NEW GENERIC TOP-LEVEL DOMAIN NAMES ("gTLD")
DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

RESPONSE FORM TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT

- Applicant responding to several Objections or Objections based on separate grounds must file separate Responses
- Response Form must be filed in English and submitted by email to expertise@iccwbo.org
- The substantive part is limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less

Disclaimer: This form is the template to be used by Applicants who wish to file a Response. Applicants must review carefully the Procedural Documents listed below. This form may not be published or used for any purpose other than the proceedings pursuant to the New GTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure from ICANN administered by the ICC International Centre for Expertise ("Centre").

References to use for the Procedural Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules for Expertise of the ICC</td>
<td>“Rules”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix III to the ICC Expertise Rules, Schedule of expertise costs for proceedings under the new gTLD dispute resolution procedure</td>
<td>“Appendix III”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Practice Note on the Administration of Cases</td>
<td>“ICC Practice Note”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Module 3 - New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
<td>“Procedure”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook</td>
<td>“Guidebook”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Identification of the Parties and their Representatives

## Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>dot Rugby Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Geir Andreas Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Objector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>International Rugby Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Julie O’Mahony, Senior Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copy the information provided by the Objector.*

## Applicant’s Representative(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous Four Media Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Peter Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add separate tables for any additional representative (for example external counsel or in-house counsel).*
**Applicant’s Contact Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous Four Media Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Peter Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Information Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This address shall be used for all communication and notifications in the present proceedings. Accordingly, notification to this address shall be deemed as notification to the Applicant. The Contact Address can be the Applicant’s address, the Applicant’s Representative’s address or any other address used for correspondence in these proceedings.

**Other Related Entities**

Add separate tables for any additional other related entity.
Disputed gTLD

gTLD Applicant has applied to and Objector objects to [.example]

| Name | .RUGBY Application ID 1-1206-66762 |

Objection

The Objector filed its Objection on the following Ground (Article 3.2.1 of the Guidebook and Article 2 of the Procedure)

☐ 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.

or

☒ 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.

Copy the information provided by the Objector.

Point-by-Point Response to the claims made by the Objector (Article 3.3.3 of the Guidebook and Article 11 of the Procedure)

(Provide an answer for each point raised by the Objector).

I. INTRODUCTION

Dot Rugby Limited ("Applicant" or "Respondent") hereby submits this Response to the Community Objection filed against its application for the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") .RUGBY by the International Rugby Board ("IRB" or "Objector").

The Applicant, dot Rugby Limited is a Gibraltar private limited company, the shares of which are partially owned by Domain Venture Partners PCC Limited, a Gibraltar Experienced Investor Fund regulated by the Financial Services Commission of Gibraltar. .RUGBY gTLD is intended and designed to increase availability and access to create, produce and disseminate informative, creative and innovative rugby related content. Its framework and mechanisms have been established to ensure the gTLD operates and grows in a manner that is responsible, protects consumers and promotes consumer and industry trust and confidence. The Applicant hopes to work closely with key global rugby stakeholders to further develop policies and best practices to ensure successful operation of the gTLD.

Notably, the Objector, through its affiliation with IRB Strategic Developments Limited, has submitted a competing bid for the .RUGBY gTLD.1 The objection process is not a substitute for Community Priority Evaluation and was not envisaged to be a mechanism by which one applicant could gain a competitive advantage over another.

1 See New gTLD Application ID 1-994-63638 at (Annex 1)
Moreover, the alleged community is incapable of being clearly delineated, and Applicant targets a much broader user base for the gTLD than Objector represents. Thus, the .RUGBY objection should be denied.

A. Standing: IRB has not established that it has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community as a whole (Applicant Guidebook (“AGB”) § 3.2.2.4 and Obj. paragraph A page 5)

Whilst the IRB may be an established institution, they do not have an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated “rugby” community; rather their relationship is with a particular subset of the alleged community, which in itself is not clearly delineated. In addition, since they do not have an ongoing relationship with the sport as a whole (including for example Touch Rugby or Rugby League), their relationship is not sufficient to support the objection to Applicant’s .rugby gTLD:

1. There is some suggestion in the public domain that the IRB fails certain members of the alleged community, in part focusing too heavily on elite rugby, giving too much power to the 8 founding members, and complaints that “they are too Anglo-centric.”

2. The IRB has also been accused of failing the smaller nations in the alleged community especially during the last World Cup and in at least one instance excluding one of the smaller nations from being able to qualify. For example:
   
a. “The IRB has come in for constant criticism since the World Cup started, particularly over their treatment of the minnow nations, who had to play their pool matches in a tight timeframe.”
   
b. “[P]oorer countries are undermined, underfunded, cleverly weakened, robbed at every stage yet asked to make the numbers in the World Cup so that rugby can masquerade as a global game.”
   
c. Noteworthy is the IRB’s decision to exclude Cyprus from being able to qualify for the Ruby World Cup 2015 because Cyprus was not a “full member.”

3. Further, there is some uncertainty and controversy in relation to IRB membership, thus raising questions as to which members are actually considered to form their “community”. For example, Greece (Hellenic Federation of Rugby) was granted full membership on a probationary basis despite not meeting all membership criteria and the UAE Association was fast-tracked to full membership, however Cyprus was not given the same opportunities.

4. The IRB also seems to narrowly define the alleged community, focusing on professional and amateur players within organized unions and associations. However, IRB does not represent the alleged community as a whole which would include unorganized or unofficially recognized leagues, many clubs and teams (e.g., community social/recreational leagues and clubs, company sponsored after work

---


rugby recreational leagues and school leagues), rugby equipment/clothing manufacturers and retailers, media outlets, fan participants (i.e., fantasy rugby league), the video game industry and indeed Touch Rugby or Rugby League.7

5. The Applicant commissioned a survey of supporters of rugby amongst general internet users.8 79% of participants surveyed when asked whether they received sponsorship or support from an official rugby organization said “no,” thus suggesting that formal organization is not a necessity to participate in the sport.9 61.9% also agreed that the rugby community includes stakeholders such as the media and manufacturers.

B. Community: Objector fails to prove that the alleged community is “clearly delineated” (AGB § 3.5.4 and Objection paragraph B pages 6 and 7)

The alleged Rugby community is not clearly delineated because it is comprised of a significant number of stakeholders who do not necessarily share similar goals, values or interests, thus the alleged community lacks formal boundaries, evidenced by disagreement as to which stakeholders are considered members of the rugby community.

1. In an official statement, the Independent Objector (“IO”) explained that alleged communities associated with so-called “generic” strings cannot likely meet the “clearly delineated” criteria due to the broad definition of “community” and the nature of generic terms, which are by definition used by a significant number of people, who do not necessarily share similar goals, values or interests. For example, the IO expressed disbelief about the clear delineation of an alleged community encompassing a large variety of stakeholders who do not always share similar primary interests, because stakeholders are of a very different nature.10

2. The word “rugby” is a generic word, being a sport, and Applicant intends to use the gTLD as such.

3. According to the IRB, there are more than four million registered players worldwide, but more than half are from England and over three-quarters (3.3 million) come from the eight Foundation Unions, i.e., Scotland, Ireland, Wales, England, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and France. Meanwhile, there are less than a quarter of a million players in the ten most populous nations of the world (China, India, USA, Indonesia, Brazil, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Russia, Nigeria, and Japan). Television audience data for the 2007 World Cup final, between South Africa and England, shows that 97% of the 33 million total viewers came from the Foundation Unions – with just half a million viewers of the final spread amongst all the remaining nations where it was shown live. There are 115 members of the IRB – but rugby is evidently not particularly popular in most of them.11

---

7 See http://plover.net/~bonds/rugby.html for a good explanation of why Rugby Union receives more media coverage that Rugby League. (Annex 7)

8 See (Annex 8)

9 See Q3 Rugby Survey (Annex 8)

10 See (Annex 9) - http://www.independent-Objector-newgtlds.org/english-version/the-issue-of-closed-generic-gtlds/ - (indicating clear delineation is doubtful for “book community” potentially encompassing authors, publishers, libraries, retailers, readers, and international organizations because some stakeholders have the promotion of literature as their primary aim but for many others it is one objective among many others)

These statistics call into question the IRB’s claim that it is representative of a clearly delineated rugby community, as it appears that only a few of these members are active while quite a number are passive members of the alleged community, thus confusing any notion of delineation.

4. The IRB also represents only a subsector of the alleged rugby community, but not the alleged community as a whole which would include Touch Rugby\textsuperscript{12}, unorganized or unofficially recognized leagues, clubs and teams (e.g., community social/recreational leagues and clubs, company sponsored after work rugby recreational leagues), rugby equipment/clothing manufacturers and retailers, media outlets, fan participants (i.e., fantasy rugby league), the video game industry. It is impossible to ascertain the amount of unorganized/unofficially recognized leagues, clubs, teams that should be included as members of the rugby community, and as such the alleged rugby community is not clearly delineated.\textsuperscript{13}

5. Further, although the IRB offers in support of this Objection “an opposition letter” from the Rugby League International Federation (“RLIF”), it cannot truly claim to represent a global rugby “community” which would by necessity have to include, in a large part, the Rugby League.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[i.] The official Rugby League administration is undertaken by the RLIF who make themselves responsible for the “Laws of the Game,” the development, organization and governance of official Rugby League matches internationally, and for the sport’s major international tournament, the Rugby League World Cup.\textsuperscript{15}
  \item[ii.] We set out below a table identifying 2005-2006 participation levels in both Rugby Union and Rugby League in Australia; one of the largest and most influential nations in the Rugby community.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{itemize}

\begin{tabular}{lccccccc}
\hline
Age group (years) & 15-17 & 18-24 & 25-34 & 35-44 & 45-54 & 55-64 & 65 and over & Total  \\
\hline
Number ('000) & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{12} Touch Rugby is represented by the Federation of International Touch, which is conspicuously absent from any involvement in the objection or competing application. See \url{www.international-touch.org} (Annex 11)

\textsuperscript{13} See \url{http://www.economist.com/blogs/gametheory/2011/10/globalisation-rugby} “That things are tight at the top is not surprising, bearing in mind the resource gap between the top countries, where rugby is a professional game, and the have-nots, where amateurism still rules the day”. (Annex 12)

\textsuperscript{14} The “opposition letter” is not so much a letter of direct opposition to the Applicant’s application but is more support for a competing bid. The letter itself recognises the inherent tension between rugby union and rugby league, since it alludes to an agreement that no restriction would be placed on rugby league applications for second level domains.

\textsuperscript{15} See \url{http://www.rlif.com/about-rlif} (Annex 13)

\textsuperscript{16} \url{http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4156.0.55.001Feature+Article1May%202009} (Annex 14)
Rugby League 33.2 27.7 *22.9 *5.8 **1.7 - - 91.2
Rugby Union 19.8 28.1 *16.8 *7.3 *6.8 - - 78.9

Participation rate (%)
Rugby League 4.1 1.4 *0.8 *0.2 **0.1 - - 0.6
Rugby Union 2.4 1.4 *0.6 *0.2 *0.2 - - 0.5

The chart shows that Rugby League was more popular than Rugby Union, thereby supporting the notion that the IRB is not only not representative of the whole of the alleged Rugby Community, but also is not associated with the most popular form of rugby in one of its biggest member states. See the article referenced at footnote 7 which explores the social development side of the game.

6. Assuming for arguments sake there is a clearly delineated rugby union community, which we contend there is not, there is no clearly delineated rugby community of which one organization such as the IRB can claim to be representative.

7. Finally, the fact that IRB could have filed a community application but instead chose to file a standard application, should have no bearing on the Panel's decision to this objection. (Objection at page 8). IRB made the conscious decision not to file such an application. A closer examination of the criteria required for a community application yields insight as to why this decision was taken. Specifically, as discussed above, IRB cannot claim to be the only global representative of the alleged Rugby community, given the distinctively different forms of rugby – rugby union, rugby league and touch rugby – all of which flourish under different rules and governing bodies. Moreover, had it applied for community priority designation, it likely would have faced opposition from the RLIF and the international federation of touch, because it could not restrict registration to its members.

8. Thus, because of the alleged Rugby community's diversity of goals, values and interests, as well as its lack formal boundaries, the IRB fails to prove that the alleged community is clearly delineated.

D. Substantial Opposition: IRB Fails to Prove Substantial Opposition to Respondent’s Rugby Application (AGB § 3.5.4 and Objection, paragraph 2)

1. The number of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the alleged rugby community is small.

IRB represents 100 national unions or associations in full membership, 18 Associate members and 6 Regional Associations, yet provides letters of support from only a small number of its members (Objection at page 8 - Attachment B). A number of objections are from organisations one would not associate with Rugby.

2. The representative nature of entities expressing opposition and level of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition.
i. The Objector represents a subsector of the rugby community as a whole, i.e., “elite and organized rugby union”, and does not provide examples of support from any other members of the alleged community such as recreational leagues, media outlets, or sponsors.

ii. It is noted that the United Kingdom issued an Early Warning expressed opposition to our application and support for Objector’s application (Objection at paragraph 2 page 9 – Attachment C). This was procured by or on behalf of the Objector and totally against the spirit of the GAC process. It is noteworthy that the objection was not pursued further by the UK and did not form part of the GAC communiqué issued after the ICANN Beijing meeting.

iii. There appears to be little support at national level for the objection outside of the 8 Founding Nations: only Tonga, Japan, Kenya and Italy, and two umbrella organisations.

3. Distribution or diversity among sources of expressions of opposition (regional, subsectors, leadership, membership)

i. As mentioned above, the vast majority of the IRB’s support comes from their membership; thus there is little diversity of entities expressing opposition.

ii. Many of the letters are also form letters. Ten letters from individual rugby players, a referee, Irish Rugby Union Players Association and Rugby Football Union are the same. Also five other letters mirror parts or all of the UK Early Warning Letter (i.e., FFR, Jean-Louis Barthes, Tonga Rugby Union, New Zealand Rugby Union, Australian Rugby Union, and South African Rugby Union). This is obviously therefore a campaign orchestrated by the IRB.

4. Costs incurred by Objector in expressing opposition, including other channels Objector may have used to convey opposition

Costs incurred by the IRB in expressing opposition, including other channels the IRB may have used to convey opposition, are minimal in comparison to: the costs of applying for the .RUGBY gTLD; the annual revenues of IRB and its members; its investments in rugby related activities.

i. For example, IRB strategic programs and investment amounted to £153million ($245.6 million) from 2009 to 2012 for efforts to increase participation, performance, recruitment and retention of players.

ii. The IRB invested in targeted high performance initiatives in 22 countries with an investment of £48 million ($77 million) over the period 2009-2012, to its annual expenditure on annual Union grants, tournament funding and education and training program expenditure.

17 See (Annex 15), emails. The first is from Brady Bohrmann to Geir Rasmussen of Famous Four Media, threatening to launch a global public campaign against Famous Four Media. The second is to Jon Nevett of December 2012 in which Roar Domains (who assist the competing bidder) state “We are pleased to have obtained four Early Warnings on behalf of our applications, and fully expect the GAC process to be completed to GAC Advice.”

18 See (Annex 16)

19 See http://www.irb.com/mm/Document/NewsMedia/MediaZone/02/04/22/88/2042288_PDF.pdf (Annex 17)

iii. The IRB invests over $3 million annually in development, high performance, and tournament programs in collaboration with Asian Rugby Football Union (ARFU), which explains why the ARFU were prepared to file a letter of support for IRB.21

5. Also, given that IRB filed an application for the .rugby string, cost estimates for obtaining the gTLD certainly should have included costs associated with defending their application, either from objection or by lodging objections against other applicants. As such, it is difficult to see how IRB has expended more resources than necessary to participate in the new gTLD application progress.

6. Thus, the IRB fails to prove substantial opposition to Respondent’s application due to the opposing entities’ relatively small number; unrepresentative nature; unrecognized stature or weight; and lack of distribution or diversity. The IRB moreover fails to offer any proof of historical defense, or costs incurred or channels used in conveying opposition.

