held that in the absence of "a persuasive justification for ... misconstruction of nonambiguous rules" there was "no basis for deviating from the general rule". Id. at 931–32. The court in Kyle therefore reversed, as an abuse of discretion, a district court's decision to enlarge time for filing a

4. While Pioneer involved Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b), the Court's analysis was based on the plain meaning of the phrase "excusable neglect" and drew on its use in other procedural contexts, including Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b) and Fed.R.Crim.P. 45(b). This court has held that the Court's analysis of "excusable neglect" in Pioneer applies to the use of that phrase in Fed.R.App.P. 4(a)(5). Reynolds v. Wagner, 55 F.3d 1426, 1429 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, --- U.S. ---, 116 S.Ct. 339, 133 L.Ed.2d 237 (1995). The same decision suggests that the analysis applies to Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b) as well.

5. The Advisory Committee Notes to the 1993 Amendments to Rule 54, which instituted the 14-day filing deadline, explain that "[a] new period for filing will automatically begin if a new judgment is entered following a reversal or remand by the appellate court ...". Because we today reverse the district court's dismissal of the individual appellants, further proceedings below may lead to the entry of a new judgment that will begin a new period for filing.

III. Attorney Fees on Appeal

[21, 22] CIHD seeks an award of attorney's fees on appeal. Section 35(a) of the Lanham Act provides that a court "in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party" when a violation of § 43(a) has been established. 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a). "While the term 'exceptional' is not defined in the statute, generally a trademark case is exceptional for purposes of an award of attorneys' fees when the infringement is malicious, fraudulent, deliberate or willful." Lindy Pen Co. v. Bic Pen Corp., 982 F.2d 1400, 1408 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 510 U.S. 815, 114 S.Ct. 64, 126 L.Ed.2d 34 (1993). Because the district court found that appellants "knowingly, intentionally and deliberately adopted and used [the CIHD name] in order to cause confusion [and] obstruct [CIHD's] pursuit of its environmental agenda", this case falls within that class of exceptional cases in which courts may award attorney's fees pursuant to § 1117(a). CIHD is therefore entitled to reasonable attorney's fees on appeal.

CONCLUSION

We affirm the district court's findings and conclusions with respect to appellants' in-
fringement of CIHD’s tradename, as well as its dismissal of CIHD’s damages claims and
its denial of CIHD’s motion for an extension of time in which to file a motion for attorney’s fees. However, we reverse the district
court’s dismissal of CIHD’s complaint as
against the individual appellants and remand
the case for further proceedings.

Plaintiff–Appellee, The Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc., in No. 95–35439, and
Plaintiff–Appellant, The Committee for Idaho’s High Desert, Inc., in No. 95–35472 are
titled to costs.
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Crow Tribe sought declaratory and in-
junctive relief against imposition of severance
and gross proceeds taxes by state of Mont-
tana on coal produced from tribal deposits.
The District Court, 469 F.Supp. 154, dis-
missed. Tribe appealed. The Court of Ap-
peals, 650 F.2d 1104, reversed and remanded.
On remand, the District Court, 657 F.Supp.
573, upheld taxes. Tribe appealed. The
Court of Appeals, 819 F.2d 895, reversed, and
the Supreme Court, 484 U.S. 997, 108
S.Ct. 685, 98 L.Ed.2d 638, affirmed. Tribe
sought restitution damages from state. The
District Court dismissed. Tribe appealed,
and the Court of Appeals, 969 F.2d 848,
dismissed appeal as improvidently granted.
On the merits, the United States District
Court for the District of Montana, Jack D.
Shanstrom, Chief Judge, denied relief.
Tribe appealed. The Court of Appeals held
that: (1) denial of equitable relief was an
abuse of discretion as law of the case favored
restitution, and (2) Tribe failed to show that
coal taxes caused it to lose its lease with
another lessee.

Reversed and remanded.

1. Federal Courts ⇔ 950

Denial of restitution to Crow Tribe of
monies paid by Tribe’s lessee to state of
Montana under severance and gross pro-
ceeds taxes unlawfully levied on coal pro-
duced from tribal coal deposits was an abuse
of discretion, as district court failed to give
appropriate weight to law of the case when it
relied on equitable considerations either re-
jected explicitly or rendered irrelevant in
prior appeals; state levied unlawful taxes
with illegitimate intent of appropriating most
of Tribe’s economic rent from its coal, and
state benefited from its wrong, while equities
weighed in favor of restoring improperly col-
lected revenues to entity entitled to receive
them. MCA 15–23–701 to 15–23–703, 15–35–
101 to 15–35–205.

2. Mines and Minerals ⇔ 87

Crow Tribe did not have to be in privity
with coal lessee to be entitled to equitable
restitution of severance and gross proceeds
taxes illegally levied by state of Montana on