E. Targeting: The IRB Fails to Prove a Strong Association Between the .Rugby String and the alleged Rugby Community (Objection, paragraph 3)

1. Statements contained in the application

There is little question that there would be an association between the applied-for .rugby gTLD and the members/unions IRB represents, however the application demonstrates that Applicant has a broader target than the alleged “IRB rugby” community, as the application evidences22.

The “strong association” alleged by the IRB is purely ancillary or derivative.

2. Associations by the public

Public perceptions demonstrate that Applicant has a broader target than the alleged “rugby” community23.

Finally, the public understands that a domain name registration does not confer or even define special status for the holder worldwide and for every purpose. For example, for-profit businesses operate .org domain names (slashdot.org); American-based companies use ccTLDs of other counties for unconventional naming purposes (bit.ly, fold.it, twit.tv).

Thus IRB fails to prove sufficient targeting to support this objection because Applicant’s intended use for the gTLD is much more inclusive, and the public, including average Internet users, understands the same.


22 See (Annex 19) “Rugby is a great leveller. Given the chance, anyone - from the poorest child to the world’s richest man - can play rugby. Passion is the essence of rugby, and we hope to capture this within .rugby largely using the valuable platform presented by the internet. the aim of .rugby is to create a blank canvas for the online rugby sector set within a secure environment. The Applicant will achieve this by creating a consolidated, versatile and dedicated space for the rugby sector. As the new space is dedicated to those within this affinity group the Applicant will ensure that consumer trust is promoted. Consequently consumer choice will be augmented as there will be a ready marketplace specifically for rugby-related enterprises to provide their goods and services”.

23 See (Annex 8)
F. Detriment: Any likelihood of material detriment to the rights and legitimate interest of the Rugby Community is Speculative

1. The thrust of IRB’s argument (Obj. paragraph 4A) seems to be that only IRB can control and manage the .rugby gTLD because that right or responsibility belongs only to an entity operating within the industry associated with this generic term. That is simply untrue. IRB is not the only entity that can or will ensure that the .rugby gTLD will act for the benefit of rugby. The Applicant, as a neutral third party with no affiliation to any single representative group, is best capable of ensuring that .rugby acts to the benefit of all stakeholders in rugby. No single organization can unfairly influence the development of the gTLD and restrict the content appearing within this string to serve its own interest. An IRB-managed gTLD raises questions about IRB’s ability to be impartial as to third parties who are interested in rugby that are not a part of IRB or who are critical of IRB. The fact that the IRB as a sports federation promotes rugby does not necessarily mean it promotes the interest of every facet of the sport worldwide.

2. IRB offers no evidence that Applicant is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the Rugby community (Obj. paragraph 4Aa)

The Applicant has every intention of acting in the interests of rugby and will put rugby in the forefront of how the gTLD will be operated. All relevant stakeholders will have an opportunity to join the Governance Council (GC) which will provide stakeholders with a voice to direct policies of the registry. The Rugby GC will shape the gTLD. We encourage involvement from a broad spectrum of key stakeholders, including IRB, RFIL, IWRF, their respective leagues, rugby players and coaches, referees, volunteers, fans, sponsors and individual governments. The fact that we have not yet consulted with IRB regarding the gTLD’s policies should not be of concern. At this time, IRB is a competing applicant. The policies are to be further developed and refined through the GC. What our application demonstrates is that the framework for the GC and for establishment of the TLD’s policies is in place.

3. For example, the GC will recommend policies and best practices to ensure fair access and to combat critical issues of fraudulent websites, have oversight of the type of information offered within the gTLD, set registration policies, ensure compliance with regulatory controls, establish abuse prevention and takedown measures, protect intellectual property rights, and set rules for the gTLD on other matters of importance to the rugby industry. We disagree with the statement by the IRB that the true system of management and control is “entirely within the DVP structure” (Obj. paragraph 4Aa). We have committed to a PIC Spec, and so will potentially be open to challenge under the PIC dispute resolution procedure by any member of the public if we do not abide by commitments in the PIC Spec and the application. Unlike other applicants, Applicant will have a body of self-appointed persons and organisations in the GC watching its stewardship of the .rugby gTLD, and is therefore under much more scrutiny than any other applicant. The GC could challenge Applicant’s actions under the PIC dispute resolution procedure.

4. A three-part plan is currently underway to attract such stakeholders to the GC. First the GC website has been up and running for the past several months to

---

²⁴ See PIC Spec Statement (Annex 20)
attract interest from organisations and to join.\textsuperscript{25} Second, outreach has been made to the rugby industry as a whole through press releases to drive traffic to the GC website.\textsuperscript{26} Finally, Applicant continues its efforts to identify key stakeholders, so that when the time delegation of the gTLD nears, we will be prepared to contact such organisations with a view to encouraging their participation in the GC.

5. Further, Applicant will also perform periodic consumer surveys to measure trust and satisfaction with the gTLD. Surveys will be conducted to improve operation of the gTLD and to obtain data that will ensure that the processes in place are responsive to all stakeholders’ needs, and to assist with the development and refinement of abuse policies, and procedures and rights protection mechanisms. These surveys will be designed to measure:
   i. Consumer satisfaction with gTLD content
   ii. Service availability of critical registry systems
   iii. Abuse and takedown incidents
   iv. Whois data accuracy
   v. Rights protection incidents

6. IRB offers no evidence of concrete or economic damage to the Rugby community that would result from Applicant’s operation of the .Rugby String (Obj. paragraph 4Ab).

The Applicant has implemented measures that go above and beyond those required by ICANN to address concerns of fraud and other illegal activities and to protect intellectual property rights, and beyond what the IRB offers through its application for the .rugby string:\textsuperscript{27}

   i. Use of domain names that infringe upon the legal rights of others in .rugby will not be tolerated and preventing abusive registrations is a core objective of Applicant. Applicant will prevent abusive registrations and those that infringe upon intellectual property rights by implementing comprehensive registration, rights protection and anti-abuse guidelines as defined in its Acceptable Use Policy (AUP).

   ii. Whilst all domains will be registered on a first-come, first-served basis during the “General Availability Phase,” a Trademark Claims Service will be offered for the first 90 days of general registration with the intent of providing clear notice to potential registrants of the existing rights of trademark owners with registered trademarks in the Trademark Clearinghouse. Moreover, all registrars who are accredited to sell names in .rugby will be required to review all domain names requested to be registered during the Trademark Claims period to determine if they are an identical match of a trademark that has been filed with the Trademark Clearinghouse.

   iii. The GC Board of Directors will also meet regularly to discuss matters relating to intellectual property protection. The Board will be responsible for recommending mechanisms to protect against intellectual property violations and to deal with infringement. Further, the Board may recommend reservation of certain second-level domains for various purposes and initiatives related to the rugby sector.

\textsuperscript{25} www.governancecouncils.com/rugby (Annex 21)

\textsuperscript{26} See Press Release (Annex 22)

\textsuperscript{27} See (Annex 23) question 18, 28, Application
7. The above mechanisms should help to provide adequate protection of the brands, professional players, officials, sponsors and teams that fall under the rugby community’s umbrella.

8. Further, Applicant’s Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Plan, in conjunction with the GC and the Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Working Group, is another mechanism that it committed to in its application and PIC Spec that will be used to combat fraudulent and unauthorized ticket sales, unofficial tournament and team merchandise sales, and other abusive activities that negatively impact the goodwill and reputation of the rugby community and result in the loss of income, confidence and integrity in the sport. The plan includes:

i. establishment of 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 .rugby gTLD;

ii. Whois accuracy measures, educating consumers about domain name use, restrictions on proxy registration services, and cooperation with law enforcement agencies;

iii. a provision wherein bad actors and repeat offenders who engage in abuse registrations will be blacklisted, and will face potential disqualification of their current or any future registrations;

iv. an Acceptable Use Policy that gives Applicant the ability to quickly lock, cancel, transfer or take ownership of any domain name.

9. All of these mechanisms are designed to combat fraudulent websites, prohibit fraudulent or unauthorized re-sale of tickets, the sale of unofficial tournament and team merchandise, protect consumers, and increase consumer and industry trust and satisfaction in the .rugby gTLD. Given all of these mechanisms, rugby is likely to benefit from Applicant’s operation of the gTLD.

10. The IRB’s claims of alleged economic harm are speculative. They offer no concrete evidence of harm. Moreover, the damage they allege seem only to materialise if Applicant is delegated the string, instead of IRB.

11. IRB offers no concrete evidence that Applicant’s operation of the gTLD will interview with core, noncommercial activities of the Rugby Community (Obj. paragraph 4Ac)

It seems unlikely that local and provincial amateur teams would suffer significant cybersquatting issues, but Applicant does take this risk seriously. The GC Board may recommend reservation of certain second-level domains for various purposes and initiatives related to the rugby sector, such as the non-commercial programs and/or well-known identifiers or names. The concern over protection of “non-trademark” identifiers is an issue that stakeholders within the rugby community can and should raise with the GC, in an effort to better ensure that registration policies and/or other measures are

28 See (Annex 23) questions 18 and 28
implemented so they are not lost to persons/entities not genuinely associated with rugby.

IRB also seems to suggest that the average, reasonable internet user is not sophisticated enough to locate the information he/she is searching for. We do not think this is the case. We see no reason why internet users should have difficulty navigating the gTLD and finding information coming from “individuals and entities associated with the Rugby community”.

12. **IRB offers no evidence that Dot Rugby’s operation of the gTLD will damage the reputation of the rugby community (Obj. paragraph 4Ad)**

The IRB’s suggestion that the reputation of rugby will be damaged if Applicant is delegated the string because of a pending civil suit should be rejected. This is a “smoke screen” intended only to cloud the issues or divert attention from the fact that a neutral third party, the Applicant, can provide a safe, secure, consume-oriented, trustworthy and inclusive .rugby gTLD. The civil action, *David Ways v. Roache et al.*, is in the preliminary stages. Indeed Iain Roache has not even been served. There have been no findings of fact by the court and no judgment has been rendered against DVP, which intends to fight the case vigorously, as the underlying allegations are meritless. Any large, well-funded organization frequently finds spurious claims filed against it. The Panel should resist any temptation to base a finding of reputational damage on the mere fact that a complaint has been filed against DVP. Many of Applicant’s affiliated entities have already passed Initial Evaluation and hence have passed ICANN’s background checks.

13. **The IRB’s efforts to draw an association between .rugby and gambling (Obj. paragraph 4B) are pure speculation.**

Nowhere in our application is there any mention of any plan to associate the .rugby TLD with gambling. Neither Applicant nor any of its affiliated entities have any link or do business with Gibraltar based gaming companies.

Moreover, Applicant’s proposed Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) requires that registrants will use in accordance with applicable law. Further, the GC for each TLD that is awarded will be independent and made up of stakeholders relevant to the individual TLD sector. In other words, there is no plan to overlap GC Boards of Directors across TLDs or to “cross sell across TLDs”, so IRB’s concerns are misplaced.

14. Thus, because the IRB fails to offer proof of reputational, concrete, or economic damage to the community; that Applicant does or will not act according to community or user interests; that Applicant will interfere with the community’s core activities; that community core activities depend on the DNS (rugby is a sport that is played on a pitch and does not rely on any particular domain name); or any certainty that detrimental outcomes would occur, the IRB therefore fails to prove any likelihood of material detriment to the rights and legitimate interest of the alleged Rugby Community.

---

29 See (Annex 24)

30 “all registrants agree that they will not use their domain for any purposes which are prohibited by the laws of the jurisdiction(s) in which they do business or any other applicable law. You may not use your domain for any purposes or in any manner which violate a statute, rule or law governing use of the Internet and/or electronic commerce, including those statutes related to gaming and/or online gambling.” Response to Q28, Paragraph 14 (See Annex 23)
V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondent respectfully requests that the community objection filed by the IRB be denied.
Communication (Article 6(a) of the Procedure and Article 1 of the ICC Practice Note)

A copy of this Response is/was transmitted to the Objector on: 5th June 2013 by e-mail, the following addresses: Contact Information Redacted

A copy of this Response is/was transmitted to ICANN on: 5th June 2013 by e-mail to the following address: drfiling@icann.org

Filing Fee (Article 1 Appendix III to the Rules and Article 11(f) of the Procedure)

As required, Euros 5 000 were paid to ICC on 14th May 2013

Evidence of the payment is attached for information.

Description of the Annexes filed with the Response (Article 11(e) of the Procedure)

List and Provide description of any annex filed.

1. New gTLD Application ID 1-994-63638
2. Daily Telegraph article
3. IRB treatment of minnow nations
4. Monstrous IRB maim the minnows
5. IRB excludes Cyprus
6. Uncertainty and Controversy with IRB membership
7. Rugby League vs Rugby Union
8. Rugby Survey
9. The issue of Closed Generic
10. Is IRB truly representative of clearly delineated rugby community
11. Touch Rugby
12. Economist article
13. Rugby League International Federation
14. 2005-2006 participation levels in both Rugby Union and Rugby League in Australia
15. Roar Domains Email
16. GAC communique issued after the ICANN Beijing meeting
17. IRB Investments
18. IRB invests over $3 million annually in development
19. Extract from dot Rugby Limited Application
20. PIC Specification
21. governance council rugby
22. Press Release
23. Application Questions 18 & 28 from dot Rugby Limited
24. Applications passes IE - proof of passing background checks
Date: 5th June 2013

Signature: ______________________________

Peter Young  
Chief Legal Officer, Famous Four Media Limited  
For and on behalf of dot Rugby Limited
Annex 1
APPLICATION DETAILS

Application ID: 1-594-63938

String: RUGBY (download public portion of application) (application-result/applicationdetails/application/attachment/download?attachmentid=8244521&ac=289)

Applicant: IRB Strategic Developments Limited

Prioritization Number: 273

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Web Site: www.irb.com

Primary Contact: Antony Van Coevering

Contact Information Redacted

Phone Number:

Email: Contact Information Redacted

Attachments (8):

Unlike these files were prepared and submitted by a party other than ICANN, and ICANN is not responsible for the content. These 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.

- 24 (PDF) RUGBY Logo.rtf (application-result/applicationdetails/application/attachment/download?attachmentid=8244521&ac=289)
- 24 (PDF) IRB 2008 Strategic Plan.pdf (application-result/applicationdetails/application/attachment/download?attachmentid=8244521&ac=289)


Result: Pass (application-result/applicationdetails/application/attachment/download?attachmentid=8244521&ac=289)

© 2013 Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: IRB Strategic Developments Limited

String: RUGBY
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-994-63638

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
IRB Strategic Developments Limited

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:
www.irb.com

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
Anthony Van Coevering

6(b). Title
CEO

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
6(f). Email Address
   Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
   Michael Salazar

7(b). Title
   CPO

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
   Private Limited Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
   Incorporated under laws of Ireland under COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER 270368

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

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

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

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
   [Signatures of 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>Bernard Lepape</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brophy</td>
<td>Company Secretary</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>RoboBody Trustees Limited</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rugby</td>
<td>Development</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.

RUGBY

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

14(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.

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

14(c). If an IDN, provide the language of the label (as referenced by ISO-639-1).

14(d). If an IDN, provide the script of the label (in English).

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

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

15(a). If an IDN, Attach IDN Tables for the proposed registry.

Attachments are not displayed on this form.

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

15(c). List any variant strings 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.

We ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string in two ways:
Annex 2
IRB critics must come out of the shadows to validate report

A report from Spectrum Value Partners, a management consultancy, and Addleshaw Goddard, a law firm, was released recently making sweeping criticisms of the way the International Rugby Board are run, their approach to running and expanding rugby worldwide and, in particular, their decision-making concerning the World Cup.

Don’t believe the hype: the way World Cup tournaments are awarded can be improved. Photo: Getty Images

By Brian Moore
12.52AM BST 31 Jul 2008

The most important observations are that:

The IRB, whose eight founding members have a power of veto enshrined constitutionally, have confused governing structure with the IRB council and IRB executive committee, blurring the lines of authority and responsibility.

Too much power is in the hands of the group above.
There is too much focus on elite rugby.
They are too Anglo-centric and fail to exploit emerging markets in Asia properly.
They have no non-executive counterbalance within their governing structure.
They lack transparency over the way they make decisions and the results of those decisions — particularly in relation to running and awarding the Rugby World Cup.

All the above are true and serious discussion of these failings is necessary. I call the eight founding members 'The Cosy Club' because of their arrogant will to preserve their own status at any cost.

Unfortunately, the report describes its commissioners as a diverse collection of professional rugby administrators, sponsors, supporters, and former players, from both small and large rugby nations. And therein lies the problem that will see the valid criticisms of the IRB fail to gain a proper platform.

I understand the benefits of anonymity, but in the end they never outweigh the negatives. By refusing to accept responsibility for the report’s commissioning, the commissioners lay themselves open to any number of allegations, that can and will be made. The IRB will not even discuss the report until they step forward.

Further, the report correctly criticises the IRB for lack of transparency in relation to a number of issues, but makes this call for openness while hiding behind a cloak of secrecy, however well intentioned. These counter-points are so easy to make and those commissioning would do better to fight on their record; at least then people could see unwarranted criticism for what it is.

© Copyright of Telegraph Media Group Limited 2013
Annex 3
IRB hit back at criticisms

Published: 11:25AM Tuesday October 04, 2011 Source: Newstalk ZB/ONE Sport

IRB executive Mike Miller - Source: Photosport

International Rugby Board executive Mike Miller has hit back at suggestions the IRB doesn't care about the minnow countries, while also calling NZRU chief executive Steve Tew's bluff over his threat to pull the All Blacks out of the next Rugby World Cup.

The IRB has come in for constant criticism since the World Cup started, particularly over their treatment of the minnow nations, who had to play their pool matches in a tight timeframe.

Mr Miller says he needs to correct some misconceptions about the treatment of those teams and points out that the IRB would not have invested millions in the smaller playing nations if it did not want them to be more competitive.

"Why did we pay for and open up a high performance centre in Samoa?" Mr Miller told Newstalk ZB.

"Why do we pay for the Pacific Nations Cup which the three Pacific Islands take part in?"

"Why do we give them coaches, training? Why do we provide them with gymns, with analysis too?"

He said the IRB has also ensured that the one country will actually tour the others from next year.

"Why do we do all that if we don't care?" he asked.

Mr Miller also responded to criticisms from the NZRU that New Zealand misses out on millions of dollars of income during World Cup years, and that unless the system changes, the All Blacks may have to withdraw from the 2015 tournament in England.

Tew alluded to withdrawing the All Blacks from the next tournament because of what he described as $13 million in lost revenue from sponsors after competing in the 2011 event.

Australian Rugby Union CEO John O'Neill backed Tew's claims, estimating the ARU has lost as much as $20 million through participating in the global tournament.

The money lost comes from teams not being allowed to associate with their sponsors for the period of the tournament.

But Mr Miller said the figures raised by Tew:

"All of the unions are suffering, it is very difficult," Mr Miller said.

He also pointed out it's up to the IRB board how the cash is carved up - and Tew and O'Neill are both IRB board members.

"The money that we make gets distributed to all unions including New Zealand, and New Zealand is on the council which decides where the money goes."

Mr Miller says it will therefore be up to New Zealand and Australia to persuade the other countries unions of any change.

"We are working with the New Zealand union and with the Australian union and everyone else and they ultimately will decide."

"It's a democracy."

"Whether they get exactly what they want or not, it depends if they can persuade the other council members."

But he acknowledges it would be good for the All Blacks to be at the 2015 event.

And while laying down the law to the NZRU, the IRB CEO is giving New Zealand's hosting of the 2011 Rugby World Cup 10 out of 10.

He says the tournament has been the best ever, despite that it won't be the best in terms of finance, but the IRB always knew that would be the case.

* Follow TVNZ's Rugby World Cup updates on Facebook and Twitter
Annex 4
Monstrous IRB maim the minnows

Roar Guru

By kingplaymaker, 21 Sep 2011 kingplaymaker is a Roar Guru

Tagged:
Eliota Fuimaono-Sapolu, International Rugby Board, IRB, rugby minnows, Rugby Union, Rugby World Cup, RWC minnows

94 Have your say
2,391 reads

Email
Tweet (1)
Like (1) Send

Related coverage

- Rugby Union news
- Rugby World Cup 2011 news
- Rugby 2011 news
- 2013 Wallabies squad news

Sports Highlights

Watch more sports news video

Imagine you’re a less than top notch rugby nation such as Scotland or Wales. You can beat one of the top five teams once in a blue moon, but more often you discover yourself quivering at the prospect of defeat at the rough hands of a rugby minnow.

What can you do to avoid the preposterous fate of being defeated and eliminated from a World Cup by one of these poor, vulgar countries?

No problem. You are richer by far than these little guys. You have board members on the IRB. So you can undertake the following easy project to save the day. No one will oppose you, no one will whisper the faintest word of criticism.

1. Exclude them from major tournaments and regular international competition.

Is it really the case that Georgia or Romania are so much weaker than Scotland and Wales and do not merit inclusion in the Six Nations? Wouldn’t it speed forward the development of the game in those countries? Precisely!

They are dangerously close to becoming good teams who could knock Wales or Scotland out of the World Cup or defeat them in the Six Nations.

Deprive them of the opportunity to play regularly and they will never be in shape to amount to much and the game will never grow where they live. Thankfully, with places on the IRB board, it is possible to make certain they never see the light of high end competition.

2. Keep their playing squads weak.

It’s noticeable that the major teams voting against a player changing the country they represent are the those most threatened by the prospect of defeat on the pitch – Wales, Scotland, Ireland (don’t think because the Irish beat Australia that they are not very likely to lose to a minnow normally).

So we see a drastically weakened Samoa, which could have beaten Wales with full access to players who are dragged off by the promise of greater riches to the four corners of the rugby world – Australia, New Zealand, England, Wales. Having taken the best years away from these players, the IRB makes sure they won’t even allow these poor countries the cast-off remains.

3. Fail to expand the game.

There has been almost no improvement in the state of rugby in the minnow countries as a result of the IRB’s intervention. Samoa and Fiji look weaker than they were at the last cup, Georgia no stronger, and it should be noted that there has not been a single upset yet involving a minnow. Not one.

They may threaten through enthusiasm and unfamiliarity (to their opponents) for some time, but the result is always the same.

4. Give them impossible turnover time.

How on earth can, for example, Samoa defeat Wales three days after their previous match?

The maliciously planned short turnover for Tier two nations effectively removes the smallest lingering hope of a minnow qualifying from a pool and just as well: it would be at the expense of a Wales or a Scotland.

An extra week added to the world cup could easily solve this. For what it’s worth, it also makes the world cup far less interesting, as there is no gain or loss of matches.
One thing is clear: the IRB intentionally keeps the weak weak so as not to threaten the strong.

Samoa have been brave in spelling out the horrendous truth, the Prime Minister observing how unfair it is to intentionally rob a team of its players by denying them the right to change nation.

But it took a profoundly honest and courageous twitter post from Eliota Fuimaono-Sapolu to make plain reality:

"IRB, Stop exploiting my people. Please, all we ask, is fairness. If they get a week, give us a week. Simple. Equity, justice."

"Give Wales 3 days off, and give Samoa a week! We would kill them!!!"

The truest line, summed up in a breath the shocking manipulation of these poor countries is the first:

"Stop exploiting my people."

These poor countries are undermined, underfunded, cleverly weakened, robbed at every stage and are then asked to make up the numbers in the World Cup so that rugby can masquerade as a global game.

It is not. A coterie of ex-players rather than a professional body form the IRB, who conspire to keep power to themselves and prevent the lesser teams from being a threat while abusing them to parade the lie that they have a genuinely widespread international sport.

So when you see Wales or Scotland in a World Cup quarter final, don’t think for a moment they played any rugby to deserve it. The victories won were off the pitch, and they were uncontested.
Annex 5
Cyprus denied Rugby World Cup chance

The Cyprus Rugby Federation (CRF) has expressed its disappointment at the International Rugby Board's (IRB) decision to deny them a chance to qualify for the 2015 World Cup.

Cyprus hit the headlines last month when they set a new world record of 18 consecutive Test match victories on their way to the top of the FIRA/AER European Nations Cup Division 2C table but have since been dealt a body blow by the sport's governing body who have ruled that they cannot participate in the qualification process for the World Cup because they are not full members of the IRB.

The Mouflons, as they are known, are favourites to cement their place at the top of the Division 2C table when they tackle Hungary this weekend. CRF officials were hopeful they would then be cleared to take on the top side in Division 2D in the first round of European RWC qualifying on May 4 having done all they could to fulfil the membership requirements. But they appear to have failed to convince the IRB and that honour now looks set to fall to Hungary or Slovenia as the next highest-placed full member in Division 2C.

Lawrence Vasillides, president of the CRF, claims it will have a huge impact on the development of the sport in the country. "The CRF regrets that the IRB has taken this decision which we believe will have severe and detrimental effects on Cyprus rugby, especially due to the economic and continuous crisis that has affected the nation recently," he said in a statement. "It is a well known fact that sports will be directly affected by the economic crisis and as such the participation of Cyprus in the biggest rugby event in the world would have been a way to curb the inevitable downgrading of rugby events and development in Cyprus."

Vasillides also revealed that two development events had already "fallen as casualties of the economic crisis" and he urged fans to rally around. "We hope that the continued economic crisis will not adversely affect Cyprus rugby and we call on the supporters which are the soul of rugby to keep supporting us in any way possible."

He did not have to wait long for the wider rugby community to act with an online petition launched in the hope of forcing the IRB into a re-think and allowing Cyprus to take part in the European qualifying that kicks off next month. There is hope with Greece having been granted full membership on a probationary basis last year despite meeting all membership criteria while their case has also attracted support on Twitter with Seimion international Elito Fuimaono-Sapoa among those to question the decision.

Related Links
Features: Cyprus over a World Cup chance
Features: Cyprus on verge of historic win
Tournaments/Tours: IRB Rugby World Cup
External Links: Cyprus' world record run of 18 Test victories
We use cookies and other technology that recognise you to improve your online experience. By using this site you consent to this use of cookies. For more information please see our Cookies Policy.

[User]•April 18 at 11:08am

Being top 10 teams is not the issue and you know it.

[Paul Shashkinopoulos Shanks • University of Life]•April 18 at 11:08am

Peter - I am not really sure what your point is - we know that the top teams would beat us; there are no arguments there. The top 10 teams have thousands of players to choose from and some pretty healthy budgets.

As for the record, this has been achieved by a player pool of about 50 players on a shoestring budget, every team has to start somewhere and we have started at the very bottom and slowly but surely we are making our way up the divisions. Teams that have been played have been on an equal footing and ranking. Through the successes we have managed to attract the interest in the sport, one of our main goals. This whole argument is about expanding the game that we love not stating the obvious!

[Pieter Thefuture • Cape Town, Western Cape]•April 18 at 11:42am

World record 18 consecutive wins - against opposition The Springboks, All Blacks, and Wallabies will feel like failure if they do not beat them by 100+ points. How can this be considered a record if even their biggest supporters will concede that they don't have a snowball chance of beating any of the top 10 nations. the top 3 teams can break this record by inviting all the teams cyprus has beaten and play 18 different starting line-ups and still win every game with a huge margin.

[Lee Richards • Stouftville Grammar]•April 16 at 1:09am

You seem to have missed the point here Peter, Cyprus have won 13 games against teams who have been expected to give them a well played game at their level. Cyprus have taken on A beaten all comers so far. Do you believe SA or any other top South African team could do this. Play teams who are considered to be their equals? Let's face it if SA had done that, they'd still have the World Cup wouldn't they?

[John C Wood • Top Commentator]•April 15 at 2:14am

This record is non-regular. The AWC is a chance for the 'mimic' to play top teams and so improve their game - trial how Italy now plays in the 5 Nations and Argentina now plays in the old 'Tri Nations' - a few years ago they were considered 2nd tier teams - now they are up there with the best. Cyprus should be allowed to get the necessary experience so that they can progress up the ladder - their record is a 'model' for all to look at.

[David Arrasmith • Paphos, Paphos, Cyprus]•April 15 at 11:23am

keep fighting.
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Annex 6
Petition | Cyprus National Rugby Team: Let Cyprus take part in...

http://www.change.org/en-GB/petitions/cyprus-national-rugby-tea...

Petitioning IRB

This petition will be delivered to:

IRB

Cyprus National Rugby Team: Let Cyprus take part in RWC2015 Qualifying

Recent signatures
1. 2. Petition by
   • Paul Byford AUCKLAND, NZ NEW ZEALAND
     Cyprus National Rugby Team
   • Max Starker GLOUCESTER, GB UNITED KINGDOM

Multiply your impact

Turn your signatures into dozens more by sharing this petition and recruiting people you know to sign.

YOU 5d
YOUR FRIENDS
   • Mike O'Neil DUBLIN, IE IRELAND
     170 9d
     avg.
   • Tom Coaker BROADSTAIRS,
     FRIENDS
     10,000 5d
     approx.
     • Richard Grist RICHARD GRIST
       1d
     • Peter Husband FAREHAM, GB UNITED KINGDOM
       1d
     • C Topham CARDIFF, GB UNITED KINGDOM
       1d
     • Elizabeth Fuller CHIPPENHAM
       1d

Cyprus have won a Test record 18 successive internationals - surpassing New Zealand (1965-69), South Africa (1997-98) and Lithuania (2006-10) - and currently top European Nations Cup Division 2C.

They have won all three of their games in convincing fashion - against Austria 54-20, Slovenia 49-8 and Bulgaria 79-10 - and are favourites to overcome Hungary in their final pool game.

The winner of the pool should face the country which tops European Nations Cup Division 2D next month in the first match of the qualifying process for the World Cup in England.

Games against the winners of Divisions 2B, 2A and 1B would follow before a showdown with the third-placed side from Division 1A (which features Georgia,
two legs for a place in the World Cup.

However despite securing promotion to Division 2B for next year, Cyprus are unable to take their place in the qualifier against Norway or Luxembourg as they are not yet a member of the IRB. Cyprus are able to compete in European competitions as members of FIRA-AER.

Also.................. via Planet Rugby

The chance of record holders Cyprus being involved in the 2015 World Cup has taken a setback after they were omitted from the qualifying process.

Cyprus beat Bulgaria 79-10 on March 16 this year to increase their winning run to a record breaking 18 games, stretching back to November 2008.

That would make for an incredible achievement on its own, but consider the fact that the first independent rugby club on the island was only established in 2003, and they played their first international on March 24, 2007 and the enormity of their feats to date become even more apparent.

The ‘Mouflons’, as they are known, have won 22 of their 23 matches, scoring 1014 points and 116 tries along the way and only allowing 157 points against. They do not receive hefty government funding and are reliant on players sacrificing time and their own money in order to play for the side.

Football is the dominant sport there, so recognition has not come easily.

In December 2012, the official 2015 World Cup website specifically highlighted the unbeaten run as an example of how the game is growing and stated:

"If Cyprus can go on and win (FIRA-AER European Nations Cup) Division 2C then a series of play-off rounds will stand between them and the Répechage - and the chance to compete on the biggest stage of all at England 2015," it read.

The IRB went of course aware that the story of a textbook 'underdog' team like Cyprus ending up in a pool with England, Wales and Australia would capture the imagination of many across the globe.

However just a few months later in April 2013, Cyprus were told they would not be eligible to enter the qualifying stages for the tournament as they haven’t yet secured full membership.

Steps to IRB full membership

1. A Union must apply to become an associate member of its Regional Union.
2. After all membership criteria are met, including one year as an associate member, the Union is admitted to the Regional Union as a full member.
3. After completion of stages 1 and 2, and two years as a full member of a Regional Union, the Union may then apply to become an Associate member of the IRB. As an associate member, the union can participate in IRB funded tournaments but not the Rugby World Cup.
4. Following two years of associate membership of the IRB, the union may then apply to become a Full Member.

Interestingly there appears to be exceptions to those rules.

In November 2012, the IRB announced that Greece (Hellenic Federation of Rugby) would be granted full membership on a probationary basis with the comments that: "Despite not meeting all membership criteria owing to the certain unique circumstances in Greece, special dispensation was given for a 12-month probationary period. This was granted to allow the Union every possible opportunity to bolster domestic competition and development programmes."

It is also the case that the UAE (United Arab Emirates Rugby Association) were fast-tracked to full membership from May 2012 to December 2012. Now the main reason for this was that the Arabian Gulf RFU has been disbanded and the UAE was described as: "A well-structured organisation with full-time administrators. It has 1,300 adult licensed players and a further 4,600 Underage players. At domestic level, UAERF runs a seven-team annual domestic 15-a-side premiership and an eight-team conference competition."

IRB Chairman Bernard Lapasset's comments when welcoming the UAE as a full member stated that it was a positive time in the game.
"These are very exciting times for our sport with unprecedented growth and interest around the world. Today’s announcement certainly underlines Rugby’s ability to reach out to new communities and countries in every region," he said.

Now Cyprus cannot boast the same structure that the UAE have and indeed have only recently met the criteria required to become an association member by having four clubs.

However, compare their playing results - UAE have lost 12 of 15 games, scoring just 17 tries and 184 points and conceding 888. They were beaten 3-106 by Japan in May 2012 and 3-94 by Belgium in December of last year. Greece have been beaten in all three meetings, with 144 points scored and 21 conceded.

Head Coach Paul Shanks and his side surely deserve the chance to try and qualify for the World Cup after their endeavours and it isn’t a stretch to say that the ‘unique circumstances’ that allowed Greece to obtain a probationary membership are going to be pretty similar to those currently hurting Cyprus.

Terms like ‘growing the global family’ and ‘taking tournaments to new territories’ feature heavily in IRB reports. That rugby is now played at the University in Nicosia, and TAG in Cyprus schools is down to the success of the Cyprus national team.

Given their remarkable feats on the field and their attempts to grow the game, what would be the problem with rewarding that with a probationary membership to allow entry into the qualification knockout stages? If not, why was their specific story promoted by the IRB in the first place?

By Russ Petty
To:
IRB
Let Cyprus take part in RWC2015 Qualifying

Sincerely,
[Your name]

News
1. Reached 2,500 signatures

Supporters

Reasons for signing
• Most Popular
• Latest
• Therese Richardson ENGLAND, UNITED KINGDOM
  • about 1 month ago
  • Liked 4

Look at the achievement as in the picture, how can you possibly say they may be unable to take part - with all the upheaval in Cyprus at the moment they should take part to give the Country hope and of course they have earned it and so deserve a place xxx

REPORT THIS COMMENT:

• Anna Economou SOUTHEND-ON-SEA, UNITED KINGDOM
  • about 1 month ago
  • Liked 3

To see my country represented

REPORT THIS COMMENT:

• Stav Economou ESSEX, UNITED KINGDOM
  • about 1 month ago
  • Liked 2

18 games unbeaten, so they deserve a chance to play against best teams in the world

REPORT THIS COMMENT:

• Douilla Economou BRIGHTON, UNITED KINGDOM
  • about 1 month ago
  • Liked 2
Annex 7
rugby league vs. rugby union

I'm embarrassed, as any thinking person should be, to admit that I've watched quite a bit of television lately. But for one reason or another, I've seen several games of rugby - both League and Union - over the past few weeks. And I feel myself drawn to comment on a certain sporting injustice.

First, a note for baffled Americans. Rugby is a kind of 'British Empire' version of American Football, in which two opposing teams of 250-pound hulks attempt to force an oval ball over the opponent's line - a procedure known as a 'try'. (There's more to it than that, but let's leave it there for the moment.) In 1895, rugby split into two different camps. Rugby League became a professional game with a simplified set of rules; today it is chiefly only played in Australia and northern England. Rugby Union stayed amateur and kept the original rules; today it claims to be one of the world's most widely played games, played all over the British Isles, France, India, South Africa, Argentina and throughout Oceania. Rugby Union gets massive TV and media coverage; Rugby League is only covered when there's nothing else happening, and sometimes not even then.

And this is the injustice I was talking about, because Rugby League is the better game in every way. It's faster, more open, more exciting. In League, the ball is always in motion; in Union, the ball always seems to be stuck under a pile of bodies. In League, most of the points come from tries; in Union, most of the points come from penalties. League games are all-action, with barely enough time to squeeze in TV replays; Union games involve lots of standing around in bewilderment as the play gets halted for constant rule infringements.

The reason for the constant rule infringements is that Union has far too many rules. Nobody knows them all: not the players, not the commentators, and certainly not the tossers in Burberry who shout 'heave' on the sidelines. Perhaps fittingly for a game played by people who grow up to be lawyers, games often hinge on the interpretation of obscure rules and precedents that are applied almost at random. It's like an ultra-violent version of Mornington Crescent.

I'm tempted to say that the more rules there are in a game, the less satisfactory it is. Chess, for example, is a very simple game, yet it is deep and rich enough to have inspired a mass of study and literature. Go is simpler and richer again. In fact, simplicity has been the key to most of the games that have inspired the popular imagination - from football to basketball, from Scrabble to Monopoly. Apart from Rugby Union, I can't think of another popular game with such a messy, patched-up ruleset. Why has this abomination survived for so long? And why has it flourished when there is a much simpler and more satisfactory alternative in Rugby League?

The answer is obvious. Rugby Union was the sport of choice in the schools that TV executives went to. Rugby Union nets the TV station a nice cachet of ABCi viewers. Rugby Union, more than any other sport, is the preserve of the middle classes.

The truth is that despite the media hype and its status as a 'world sport', Rugby Union isn't all that popular. Nobody goes to see club matches. Internationals do get big crowds, but these are drawn from a thin social layer. And these are just the spectators: even fewer people actually play the game. In South Africa, despite lip-service to the contrary, it's a pastime exclusively for white boys. In Britain and Ireland, despite all the media coverage, it's only played in a handful of schools - the fee-paying ones. Why hasn't Rugby Union spread to working-class schools? One reason is that the boys of Old Wesley and Old Belvedere wouldn't fancy lining up against a Ballyfermot XV. Another reason, quite simply, is that it's crap.

Like many of the entertainments to come out of British public schools, Rugby Union is a mix of sadism and coming-of-age ceremony. For eighty minutes, a group of public school boys undergo a series of punishing ordeals, which must be endured rather than enjoyed. To succeed, they must show courage, commitment, self-sacrifice, teamwork, individual responsibility and a number of other things they'll talk about when they become management consultants. Only when the eighty minutes are over can they call themselves men. This is the 'amateurism' to which the rugby football unions were so dedicated.

The game aspect of Rugby Union is always subordinated to this 'self-proving' aspect; even at international level, Rugby Union is less a game and more a televised Masonic ritual. The parallels with Freemasonry don't stop there, however. Once the players become too knackered to play anymore, young boys' pastime turns into old boys' network. As with a carefully contrived handshake, or the astute raising of a trouser leg, a past in Rugby Union can get you places. Many, perhaps even most, of Ireland's present knights of industry - Sir Tony O'Reilly the most prominent example - were former rugby players. It's a truism, almost a banality, to say that Rugby Union looks after its own.

Rugby League, by contrast, is played by coal-miners' sons from Wigan. Did it ever stand a chance?
Annex 8
### Rugby Survey

**1. Do you have any active interest in Rugby?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 974
skipped question: 0

**2. Have you or your team ever received sponsorship or support from an official rugby organisation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 97
skipped question: 877
3. **Which of the following would you most strongly associate with rugby? (Please choose only one.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Association of Rugby Players (GARP)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Rugby Confederation (WRC)</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rugby Board (IRB)</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Union of Rugby Players (WURP)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Rugby (IAR)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Federation of Rugby (GFR)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 97
skipped question 877

4. **Do you agree that the rugby community includes stakeholders such as manufacturers and media?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 97
skipped question 877
### 5. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 964
- Skipped question: 10

### 6. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 18</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 964
- Skipped question: 10

### 7. Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $24,999</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000+</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 877
- Skipped question: 97
8. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school degree</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate or bachelor degree</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 964
skipped question 10

9. Location (Census Region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 944
skipped question 30
Annex 9
Independent Objector

The Issue of "Closed Generic" gTLDs Applications - The Views of the Independent Objector

- Description of the issue

1. ICANN has recently opened a 30-day public comments period to address the issue of "closed generic" gTLDs. ICANN seeks comments from interested stakeholders in order to explore potential new alternatives and provisions addressing the issue.
2. As the Independent Objector, I have faced the issue of "closed generic" gTLDs from the very beginning of my review of applications. Notably, several persons and entities reported directly to me their concerns on this issue and urged me to file objections against the concerned applications. I have decided not to do so on this sole ground. As I am acting on behalf of the public who use the global Internet and committed to full transparency, I deem it necessary to briefly explain my position in this respect.
3. In my view, a "generic term" is a word associated to goods, service, activities or market sectors, which is widely used by people and commonly understood as referring to the good, service, activity or market sector in question. It is supposedly not directly associated to a brand or trademark. However, sometimes trademarks or brands become generic terms, such as "Aspirin".
4. I note that the core question is whether applicants, generally being companies and corporate entities, can have the benefit of a new gTLD string for their own use, notwithstanding the general use of the term by the public.
5. According to the new gTLDs Program Committee of the ICANN Board of Directors and its resolution of February 2, 2013, it is understood that "members of the community term a 'closed generic' TLD as a TLD string that is a generic term and is proposed to be operated by a participant exclusively for its own benefit". Where the new gTLDs "program's goals include enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs", opponents to applications for "closed generic" gTLDs argue that it would have a negative impact on competition and consumer choice.

- The Independent Objector's Mission

1. On this issue, it is important to insist on the core essence of the IO's functions and his "limited powers" as described in the Applicant Guidebook, which constitutes the basis for his mandate under the new gTLDs Dispute Resolution Process.
2. The IO is only entitled to lodge objections on the limited public interest and community grounds. For both grounds for objection, he acts in complete independence, and solely in the best interests of the public who use the global Internet.
3. In line with this public interest mission, the IO is only allowed to file objections when applications have been commented in the public sphere. He can only lodge an objection if no one else files previously an objection on the same ground, which implies that he is acting as a "safety net".
4. When reviewing the applications, I have paid great attention to the related public comments, some of which addressed the issue of "closed generic" gTLDs.
5. While the present comment aims at explaining the reasons why I consider that the issue of "closed generic" gTLDs does not fall within the scope of my limited functions, it should be noted that the hereunder remarks are general; each application is reviewed separately and has specificities which could justify an objection from the IO for other reasons. It is also not the mission of the IO to express his personal position on the substance of the issue, nor to make suggestions and proposals to ICANN.
6. However, I acknowledge the importance of the problem. The question of the
profitable to a large part of the public, and this is undoubtedly the case concerning
gTLDs strings such as “.search”, “.book”, “.beauty”, “.insurance”, “.blog”, “.shop”,
“.music”, “.jewelry”, “.app” or “.cloud”, to mention the most commented ones.

**Limited Public Interest Objections**

1. In case of a limited public interest objection, the essential criterion is not to
determine whether or not the application is contrary to the multiple potential interests
of the public who use the global Internet. It is not the mission of the IO to protect
personal or commercial interests of individual Internet users. This particular
objection ground aims at ensuring that no applied-for gTLD string and its intended
use is contrary to fundamental norms of public order and morality that are
recognized under international law.

2. For instance, a limited public interests objection could be triggered in case an
application promote unlawful activities or international crimes, such as child
pornography, sale of counterfeit medicines, slavery, torture or genocide; in case it
dangers international public order or again in case it is obviously against moral
values that have been transcribed in international norms.

3. In its letter dated 31 January 2013, Microsoft argued that applied-for “generic
closed” gTLDs strings “threaten the openness and freedom of the Internet and could
have harmful consequences for Internet users worldwide”.

4. On the issue of the openness and freedom of the Internet, which is the main argument
used by most opponents to “generic closed” gTLDs on the ground of the protection
of the public interest, I acknowledge that there are fundamental principles of
international law which should be protected. This is notably the case of the principle
of freedom of expression, which is given a broad interpretation in international law
as it encompasses the freedom of speech, opinion, expression and access to
information. This freedom applies to the Internet as recalled by the United Nations
Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which “recognizes that
the Internet holds enormous potential for development. It provides an unprecedented
volume of resources for information and knowledge and opens up new opportunities
for expression and participation. UNESCO assumes its responsibility of promoting
freedom of expression on Internet and has integrated it to its regular program. The
principle of freedom of expression must apply not only to traditional media but also
to the Internet and all types of emerging media platforms which will definitely
contribute to development, democracy and dialogue.”

5. I also note that the issue of the openness of the Internet was discussed recently at the
international level. The United Nations Human Rights Council requested the Special
Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and
expression, Frank La Rue, to further explore the issue. However, his reports do not,
either directly or indirectly, address the issue of “closed gTLDs”, or more generally
of the management of the DNS, and refer to “the advantages and challenges of new
information and communications technologies, including the Internet and mobile
technologies, for the exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression,
including the right to seek, receive and impart information and the relevance of a
wide diversity of sources, as well as access to the information society for all”. The
Special Rapporteur’s reports notably address the issues of restrictions of content on
the Internet, the access to the Internet and the necessary infrastructures, and general
principles on the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the Internet.

6. However, while I recognize that certain questions raised by the openness of the
Internet should be in line with fundamental principles of public order and morality
recognized under international law, I also note that these principles are hardly
relevant for the specific issue of “closed generic” gTLDs. Indeed, I have strong
doubts that the question of closed gTLDs is related to the problematic of public
order: the issue might be linked to commercial interests, it is not directly linked with
the freedom of expression.

7. Therefore, whether applicants can benefit from a new gTLD string for their own
use, notwithstanding the general use of the term by the public, does not seem to be an
issue that I could invoke to justify an objection on this ground. Therefore, a limited
public interest objection would not be warranted for those applications, at least on
the ground of the openness of the access to a gTLD.

**Community Objections**

1. For every application I review, I also assess whether a community objection could
be warranted. I examine whether there is a substantial opposition to the gTLD
may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. The communities in question must be strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection.

2. I base my evaluation on four eliminator tests, which are set out in the Applicant Guidebook in order to guide the Expert panels for the evaluation of community objections. The gTLD string must explicitly or implicitly target a specific community. The targeted community must be clearly delineated. I verify if there is a substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community. Finally, I assess whether the application for the gTLD string 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.

3. As for the community test, (the IO determines if the community invoked is a clearly delineated community), the notion of “community” is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s Applicant Guidebook for the new gTLDs program. It can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethnic, religious, linguistic or similar community. Moreover, communities can also be classified in sub-communities (i.e. the Jewish community in New York or the Italian community on Facebook). However, beyond the diversity of communities, there are common definitional elements and a community can be defined as a group of individuals who have something in common (which can include their nationality or place of residence – i.e. the French, South-East Asian or Brazilian community – or a common characteristic – i.e. the disability community), or share common values, interests or goals (i.e. the health or legal community). For the purpose of the IO evaluation, it is clear that what matters is that the community invoked can be clearly delineated, enjoys a certain level of public recognition and encompasses a certain number of people and/or entities.

4. In view of the broad elements of definition mentioned above, and more pertinently in view of the very nature of a “generic term”, it is unlikely that these applications will pass this community test. Of course for a community objection, each application has to be reviewed separately. However, as a general remark and because I have reviewed all applications, it is difficult in these cases to prove the existence of a clearly delineated community. By definition, a “generic term” is a term which is used by a significant number of people, who do not necessarily share similar goals, values or interests. A specific community should distinguish itself from others, precisely by its characteristics or specificities. It cannot be the case for a “generic term” which, by definition, goes beyond specificities as it is used by very different persons. Therefore, while I fully understand the concerns expressed on behalf of the public who use the Internet, the latter cannot be considered as a clearly delineated community. When criteria for this test are not met on this basis, a community objection is not warranted.

5. I have however reviewed all the applications in order to make sure that in each case, no clearly delineated community, generally referring to a particular industry, was substantially opposed to the string and that their interests were not threatened. As a general observation, I have to note that in most cases, such a delineated community does not exist.

6. Taking “book” as an example, the “book industry” and a hypothetical “book community” would encompass a large variety of stakeholders, who do not always share similar primary interests. Thus, it would include authors, publishers, libraries, retailers, readers, etc... In a more inclusive way, we could also include international organizations working, inter alia, for the promotion of culture such as the UNESCO. Therefore, these different stakeholders are difficult to be delineated as a single community since they are of very different nature. Some have the promotion of literature as their primary aim but for many others it is one objective among many others. It is therefore quite doubtful that they represent a clearly delineated community within the meaning of the Applicant Guidebook.

7. Therefore, I note that, in general, for the issue of “closed generic” gTLDs and my possibility to object to the IO on the community ground, it is unlikely that the applications concerned meet the four tests. However, it is important to note that for an assessment on the community ground, each application has to be reviewed separately. The present comment only affirms that a community objection cannot be lodged on behalf of the public who uses the Internet as a whole, which cannot be considered as a clearly delineated community.

8. Moreover, as for my possibility to object to the community ground, it is my clearly explained public policy not to make an objection when a single established institution representing and associated with the community having an interest in an objection can lodge such an objection directly. This does not exclude that I could deem it nevertheless appropriate to file a community objection in exceptional circumstances, in particular if the established institution represents and associated
with the community has compelling reasons not to do so, or if several institutions
could represent a single community and are in the same interest so that an application
could raise issues of priority, or in respect to the modalities of the objection. The
objections I have just filed are based on such assessments.
Annex 10
RUGBY IS A SPECIAL SPORT, WITH ALL THE INGREDIENTS TO BE ONE OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL IN THE WORLD

1.2 RUGBY TODAY

Rugby is a sport that has grown rapidly in popularity in recent years. A recent report shows that 97% of people worldwide have heard of rugby. According to international rugby unions, there are now over 80 million registered players worldwide, with over 100 countries having active rugby teams. Rugby is not only loved by fans, but it is also followed by significant revenue, contributing to the economic growth of many countries.

Currently, the top teams are playing in front of packed stadiums, indicating a strong demand for the sport. Fans from all over the world come together to watch the matches, creating a unique atmosphere that is difficult to replicate in any other sport. Rugby has captured the hearts of fans and continues to grow in popularity, becoming a sport that is enjoyed by people from all walks of life.
12. RUGBY AND THE COMPETITION

Meanwhile, the competition in the field of other sports is heating up. Football (soccer) is enjoying success in Asia, with the FIFA World Cup in South Korea and Japan in 2002, and an increasing number of Asian teams making their mark, such as China's year-old Chinese Super League, which opened in 2004.

The big three: American football, basketball, and baseball appear to be the main competitors in the US, with a strong following. Basketball is also popular, especially in the East, with New York's Madison Square Garden drawing large crowds.

The NFL has given the mid-Winter NFL games more of an international flavor by playing in London, and the American Football League has expanded to Europe, with teams in London and Paris.


13. RUGBY'S MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

In the 1960s, rugby was at its highest point of popularity, and the game was spread globally. However, since the 1970s, rugby has struggled to maintain its momentum, especially in the Americas, where it has not been as popular as in Europe and the UK. The sport has been trying to attract new fans, and efforts have been made to increase the game's visibility in the media.

The Invincible Price of the Olympic Games was paid

The Rugby World Cup, an event without parallel, is held every four years. It is considered the pinnacle of rugby, and the tournament attracts teams from all over the world. In the lead-up to the event, teams often travel to their host nation, and the event is a major event in the rugby calendar.

Since the 1970s, rugby's visibility has been limited, and the sport has struggled to attract new fans. The Invincible Price of the Olympic Games was paid by the sport, as it has missed out on the global appeal of the Games. Rugby is looking to make a comeback, and it is hoped that the sport will gain more visibility in the future.
3.2 FEW RUGBY PLAYERS OUTSIDE CORE MARKETS

Despite its apparent growth, rugby still struggles to attract many players in countries outside the Foundation Unions. According to the IRB, there are more than four million registered players worldwide, but more than half are from England, and over three quarters - 3.3m - come from the eight Foundation Unions overall. Meanwhile, there are less than a quarter of a million players in the ten most populous nations of the world (China, India, USA, Indonesia, Brazil, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Russia, Nigeria, and Japan).

Rugby's footprint does not yet meaningfully touch the world's largest countries; without a concerted effort, it will struggle to achieve truly global status. The total population of rugby's top ten territories (according to the IRB rankings) is 240m. This accounts for fewer than 5% of the world's people, and is less than the population of the USA - let alone India or China. Exhibit 2 combines the population of rugby nations by their IRB ranking to illustrate the population distribution of rugby.


- Top 10 ranked IRB Unions
  - 1-10: Includes Japan (32m) and USA (31m)
  - 11-20: Includes Germany (63m)
  - 21-50: Includes Brazil (106m)
  - 51-100: Includes China (1,331m)
  - Below 50: Includes India (1,099m) and Indonesia (245m)

**Exhibit 1: Rugby Participants by Country Group (2007)**

- England
- Other Foundation Unions
- 10 most populous nations
- Other
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Latest News

Squirrels Take Out Touch in Paris

The 8th edition of Touch in Paris was held on Saturday the 18th May at Giff sur Yvette. Hosted by the local club, Roosters, the tournament was a great success despite the wet weather.

2013 Capital Cup Another Success!

Blue skies, perfect weather and 16 teams from all over Europe graced this year's Capital Cup, hosted by the Berlin Touch Association, as defending champions The Inglorious Basterds won the 2013 Grand Final with a 8-1 victory over Courant d'R from Paris.

Beach Touch in Barcelona!

The Federation of International Touch is pleased to announce the incorporation of Touch into this year's Barcelona Beach Festival; to be held over the period 14-15th June 2013 in Sitges/Villanova i La Geltrú, a lovely village located on the Spanish Costa Brava.

USA Touch Nationals & World Club Open

The 2013 USA Touch Nationals will be held over the period 4-8th of October, and will also incorporate an invitational world club challenge component. The event will comprise Open Mens, Open Women, Open Mixed, and O35 Mens divisions, as well as hoping to conduct a Youth (Under 15) division; and will be held at the ESPN Wide World of Sports Complex at Walt Disney World Resort, near Orlando, Florida.

Asian Club Champs & International Challenge

The 2013 Asian Club Championships & International Club Challenge is a regional tournament that has been staged annually since 2003. The event has been held in Singapore, Kuala Lumpur and Bangkok over past years, with this year's tournament being staged in Malaysia over the period 7-9th June.

We Want YOU!

Is something exciting happening in your neck of the woods? Does your national association have an item that may interest the global Touch community? If so, the Federation of International Touch wants to hear from YOU!

FIT on the Move!

In the modern global environment, people are often on the move and in many cases won't have time to log online on a standard PC... Instead referring to their trusty mobile phone to access the internet. But this doesn't mean you need miss the latest news from FIT.

[click here for archives]
The globalisation of rugby: It's a small world after all | The Economist  http://www.economist.com/blogs/gametheory/2011/10/globalisatio...

Game theory
Sports

The globalisation of rugby
It’s a small world after all
Oct 26th 2011, 18:47 by C.H.

AS BEFITS a game which, legend has it, was invented on the fields of an English public school in 1823, rugby is a game of tradition. And traditions take time to change. It was not until 1995, after years of debate, that rugby became fully professional. A more recent tradition came to an end last weekend, when New Zealand’s All Blacks won the 2011 Rugby World Cup with a narrow victory over an inspired France. The triumph follows 24 years of failure at the tournament by the world’s consistently best team, laying their reputation as “chokers” to rest at last—at least when playing on home soil against the French.

As attention turns to the next tournament, in England and Wales in 2015, other, less noble traditions endure. Despite rugby’s recent pretensions to being a “world” game (the first World Cup was only held in 1987), the sport remains a pretty closed shop at the top level. The list of teams that advanced beyond the tournament’s pool stages went almost exactly according to script, featuring New Zealand, France, Australia, Wales, England, Ireland and South Africa. The only very mild surprise was Argentina pipping Scotland to get into the quarter-finals. Almost 100 countries—a pretty exotic bunch—make up the full membership of the International Rugby Board (IRB), the oval-ball-code’s governing body. But only three teams beyond those nine—Canada, Fiji and Samoa—have ever made it beyond pool play in any of the contests.

That things are tight at the top is not surprising, bearing in mind the resource gap between the top countries, where rugby is a professional game, and the have-nots, where amateurism still rules the day. But despite this, rugby’s secondary powers—the “minnows” (as they tediously tend to be described)—hardly lack muscle. Many of their best players are sought out football-style by clubs in the bigger countries. Sometimes they even sign up for rival national teams—witness Manu Tuilagi, a Samoan, turning out for England while his brother played for Samoa, and Toby Faletau, who hails from Tonga but played for Wales in this year’s World Cup.

And the pool stage in the recent tournament saw some close-run matches. True, there were some drubbings—witness South Africa’s 87-0 smashing of their Namibian neighbours on September 22nd—but the cricket scores of the past (in 2003, Australia
Romania and Georgia before succumbing to Argentina, and Japan gave France a good run. Samoa shook both Wales and South Africa (and beat Australia in the run-up to the tournament). Most dramatic was tiny Tonga’s 15-14 defeat of France, the eventual runners-up, on October 1st, in a game in which both sides played like they meant it.

So, plenty of potential, but still no advancement. The smaller powers were not helped by the pool-stage schedule, in which the playing field was hardly level. Slides like Georgia’s (a classic), Samoa and Tonga found themselves playing both weekend and midweek, while the likes of New Zealand and France lullurated in week-long breaks to maximise weekend television audiences. Small-country players were not shy about expressing their anger, most dramatically Flota Puamau-Samou of Samoa, who went quite feral on Twitter, comparing the quick turnaround between games to the Holocaust. That may have just been a slight overstatement. But the IRB, to its credit, moved quickly, announcing on October 10th that the 2015 World Cup schedule would include mid-week matches for all sides.

The other obstacles faced by the “minnows” may be harder to remove. Outside of World Cup years, they have been hindered by their lack of opportunities to play against the bigger sides. The clubs, on which players rely for their wages, are reluctant to risk injury to their top men by releasing them for duty. And outside of the normal club rounds players also participate in club and provincial competitions, such as the Heineken Cup in the north and the southern Super XV. Meanwhile, top-level international play has been dominated by the Six Nations northern-hemisphere competition (between England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, France and Italy), the Tri-Nations southern one (with New Zealand, Australia and South Africa), and the odd tour in between.

This state of affairs led to discontent as far back as 2003. But there are signs that the IRB—which is proud that the Rugby World Cup is, apparently, the world’s third-largest sporting event in audience terms—is now getting to grips with the problem. It recently gave long-overdue recognition to Argentina. Although rugby remains amateur there, the country’s Pumas finished third in the 2007 World Cup, and gave the All Blacks a testing time in the quarter-final this time around. From 2012 the Tri-Nations will become the Four Nations, with Argentina joining out alongside Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. Thanks to the IRB, northern clubs will release Argentine players for the duration of the competition. The IRB also seems to be getting serious about giving second-tier sides more exposure. Its future plans include a schedule of international rugby tours ahead of the 2019 World Cup in Japan, taking in visits by top-tier countries to the Pacific Islands, North America and Japan in the November and June windows of the year, when other competitions are in hiatus.

The IRB is also making good efforts to close the resource gap, with a strategic investment programme in second-tier countries. This has funded the development of high-performance training centres in Samoa and Georgia—which named rugby its national sport in 2010 as its team strove to qualify for the World Cup. Those two sides, both delivered creditable performances in the tournament.

This is progress, but the 2011 results still point to a long way to go. The effectiveness of the IRB’s actions, and the sincerity of the major rugby powers which dominate the game, will be judged by how far top rugby’s closed shop is allowed to open—for example, whether Samoa steps up alongside Argentina in 2015 or 2019, or whether Georgia joins the European powers to make the Six Nations the Seven.

The best sides should of course be the ones at the top. But change is vital for the long-term health of the game in the professional age. There has been an awful sameness about the international rugby landscape, which comes down to the same countries playing one another, year in and year out. The only relief tends to come every four years in the shape of the World Cup. If that were to decline into simply an expanded version of the annual northern- and southern-hemisphere competitions, with the odd pool-stage upset, all but the most dedicated fans could end up deserting. If the IRB is serious in its goal to take the game global, it needs to keep leading from the front, and to step up the pace.
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About Rugby League International Federation

About RLIF

The Rugby League International Federation (RLIF) is responsible for the Laws of the Game, the development, organisation and governance Rugby League internationally, and for the sport's major international tournaments, the Rugby League World Cup.

The objects of the Rugby League International Federation are to foster, develop, extend, govern and administer the Game of Rugby League throughout the world; and to bring together the Members, Affiliates, Honorary Members and others for the purpose of achieving the above.

Key Documents

3rd August 2010 - (0.27mb)
Rugby Laws Book

3rd August 2010 - (0.4mb)
WADA 2010

Related News

KICK OFF TIMES ANNOUNCED FOR ALL GAMES
Australia | Cook Islands

4 Mar 2013: Tough assignments for Italy in RLWC2013 year

1 Mar 2013: Wales: Exciting times ahead for RLIF

18 Feb 2013: Ukraine RL completes RLIF technical strategy
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Australians are enthusiastic about their sport and have a particular passion for football.

Football (or footy as it is also known) in Australia can mean any one of four codes - Australian Rules football, Association Football (Soccer), Rugby League or Rugby Union. All four codes are team sports.

Australia is home to four professional football codes: Australian Football League (AFL), Australian Rugby Union (ARU), National Rugby League (NRL), and Football Federation Australia (FFA). AFL is the national competition of Australian Rules football and was formed in 1897 in Victoria. ARU is the national governing body for Rugby Union in Australia. NRL is the Australian national competition for Rugby League and FFA is the governing body for soccer in Australia. New South Wales and Queensland have teams represented in all four codes. Tasmania and the Northern Territory are the only state and territory without a football team in any of the four competitions.

The football code an Australian plays or follows is often dictated by where they live, their cultural heritage, or by the code they were taught at school. Endnote 1. Both Rugby Union and Rugby League are most popular in New South Wales and Queensland. Australian Rules football is the dominant form of football in Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory.

Soccer is considered to be the most popular team sport in the world. Endnote 2 and 3 and is played in over 200 countries. Endnote 4. Rugby League is played in more than 30 countries and is most prominent in Australia, England and New Zealand. Rugby Union is also popular in many countries including Australia, England, Wales and Japan.

This article presents results from the 2005-06 Multi-Purpose Household Survey (MPHS) relating to participation in and attendance at these football codes in Australia. Further information can be found in the ABS publications Participation in Sports and Physical Recreation, Australia, 2005-06, (cat. no. 4177.0) and Sports Attendance, Australia, 2005-06, (cat. no. 4174.0).

PARTICIPATION IN MAIN FOOTBALL CODES

A sport participant in this article is defined as a person aged 15 years and over who participated in sports and physical recreation activities as a player or competitor at least once during the 12 months prior to interview in 2005-06. Persons who were involved only as coaches, umpires or club officials are, not included.

Nearly two-thirds (66% or 10.5 million people) of the Australian population aged 15 years and over reported that they had participated in sports and physical recreation activities at least once during the 12 months prior to interview in 2005-06. Walking was the most commonly reported physical recreation activity with 4.0 million people (25%) participating. This was followed by aerobics/fitness (2.0 million or 13%), swimming (1.4 million or 9.0%) and cycling (1.0 million or 6.3%).

Of the four main football codes, soccer (outdoor) was the most popular sport and physical recreation activity among Australians aged 15 years and over with 2.6% of the population participating (419,600). More males participated in this activity (3.9% or 311,500) than females (1.3% or 108,100).

The next most popular football code was Australian Rules football with 268,700 participants and a participation rate of 1.7%. Males had a higher rate of participation in Australian Rules football (240,800 or 3.1%) than females (27,900 or 0.3%).

Even though touch football and soccer (indoor) are not considered as one of the four main football codes their reported participation rates of 1.6% and 1.2% respectively were higher than both Rugby League and Rugby Union (0.6% and 0.5% respectively).

When looking at participation in the football codes by age group the following observations were made from the survey.

The 15-17 year age group recorded the highest number of participants (127,500) for soccer (outdoor) in the 12 months prior to interview as well as the highest participation rate, at 16%. Soccer (outdoor) recorded the highest participation rate in all age groups.

The highest participation rate for Australian Rules football was in the 15-17 year age group with 7.6% or 82,400 participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants, Selected football codes - By age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number ('000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organised activities were defined as those sports and physical recreation activities which were organised by a club or association. Persons may participate in more than one organised activity and may also participate in non-organised activities.

Almost 87% or 66,800 people aged 15 years and over who participated in Rugby Union did so as an activity organised only by a club, association or other organisation during the 12 months prior to interview. Rugby Union reported the highest participation in an organised only capacity followed by Australian Rules football and Rugby League, both with 74%. Soccer (outdoor) reported the highest participation rate in a non-organised only capacity with 32%.

Australian Rules football recorded the highest participation rate in five out of the eight states and territories as well as the highest number of participants in those states and territories. These were Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory. Australian Rules football was less popular in New South Wales, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory.

Participation in soccer (outdoor) had the highest participation rate and the highest number of participants in New South Wales with 4.1% or 219,800 of the population aged 15 years and over. This was more than half of the total participants in Australia (419,600) for soccer (outdoor). The lowest participation rate for soccer (outdoor) was reported in South Australia with 1.4% or 17,200 persons.

When looking at the rate of participation by country of birth, people born overseas in non-English-speaking countries had the highest participation rate for soccer (outdoor) (3.3% or 91,300). This was higher than both the participation rate of people born in Australia and people born overseas in main English-speaking countries (2.5% and 2.0% respectively). People born in Australia had the highest participation rate for Australian Rules football 2.2% or 254,600 persons.

Regular participation was defined as participation undertaken more than twice a week in the 12 months prior to interview. Regular participants in sports and physical recreation activities represented almost half (45%) of all participants (4.7 million people or 29% of the Australian population aged 15 years and over).

The survey found that over one-third of people who were involved in Australian Rules football and soccer (outdoor) activities regularly participated in these sports (0.6% and 0.9% of the population respectively).
ATTENDANCE AT MAIN FOOTBALL CODES

Sport attendance in this article is defined as a person aged 15 years and over who attended at least one sporting event as a spectator (excluding junior and school sport) during the 12 months prior to interview in 2005-06.

Over two-fifths of the Australian population aged 15 years and over (44% or 7.1 million) reported that they attended at least one sporting event during the 12 months before interview in 2005-06.

In 2005-06, Australian Rules football was the sport most attended by Australians aged 15 years and over. It was attended at least once in the 12 months prior to interview by over 2.5 million people or 16% of Australians. Rugby League was the third most attended sport, with 1.5 million people attending at least one Rugby League match in 2005-06 (attendance rate of 9.3%). Rugby Union and soccer (outdoor) were the sixth and seventh most attended sports in Australia. There were 822,000 people (4.3%) who attended Rugby Union and 560,700 people (3.5%) who attended soccer (outdoor).

Other highly attended sports were horse racing which was the second most attended sport with 2.0 million people (13%), while motor sports (9.3%) was equal third with Rugby League and cricket (outdoor) was the fifth most attended sport with 4.6%.

Notably, Australian Rules football, Rugby League and Rugby Union football codes which had high attendance rates had the lowest participation rates (1.7%, 0.6% and 0.5% respectively) of the four football codes.

As previously identified, soccer (outdoor) was the most popular of the football codes participated in by Australians aged 15 years and over with 2.6% (419,600) of the Australian population participating in 2005-06. However, this is not reflected in the attendance as it is the lowest attended football code, with 3.5% or 560,700 people attending.

The attendance rate for Australian Rules football for males was 19% and for females 13%. Almost twice as many males (943,800 or 12%) as females (542,600 or 6.7%) attended Rugby League events during the 12 months prior to interview in 2005-06. A similar ratio was noted in attendance at Rugby Union attendees with males having almost double the attendance levels at these events (449,600 for males compared with 232,400 for females).

Persons attending, Selected football codes - By sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number '000</th>
<th>Males Attendance rate %</th>
<th>Number '000</th>
<th>Females Attendance rate %</th>
<th>Number '000</th>
<th>Persons Attendance rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules football</td>
<td>1,515.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1,011.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2,526.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>943.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>542.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1,486.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>449.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>232.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>682.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (outdoor)</td>
<td>248.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>560.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males in South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria had the highest attendance rates at Australian Rules football (37%, 36% and 35% respectively). Males in New South Wales and Queensland had the highest attendance rates at Rugby League, reporting 22% and 20% respectively.

The highest attendance rates for Australian Rules football were reported in South Australia (31%), Tasmania (30%) and Victoria (28%). People in Queensland and New South Wales reported low attendance rates for Australian Rules football with 7.4% and 4.7% respectively.

Conversely, high rates of attendance for Rugby League were reported for New South Wales (17%), Queensland (16%) and the Australian Capital Territory (14%). Attendance rates in the remaining states and territories were all less than 4%. Not surprisingly, the states and territories that had low attendance rates for Rugby League had the highest attendance rates for Australian Rules football.

Almost half of the people who attended Rugby Union were reported in New South Wales (334,500 people) and over one quarter were reported in Queensland (188,400). However, the highest attendance rate was reported for the Australian Capital Territory with 16%. Again, the lowest attendance rates for Rugby Union were reported in South Australia (0.6%) and Tasmania (0.5%).

The highest attendance rates for soccer (outdoor) were reported in New South Wales (4.8%) and South Australia (4.3%).

Persons attending, Selected football codes(a) - By state and territory

![Attendance rate graph](image-url)
Of the four main football codes, the highest attendance rate was reported for Australian Rules football for all three birthplaces; people born in Australia (19%), people born overseas in main English-speaking countries (12%) and people born overseas in other countries (5.8%).

Both people born overseas in main English-speaking countries and people born in other countries had a higher sports attendance rate for soccer (outdoor) (4.3% and 4.0% respectively) than people born in Australia (3.3%). However, people born overseas in main English-speaking countries had a higher attendance rate for Rugby League and Rugby Union than soccer (outdoor).

Almost two-fifths (39% or 978,600) of people who attended Australian Rules football matches did so one or two times during the 12 months prior to interview. A further 34% (868,400) attended this sport on six or more occasions.

The next most attended sport from the four selected football codes was Rugby League. Over two-fifths (44% or 848,600) of people attended Rugby League matches one or two times during the reference period and a further 29% attended three to five times.

Of those people who attended Rugby Union, more than half (55% or 375,800) attended one or two times during the 12 month period and a further 27% attended three to five times.

Over two-fifths (42% or 236,400) people attended soccer (outdoor) matches one or two times in the 12 month period and over a third (34% or 188,000) attended six or more times.

Out of the four selected football codes, Rugby Union and Rugby League had the highest number of people who attended matches one or two times during the 12 months prior to interview (55% and 44% respectively). Both Australian Rules football and soccer (outdoor) had the highest number of people who attended matches on six or more occasions during the 12 months prior to interview (both 34%).

### Frequency of attendance, Selected football codes - By sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th></th>
<th>3-5 times</th>
<th></th>
<th>6 times or more</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number '000</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Number '000</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Number '000</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Number '000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules football</td>
<td>559.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>415.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>599.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1,515.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>397.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>273.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>273.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>943.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>241.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>139.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>449.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (outdoor)</td>
<td>136.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>348.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules football</td>
<td>418.8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>269.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>328.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>1,011.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>251.1</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>542.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>232.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (outdoor)</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>212.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules football</td>
<td>978.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>678.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>868.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>2,526.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>648.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>435.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>405.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1,499.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>375.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>180.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>682.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (outdoor)</td>
<td>236.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>500.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENDNOTES
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Hi Geir,

Thanks for your response. No hurry on a call. I just wanted to reach out to grant you the courtesy of a call in order to alert you to the global public campaign that FIBA and IRB will launch against Famous Four Media in opposition to your application for .basketball and .rugby. This public campaign will follow quickly on the heels of the early warnings issued against Famous Four Media by the governments of Greece and Great Britain. You will be in receipt shortly of a letter from the heads of the respective International Federations.

Best,

Brady

Please excuse typos
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Richard, Jon and Mason,

Thank you for joining us for the call on Monday. We appreciate your time and our discussion. The purpose of this email is to send you more information about our company, and provide some thoughts in response to our discussion.

About Roar Domains

Roar Domains has partnered with the Internet Basketball Federation (FIBA) and International Rugby Board (IRB) to apply for and run .BASKETBALL and .RUGBY. On the phone on Monday, as you know, were Ryan Nelsen, Brady Bohrmann, Lara Meiners, and our attorney Kathy Kleiman. Ryan Nelsen is a New Zealand soccer player, currently playing in the English Premier League for Queens Park Rangers. He also captains the New Zealand national team. Brady Bohrmann is the Managing Director of Avalon Ventures, an early stage venture capital fund and has over 20 years of experience as a venture capitalist. Lara Meiners is a consultant with Roar Domains, managing all aspects of the new gTLD process.

Both Ryan and Brady are Roar Directors. They are deeply connected to FIBA and IRB, and deeply committed to the task ahead.

Roar Domains Speaks for FIBA and IRB in the New gTLD Area

Roar serves as the voice and arm for FIBA and IRB in the New gTLD area. We are pleased to have obtained four Early Warnings on behalf of our applications, and fully expect the GAC process to be completed to GAC Advice. The leadership of FIBA, with its 213 national basketball federations, and IRB with its 118 member unions, is well-known and well-respected. We thoroughly expect the concerns of Greece and the UK GAC members to resonate with other GAC members and Ministries of Sport worldwide. Stewardship and trust in the basketball and rugby communities are issues we find fully resonate in every arena in which we share them.

As the GAC moves towards GAC Advice, Ministries of Sport around the world will be contacted and are likely to become involved on the New gTLD sporting issues. In that case, Domains may find that additional sporting TLD applications are at risk as GAC may choose to adopt a broad principle for the protection of sporting trust and stewardship – one that extends beyond BASKETBALL and RUGBY to new gTLD strings including BASEBALL, FOOTBALL, SOCCER and FUTBOL. It is hard to predict how far GAC might go.

As part of the GAC Advice process, we will be reaching out to other international
sporting federations for their support. This outreach may raise a broader set of concerns and opposition as international sporting federations awaken to fast-developing New gTLD process. Donuts may find that it faces an additional set of oppositions and objections.

Further, while we have no desire to join the chorus of voices speaking out against Donuts, it is incumbent on us to pursue the automatic disqualification of Applicant Guidebook Section 1.2.1, and every opposition and objection process available to us. As we stated, we have only two strings, and you have applied for 307.

We strongly recommend and request that Donuts withdraw its applications from the .BASKETBALL and .RUGBY strings. We have no intention of backing down, and generic intellectual property and security protections simply do not provide the protection, services, policies and perspectives our international basketball and rugby communities require.

Please feel free to contact us to continue this discussion, or to take unilateral action to withdraw the applications and receive a refund on application fees.

Best,
Roar Domains, LLC
Annex 16
I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Beijing during the week of 4 April 2013. Sixty-one (61) GAC Members participated in the meetings and eight (8) Observers. The GAC expresses warm thanks to the local hosts China Internet Network Information Center (CNNIC), China Organizational Name Administration Center (CONAC), and Internet Society of China for their support.

II. Internal Matters

1. New Members and Observers

   The GAC welcomes Belarus, Cape Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, Lebanon, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to the Committee as members, and The World Meteorological Organisation as an Observer.

2. GAC Secretariat

   Following a request for proposals, the GAC received presentations from two organizations and agreed that one such candidate should be providing secretariat services to the GAC, with the aim of becoming operational as soon as possible. Negotiations with such organization will start immediately after the Beijing meeting.

---

To access previous GAC advice, whether on the same or other topics, past GAC communiqués are available at:  
https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Recent+Meetings  and older GAC communiqués are available at:  
https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Meetings+Archive.
3. **GAC Leadership**

The GAC warmly thanks the outgoing Vice-Chairs, Kenya, Singapore, and Sweden and welcomes the incoming Vice-Chairs, Australia, Switzerland and Trinidad & Tobago.

### III. Inter-constituencies Activities

1. **Meeting with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT 2)**

The GAC met with the ATRT 2 and received an update on the current activities of the ATRT 2. The exchange served as an information gathering session for the ATRT 2 in order to hear GAC member views on the Review Team processes and areas of interest for governments. The GAC provided input on governmental processes and the challenges and successes that arose during the first round of reviews, and implementation of the GAC related recommendations of the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team.

2. **Board/GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG)**

The Board–GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI–WG) met to discuss further developments on ATRT1 recommendations relating to the GAC, namely recommendations 11 and 12. In the context of Recommendation 11, the GAC and the Board have concluded the discussion and agreed on the details of the consultation process mandated per ICANN Bylaws, should the Board decide not to follow a GAC advice. With respect to Recommendation 12, on GAC Early Engagement, the BGRI-WG had a good exchange with the GNSO on mechanisms for the GAC to be early informed and provide early input to the GNSO PDP. The BGRI–WG intends to continue this discussion intersessionally and at its next meeting in Durban.

3. **Brand Registry Group**

The GAC met with the Brand Registry Group and received information on its origins, values and missions.

4. **Law Enforcement**

The GAC met with law enforcement representatives and received an update from Europol on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA).

***

The GAC warmly thanks the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2, the Brand Registry Group, Law Enforcement, and the ICANN Board who jointly met with the GAC as well
as all those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with the GAC in Beijing.

IV. GAC Advice to the ICANN Board

1. New gTLDs
   a. GAC Objections to Specific Applications
      i. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:
         1. The application for .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)
         2. The application for .gcc (application number: 1-1936-2101)
      ii. With regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook:
         1. The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.
   b. Safeguard Advice for New gTLDs
      To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns the GAC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of strings (see Annex I).
   c. Strings for Further GAC Consideration
      In addition to this safeguard advice, that GAC has identified certain gTLD strings where further GAC consideration may be warranted, including at the GAC meetings to be held in Durban.
      i. Consequently, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings: .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin

---

2 To track the history and progress of GAC Advice to the Board, please visit the GAC Advice Online Register available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Recent+Meetings
3 Module 3.1: “The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.
4 Module 3.1: “The GAC advises ICANN that there are concerns about a particular application “dot-example.” The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns. The ICANN Board is also expected to provide a rationale for its decision.
d. The GAC requests:
   i. a written briefing about the ability of an applicant to change the string applied for in order to address concerns raised by a GAC Member and to identify a mutually acceptable solution.

e. Community Support for Applications

   The GAC advises the Board:
   i. that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information.

f. Singular and plural versions of the same string as a TLD

   The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to potential consumer confusion.

   Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to:
   i. Reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.

g. Protections for Intergovernmental Organisations

   The GAC stresses that the IGOs perform an important global public mission with public funds, they are the creations of government under international law, and their names and acronyms warrant special protection in an expanded DNS. Such protection, which the GAC has previously advised, should be a priority.

   This recognizes that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders, warranting special protection by ICANN in the DNS, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation.

   The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues and commits to actively working with IGOs, the Board, and ICANN Staff to find a workable and timely way forward.

   Pending the resolution of these implementation issues, the GAC reiterates its advice to the ICANN Board that:
   i. appropriate preventative initial protection for the IGO names and acronyms on the provided list be in place before any new gTLDs would launch.
2. **Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)**

Consistent with previous communications to the ICANN Board

a. **the GAC advises the ICANN Board that:**

   i. the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.

The GAC also strongly supports the amendment to the new gTLD registry agreement that would require new gTLD registry operators to use only those registrars that have signed the 2013 RAA.

The GAC appreciates the improvements to the RAA that incorporate the 2009 GAC-Law Enforcement Recommendations.

The GAC is also pleased with the progress on providing verification and improving accuracy of registrant data and supports continuing efforts to identify preventative mechanisms that help deter criminal or other illegal activity. Furthermore the GAC urges all stakeholders to accelerate the implementation of accreditation programs for privacy and proxy services for WHOIS.

3. **WHOIS**

The GAC urges the ICANN Board to:

   a. ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are duly taken into account by the recently established Directory Services Expert Working Group.

The GAC stands ready to respond to any questions with regard to the GAC Principles.

The GAC also expects its views to be incorporated into whatever subsequent policy development process might be initiated once the Expert Working Group concludes its efforts.

4. **International Olympic Committee and Red Cross /Red Crescent**

Consistent with its previous communications, **the GAC advises the ICANN Board to:**

   a. amend the provisions in the new gTLD Registry Agreement pertaining to the IOC/RCRC names to confirm that the protections will be made permanent prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs.
5. Public Interest Commitments Specifications

The GAC requests:

b. more information on the Public Interest Commitments Specifications on the basis of the questions listed in annex II.

V. Next Meeting

The GAC will meet during the period of the 47th ICANN meeting in Durban, South Africa.
ANNEX I

Safeguards on New gTLDs

The GAC considers that Safeguards should apply to broad categories of strings. For clarity, this means any application for a relevant string in the current or future rounds, in all languages applied for.

The GAC advises the Board that all safeguards highlighted in this document as well as any other safeguard requested by the ICANN Board and/or implemented by the new gTLD registry and registrars should:

- be implemented in a manner that is fully respectful of human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in international and, as appropriate, regional declarations, conventions, treaties and other legal instruments – including, but not limited to, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- respect all substantive and procedural laws under the applicable jurisdictions.
- be operated in an open manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination.

Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs

The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.

1. **WHOIS verification and checks** — Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in its gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will weight the sample towards registrars with the highest percentages of deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete records in the previous checks. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during the checks, triggering the registrar’s obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.

2. **Mitigating abusive activity** — Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

3. **Security checks** — While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. If Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.
4. **Documentation**—Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and actions taken as a result of its periodic WHOIS and security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.

5. **Making and Handling Complaints** — Registry operators will ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate or promote malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

6. **Consequences** — Consistent with applicable law and any related procedures, registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of the requirement that the domain name should not be used in breach of applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the domain name.

The following safeguards are intended to apply to particular categories of new gTLDs as detailed below.

**Category 1**

**Consumer Protection, Sensitive Strings, and Regulated Markets:**

The GAC Advises the ICANN Board:

- Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. The following safeguards should apply to strings that are related to these sectors:

  1. Registry operators will include in its acceptable use policy that registrants comply with all applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection, consumer protection (including in relation to misleading and deceptive conduct), fair lending, debt collection, organic farming, disclosure of data, and financial disclosures.
  2. Registry operators will require registrars at the time of registration to notify registrants of this requirement.
  3. Registry operators will require that registrants who collect and maintain sensitive health and financial data implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of those services, as defined by applicable law and recognized industry standards.
  4. Establish a working relationship with the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies, including developing a strategy to mitigate as much as possible the risks of fraudulent, and other illegal, activities.
5. Registrants must be required by the registry operators to notify to them a single point of contact which must be kept up-to-date, for the notification of complaints or reports of registration abuse, as well as the contact details of the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies in their main place of business.

In the current round the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that the above safeguards should apply to:

- **Children:**
  - .kid, .kids, .kinder, .game, .games, .juegos, .play, .school, .schule, .toys

- **Environmental:**
  - .earth, .eco, .green, .bio, .organic

- **Health and Fitness:**
  - .care, .diet, .fit, .fitness, .health, .healthcare, .heart, .hiv, .hospital, .med, .medical, .organic, .pharmacy, .rehab, .surgery, .clinic, .healthy (IDN Chinese equivalent), .dental, .dentist .doctor, .dds, .physio

- **Financial:**

- **Gambling:**
  - .bet, .bingo, .lotto, .poker, and .spreadbetting, .casino

- **Charity:**
  - .care, .gives, .giving, .charity (and IDN Chinese equivalent)

- **Education:**
  - degree, .mba, .university

- **Intellectual Property**
  - .audio, .book (and IDN equivalent), .broadway, .film, .game, .games, .juegos, .movie, .music, .software, .song, .tunes, .fashion (and IDN equivalent), .video, .app, .art, .author, .band, .beats, .cloud (and IDN equivalent), .data, .design, .digital, .download, .entertainment, .fan, .fans, .free, .gratis, .discount, .sale, .hiphop, .media, .news, .online, .pictures, .radio, .rip, .show, .theater, .theatre, .tour, .tours, .tvs, .video, .zip

- **Professional Services:**
  - .abogado, .accountant, .accountants, .architect, .associates, .attorney, .broker, .brokers, .cpa, .doctor, .dentist, .dds, .engineer, .lawyer, .legal, .realtor, .realty, .vet

- **Corporate Identifiers:**
  - .corp, .gmbh, .inc, .limited, .llc, .llp, .ltda, .ltd, .sarl, .srl, .sal

- **Generic Geographic Terms:**
  - .town, .city, .capital
• .reise, .reisen
• .weather
• .engineering
• .law
• Inherently Governmental Functions
  o .army, .navy, .airforce
• In addition, applicants for the following strings should develop clear policies and processes to
  minimise the risk of cyber bullying/harassment
  o .fail, .gripe, .sucks, .wtf

The GAC further advises the Board:

1. In addition, some of the above strings may require further targeted safeguards, to address
   specific risks, and to bring registry policies in line with arrangements in place offline. In
   particular, a limited subset of the above strings are associated with market sectors which have
   clear and/or regulated entry requirements (such as: financial, gambling, professional services,
   environmental, health and fitness, corporate identifiers, and charity) in multiple jurisdictions,
   and the additional safeguards below should apply to some of the strings in those sectors:

   6. At the time of registration, the registry operator must verify and validate the registrants’
      authorisations, charters, licenses and/or other related credentials for participation in
      that sector.

   7. In case of doubt with regard to the authenticity of licenses or credentials, Registry
      Operators should consult with relevant national supervisory authorities, or their
      equivalents.

   8. The registry operator must conduct periodic post-registration checks to ensure
      registrants’ validity and compliance with the above requirements in order to ensure
      they continue to conform to appropriate regulations and licensing requirements and
      generally conduct their activities in the interests of the consumers they serve.

Category 2

Restricted Registration Policies

The GAC advises the ICANN Board:

1. Restricted Access
   o As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open
     manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1

---

5 Austria, Germany, and Switzerland support requirements for registry operators to develop registration policies
that allow only travel-related entities to register domain names. Second Level Domains should have a connection
to travel industries and/or its customers
above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be appropriate for the types of risks associated with the TLD. The registry operator should administer access in these kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.

2. Exclusive Access
   • For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.

   • In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access

     • .antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts, .クラウド [cloud], .ストア [store], .セール [sale], .ファッション [fashion], .家電 [consumer electronics], .手表 [watches], .書籍 [book], .珠宝 [jewelry], .通販 [online shopping], .食品 [food]
ANNEX II

List of questions related to Public Interest Commitments Specifications

1. Could a third party intervene or object if it thinks that a public interest commitment is not being followed? Will governments be able to raise those sorts of concerns on behalf of their constituents?

2. If an applicant does submit a public interest commitment and it is accepted are they able to later amend it? And if so, is there a process for that?

3. What are ICANN’s intentions with regard to maximizing awareness by registry operators of their commitments?

4. Will there be requirements on the operators to maximize the visibility of these commitments so that stakeholders, including governments, can quickly determine what commitments were made?

5. How can we follow up a situation where an operator has not made any commitments? What is the process for amending that situation?

6. Are the commitments enforceable, especially later changes? Are they then going into any contract compliance?

7. How will ICANN decide whether to follow the sanctions recommended by the PIC DRP? Will there be clear and transparent criteria? Based on other Dispute Resolution Procedures what is the expected fee level?

8. If serious damage has been a result of the past registration policy, will there be measures to remediate the harm?
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Highlights

- More than 5 million people play rugby in over 117 countries.
- Participation in rugby worldwide has increased 19% since the last Rugby World Cup in 2007.
- Participation figures are highest in Europe, but there are significant numbers of players elsewhere, with increasing numbers in emerging markets.
- Since 2007 participation has grown by 33% in Africa, 22% in South America and 16% in Asia and North America.
- In terms of participation, Japan, Sri Lanka and Argentina now feature in the top ten countries, which bodes well as there is a strong, positive correlation between participation and performance.
- These unprecedented levels of growth can be attributed to three main factors:
  - Developments in non-traditional game formats, particularly Sevens Rugby's inclusion in the Olympic program from 2016.
  - Event hosting strategies often with linked legacy programs.
  - IRB programs and investment. £153 million (USD240.6 million) is being invested from 2009 to 2012, an increase of 20% over the previous funding cycle.

Introduction

Following Six Nations and Tri Nations reports, MasterCard commissioned the Centre for the International Business of Sport (CIBS) to look at rugby in emerging markets. This report provides an introduction to some key markets for rugby, offering insight into the development of the game in non-traditional areas.

While traditionally rugby has been concentrated in relatively small pockets, it is widely accepted that the future strength and development of the sport is dependent on achieving a higher level of competitive balance between the developed and emerging rugby nations.

There are currently over 5 million rugby players in 117 countries and the IRB is committed to continue to inspire new generations to play and watch the sport. With worldwide growth of over 19% since 2007, the game is in a healthy state with participation now spreading through new territories and across demographics in emerging markets. With participation growth paramount to the diffusion and popularity of the game, the IRB is investing £153 million (USD245.6 million) between 2009 – 2012 through strategic programs and union grants to focus specifically on increasing participation, performance, recruitment and retention of players.

Worldwide rugby development is primarily funded by Rugby World Cup revenue, which accounts for 95% of all money distributed by the IRB for development. Funds available for investment have therefore increased significantly as RWC has grown and developed as a commercial property, becoming the world’s third largest sporting event, behind only the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup.

These huge increases have also been linked to revenue generation with a $1 billion (USD1.6 billion) surplus in 1997 rising to $1.224 billion (USD1.965 billion) in 2007. The IRB is investing in targeted high performing initiatives in 22 countries with an investment of $48 million (USD77 million) over the period 2009-2012, to its annual expenditure on annual Union grants, tournament funding and education and training program expenditure. Annual expenditure has increased 20% from $10 million (USD16 million) to $12 million (USD19.27 million) per year, two-thirds of which funds high performance initiatives in Tier 2 and 3 nations.
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Japan to Host IRB Pacific Nations Cup 2011

December 15, 2010 - 1:31pm

Japan’s preparations to host Rugby World Cup 2019 have been given a further boost after the International Rugby Board announced that the Japan Rugby Football Union (JRFU) will host the IRB Pacific Nations Cup 2011.

The sixth IRB Pacific Nations Cup tournament, now an established event on the annual Rugby calendar, will feature an exciting blend of local rivalry and competitive action, with an extra dimension as Fiji, Japan, Samoa and Tonga look to gain advantage ahead of Rugby World Cup 2011 in New Zealand.

Samoa will defend the title they won for the first time on home soil last year as the single-host format continues. All six IRB Pacific Nations Cup 2011 matches will be played at the Prince Chichibu Memorial Rugby Ground in Tokyo between July 2-13, providing fans with three double-header match days and the ability to see some of the world’s most exciting players in action before they head to New Zealand.

“Rugby in Asia is continuing to go from strength to strength and the IRB is delighted to award this major international tournament to Japan and a Union that has been at the very heart of this growth,” said IRB Chairman Bernard Lapasset.

“Japan staged an exceptional IRB Junior World Championship and is preparing to host the first ever Rugby World Cup in Asia. The single-hosting format of the IRB Pacific Nations Cup has proved extremely popular, allowing a greater platform for broadcast and media coverage, attendances, training and legacy programmes. I have no doubt that the 2011 tournament will be a resounding success.”

Tonga will play Fiji on the opening day while hosts Japan take on champions Samoa. Both corresponding fixtures in last year’s tournament produced thrilling matches as Fiji defeated Tonga by just three points — one of the tournament matches to be decided by a margin of three points or less — and the Brave Blossoms secured a 31-23 victory over the eventual winners.

For the JRFU, the announcement adds to the expanding portfolio of international Rugby tournaments awarded to Japan after they played host to a record-breaking IRB Junior World Championship in 2009.

Hosting the IRB Pacific Nations Cup 2011 will give a further boost to the exposure of the Game across Asia as Japan looks ahead to Rugby World Cup 2019 and a tournament aimed at bringing together the Asian Rugby family for a unique celebration of world-class Rugby across the continent.

“It is an honour to solo host the very important and prestigious IRB Pacific Nations Cup and we are grateful to the IRB for deciding to hold it next July in Tokyo. We look forward to welcoming all the participating Unions, Fiji, Samoa and Tonga and we would also love to see Rugby fans from all the corners of the globe,” said IRB President and Chairman of the Japan Rugby Football Union Nobby Masahiro.

“We are very confident that it will be a great success and that the players, teams, management and spectators will thoroughly enjoy their stay in Tokyo where tradition and modernism so vividly co-exist.”

“The sixth IRB Pacific Nations Cup is an ideal occasion to showcase the potential of the Rugby market in Japan, the enthusiasm of Japanese rugby fans and the ability of the Brave Blossoms. The Tournament will give the world Rugby family a glimpse of what lies ahead for Rugby World Cup 2019. See you next July here in Tokyo!” added Masahiro.

IRB Regional General Manager for Oceania Will Glenwright added: “The IRB Pacific Nations Cup 2011 is set to be the most exciting and competitive to date, with the tournament providing vital international matches for the Pacific Islands and Japan as they prepare for Rugby World Cup 2011 and also for their longer term development towards Rugby World Cup 2015 and 2019.”

“The tournament has become of vital importance to both the Oceania and Asia region and offers a wonderful opportunity to develop players, match officials and structures for all the Unions involved. It was hugely encouraging to see the much-improved performance of these nations during the recent November Test window.”

The tournament will also throw up two tasters for Rugby World Cup 2011 where Tonga will meet Pool A rivals Japan on Wednesday, September 21 in Whangarei before Fiji take on Samoa in their Pool D clash on September 25 in Auckland.

Notes to editors:

Since the latest round of Strategic Investment Funding was introduced in 2009, the IRB has committed a total of £3.05 million to the four Unions involved in the IRB Pacific Nations Cup for their High Performance Programmes and a further £2.5 million for the staging of both the IRB Pacific Nations Cup and the Pacific Rugby Cup in the region to increase global competitiveness.
The IRB Pacific Nations Cup has been staged five times, and prior to the 2010 edition featured representative teams from New Zealand and Australia, namely the Junior All Blacks, New Zealand Maori and Australia A. In 2010, the tournament was contested by Samoa, Fiji, Japan and Tonga (in their finishing order) with all but one match staged at Apia Park.

Asia and the Pacific Islands are strategically important areas for the IRB. In Asia, the IRB collaborates with the Asian Rugby Football Union (ARFU) to invest over US$3 million annually in development, high performance and tournament programmes across the Region. In addition, the IRB is working directly with respective National Olympic Committees to ensure all the processes are in place for the continued growth of the sport throughout Asia.

Further Information:

Andrea Wiggins, IRB Communications Manager, +353 86 040 3950, email andrea.wiggins@irb.com

check out some images of the Oceania Sevens.

Oceania Sevens 2010 gallery.
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New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Rugby Limited

String: rugby
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1206-66762

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Rugby Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Wasserfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1990

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PCC Limited

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>Charles Ashley Richard Melville</th>
<th>Chief Operating Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tania Simon Roache</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy James Irwin</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

| Domain Venture Partners SCC Limited | Not Applicable |

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.

rugby

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

14(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.

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

14(d). If an IDN, provide the script of the label (in English).

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

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

15(a). If an IDN, Attach IDN Tables for the proposed registry.

Attachements are not displayed on this form.

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

15(c). List any variant strings to the applied-for gTLD string according to the relevant IDN tables.

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

The Applicant has taken steps to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string (the "String"). The following has been undertaken:

a) The String label is valid as specified in relevant technical standards, including: Domain Names: Implementation and Specification (RFC 1035), and Clarifications to the DNS Specification (RFC 3111) and any updates thereon.
c) The TLD label is a valid host name, as specified in RFC 1034, Domain Name System (DNS) Basic Specification. Requirements for the DNS (RFC 1034), and Requirements for Internet Hosts — Application and Support (RFC 1123), and Application Techniques for Checking and Transformation of Names (RFC 1369), internationalised Domain Names in Applications (IDNA) (RFCs 5890-5894), and any updates thereof.

d) The TLD label consists entirely of letters (a-z).

The Applicant has evaluated the risks of the TLD experiencing acceptance issues similar to problems reported in the “Evaluation of the New gTLDs: Policy and Legal Issues” (31/08/2004) which discussed acceptance issues associated with the year 2000 round of new gTLDs, with the exception of three characters, which would affect a level where issues might occur. Should Registrars experience any acceptance issues the Applicant will have a dedicated Operational and Rendering Team (“ORT”) on an ongoing basis to assist with operational, rendering issues or any other problems that might arise. The ORT will be in place to assist Registrars with any additional problems that may arise out of new gTLD policy, and to ensure that other applicants would be able to address the new process which could lead to unforeseen string contention now and in the future.

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

Mission/Purpose

18(a). Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

Q18A
Mission and Purpose of .rugby?

The Applicant’s mission and purpose is to create an environment where individuals and community can interact and express themselves in ways never before seen on the Internet, in a more targeted, secure and stable environment. Its aim is to become the premier online destination for rugby players and its wide range of players. The Applicant will create an Internet space where rugby can thrive. Users can access the benefits of a safe, stable and dedicated space for the rugby sector. As the new space is dedicated to those within this affinity group the Applicant will ensure that consumer trust is promoted. Consequently consumer choice will be driven by the responsibilities of rugby-related enterprises to provide a high-quality service and experience. All stakeholders within the sector will be able to sample innovations to new ideas, or gather thoughts on the improvements of established ones. This will drive innovation and competition within the rugby sector as there will be new channels available. This new environment will cause registrants to seek new ways to separate themselves from the competition.

How will .rugby take shape?

The Applicant believes that the success of the TLD will be determined largely by the sector’s key global stakeholders. These stakeholders will be interested in registering a domain and additionally be motivated to protect their sector from detrimental practices. The Applicant believes that stakeholders should have the opportunity to influence the TLD and the way it is governed. Accordingly, the Applicant is establishing a Governance Council ("GCO"), consisting of key stakeholders that will serve as an advisory body.

Q18B
Why .rugby?

The Applicant believes that rugby is a great leveler. Given the chance, anyone - from the poorest child to the world’s richest man - can play rugby. Passion is the essence of rugby, and we hope to capture this within .rugby largely using the valuable platform presented by the Internet.

Since its inception the Internet has revolutionised the way we communicate, empowered hundreds of millions with knowledge and created a platform where global commerce can thrive. However, access to the countless benefits and opportunities which the Internet offers can often be hindered when navigating the ever-expanding sea of irrelevant and sometimes malicious content which also exists.

Thus, the aim of .rugby is to create a blank canvas for the online rugby sector set within a secure environment. The Applicant will achieve this by creating a consolidated, versatile and dedicated space for the rugby sector. As the new space is dedicated to those within this affinity group the Applicant will ensure that consumer trust is promoted. Consequently consumer choice will be driven by the responsibilities of rugby-related enterprises to provide a high-quality service and experience. All stakeholders within the sector will be able to sample innovations to new ideas, or gather thoughts on the improvements of established ones. This will drive innovation and competition within the rugby sector as there will be new channels available. This new environment will cause registrants to seek new ways to separate themselves from the competition.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the TLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.

Information for future studies and reviews

The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Consensus ("AoC"). To gauge the success of the gTLD, the Applicant recognises that an AoC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board has formed a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and possible options for the future TLD team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD policy, and applicable national law.
Annex 20
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

**SPECIFICATION 11**

**PUBLIC INTEREST COMMITMENTS**

1. Registry Operator will use only ICANN accredited registrars that are party to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on [date to be determined at time of contracting], 2013 (or any subsequent form of Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors) in registering domain names. A list of such registrars shall be maintained by ICANN on ICANN’s website.

2. Registry Operator will operate the registry for the TLD in compliance with all commitments, statements of intent and business plans stated in the following sections of Registry Operator’s application to ICANN for the TLD, which commitments, statements of intent and business plans are hereby incorporated by reference into this Agreement. Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to this paragraph shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process established by ICANN ((posted at [url to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]), as it may be amended by ICANN from time to time, the “PICDRP”). Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

The Registry Operator appreciates the opportunity to restate and once again commit to the following operational measures, where those matters are within its control, as outlined in our application. We reserve the right to amend or change this PIC Spec once the details of the Program are finalized.

In addition to the ICANN mandated minimum mechanisms, the Registry Operator will deploy the following to prevent and mitigate domain name abuse and aid in rights protection:

**Abuse Prevention and Mitigation plan:** The Registry Operator will be implementing a thorough and extensive Abuse Prevention and Mitigation plan as outlined in our response to Question 28. The APM plan is designed to minimise abusive registrations and other detrimental activities that may negatively impact internet users. This plan includes the establishment of 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 gTLD through all Registrars of record, including those involving a reseller.

**Additional Mechanism for Protection of Capital City Names:** The Registry Operator will implement an additional mechanism for protection of Capital City Names as outlined in section 6.1 of our response to Question 28. The Capital City Claim will grant additional protection to the capital city names of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

**Additional Mechanisms to Protect and Reserve IGO Names:** The Registry Operator will implement Additional Mechanisms to Protect and Reserve IGO Names as outlined in section 6.2 of our response to Question 28. The Registry Operator considers the Protection of Intergovernmental Organization ("IGO") names to be very important. The Registry Operator will use strings registered as second level domains in the .int gTLD as the basis for this protection but the Registry Operator has committed to working with the GAC to protect a future list of IGO names which the GAC may prepare.

**Acceptable Use Policy:** The Registry Operator will develop an Acceptable Use Policy as described in section 14 of our response to Question 28. This Acceptable Use Policy gives the Registry the ability to
quickly lock, cancel, transfer or take ownership of any domain name, either temporarily or permanently, if the domain name is being used in a manner that appears to threaten the stability, integrity or security of the Registry, or any of its Registrar partners and/or that may put the safety and security of any Registrant or user at risk. The process also allows the Registry to take preventive measures to avoid any such criminal or security threats.

**Right Protection Mechanisms:** The Registry Operator is firmly committed to the protection of Intellectual Property rights and to implementing the mandatory RPMs contained in the Registry Operator Guidebook and detailed in Specification 7 of the Registry Agreement. Use of domain names that infringe upon the legal rights of others in the gTLD will not be tolerated and preventing abusive registrations is a core objective of the Registry Operator.

**WHOIS Accuracy:** The Registry Operator will undertake efforts to promote WHOIS Accuracy as outlined in section 5 of our response to Question 29. This will include searchable WHOIS and Audits.

The Registry Operator is committed to ensuring that those domain names associated with abuse or malicious conduct in violation of the AUP are dealt with in a timely and decisive manner. These include taking action against those domain names that are being used to threaten the stability and security of the gTLD, or are part of a real-time investigation by law enforcement. Certain of the above commitments referenced in Question 28 and 29 will require the cooperation of the Registrar channel and the Registry Operator commits to using commercially reasonable efforts to ensure such cooperation.

Our discussions with various governments to resolve early warnings continue and we reserve right to amend or change this PIC Spec once these discussions successfully conclude.

3. Registry Operator agrees to perform following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the PICDRP. Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

Our discussions with various governments to resolve early warnings continue and we reserve right to amend or change this PIC Spec once these discussions successfully conclude.
Annex 21
Welcome to the dot Rugby Governance Council!

The .Rugby Governance Council exists to provide a voice to the Internet community interested in the .Rugby generic top level domain (gTLD). When ICANN launched its new gTLD initiative years ago, corporations, governments, and other industry stakeholders expressed a desire to see mechanisms in place to ensure that key stakeholders had a voice in marshaling new gTLDs when launched. The .Rugby Governance Council has been created to provide this voice for the .Rugby TLD. It does not exist to dictate which domains may exist on a TLD, nor to censor content. Rather, the Governance Council and its elected Board will monitor, advise, and recommend best practices, including but not limited to the Abuse Prevention and Mitigation (APM) Seal reporting system, intellectual property rights protection, TLD rules, reserved second-level domain names, certification or authentication programs, and ensuring compliance with ICANN rules. Its Board will be comprised of 5-11 individuals selected by the industry and supported by an independent management company tasked with aiding in the Governance Council’s self-governance. The result will be that the .Rugby community—and interested governments around the world—can be sure that the .Rugby TLD is appropriately supported by the Internet community. Interested parties are encouraged to apply.

Recently Published Documentation

Once the .Rugby Governance Council is active, documentation will be published for Governance Council members to review and comment on. Additionally, a document archive will be maintained for historical tracking purposes. Please check back once this Governance Council goes live, likely toward the end of 2013 or early 2014.

Documentation containing proposals will typically be approved by the Board and then posted for a comment period to allow the entire Governance Council to provide feedback. Minutes of Board meetings and other relevant documentation will be posted for Governance Council access. The purpose is to ensure an appropriate feedback mechanism whereby the entire TLD community has the opportunity to get involved.

Want to get involved?

If you are a member of the .Rugby community and have an interest in participating on the .Rugby Governance Council and/or Board of Directors, please self-nominate yourself by completing all forms below. Participation in the Governance Council and/or Board of Directors requires acceptance of the Terms & Conditions (next screen), and you will be informed via email of next steps once the self-nomination period begins.

First (Given) Name: 
Last (Family) Name: 
Company: 
Title: 
Email: 
Phone Number: 
Do you plan on running for the .Rugby Board of Directors?  
Yes  No
Summarize your connection to and/or role in the .Rugby industry

© Copyright 2013 | Terms & Conditions | Our Company
Annex 22
.Rugby Governance Council Launched

Ruggers, Fans, and Others Invited to Contribute to New gTLD Advisory Body

3 June 2013 – Dot Rugby Limited, which has submitted its application to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to operate the .Rugby top-level domain (gTLD), today announced the launch of the .Rugby Governance Council. Worldwide rugby stakeholders are being invited to contribute their perspective on the direction of the .Rugby gTLD, including advice on best practices for the sport’s premier domain.

The .Rugby Governance Council is the second of its kind, with the first-ever Governance Council (for .Health) having been announced two weeks prior. The intention is to carve out a unique advisory body that meets the needs of rugby players and fans so that their views are represented. Participants will be asked to help define best practices for the .Rugby gTLD, including Abuse Prevention and Mitigation (APM) Seal reporting system, intellectual property rights protection, gTLD rules, reserved second-level domain names, certification or authentication programmes, and ensuring compliance with ICANN rules.

“Anyone who knows anything about the rugby community knows that its players and fans are an opinionated bunch,” said Iain Roache of Dot Rugby Limited. “It is our hope that this passion can be translated to the .Rugby Governance Council so that voices from Wales, to South Africa, to New Zealand and beyond can help ensure that the .Rugby domain meets the community’s expectations.”

All interested parties with a passion for the rugby industry are invited to participate—from players, to fans, to media personnel, and more. Those interested are encouraged to visit www.governancecouncils.com/rugby and consider participating.

Dot Rugby Limited representatives explained that expressions of interest would be accepted at this site for several months, with ongoing communications sent to interested parties prior to the Governance Council launch. Officials also noted that ongoing Governance Council activity is subject to award of the .Rugby gTLD by ICANN.

– ENDS –

For further .Rugby media information, please contact Jaime Domingo – Tel: +350 21650000 or email: JDomingo@famousfourmedia.com

About Dot Rugby Limited:
dot Rugby Limited, a Gibraltar company which is serviced by Famous Four Media Limited, was established in 2011 to apply for the .Rugby gTLD. Visit www.famousfourmedia.com for more information.
Annex 23
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Rugby Limited

String: rugby
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1206-66762

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Rugby Limited

2. Address of the principal place of business
   Contact Information Redacted

3. Phone number
   +350 216 50000

4. Fax number
   Contact Information Redacted

5. If applicable, website or URL

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Haavensen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Pour Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
c) The TLD label is a valid host name, as specified IN: IOD Internet Host Table Specification (RFC 952), Requirements for Internet Hosts - Application and Support (RFC1123), and Application Techniques for Checking and Transformation of Names (RFC 3696), Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA) (RFCs 5890-5894), and any updates thereto;

d) The TLD label consists entirely of letters (a-z)

The Applicant has evaluated the risks of the TLD experiencing TLD Acceptance issues similar to problems reported in the "Evaluation of the New gTLDs: Policy and Legal Issues" (31/08/2004) which discussed acceptance issues associated with the year 2000 round of new gTLDs with more than three characters (i.e., .merco.coop.info, .museum, .name). At that time, only one gTLD, .arpa, which is not widely used outside of limited circles - had four letters. As a result, the .gtpa.com had compatibility problems with the software used by Internet infrastructure operators and application providers. Some users have recently been reporting issues with the use of .xoo names in applications such as Twitter and Skype where domain names entered from that TLD are not instantly recognized with a hyperlink as more established gTLDs are.

The string has fewer characters than the current longest TLD which is (.museum).

The Applicant's registry backend services provider, Neustar Ink tested the string for potential rendering or operational problems, none were found.

As the string is not an IDN it does not contain characters that require mixed right-to-left or left-to-right functions. The applicant has also met the requirements set forth in the requirements and components of the IDOA protocol by reviewing the RFCs and background information found on the ICANN IDN Wiki.

The Applicant tested the string using the ICONF SWordo String Similarity Assessment Tool algorithm. The result of this test is 49. The Applicant considers this to be below the level where issues might occur. Should Registrars experience any acceptance issues the Applicant will have a dedicated Operational and Rendering Team ("ORT") on an on-going basis to assist with operational, rendering issues or any other problems that might arise. The ORT will be in place to assist Registrars with any additional problems that may arise out of any TLD that other applicants may be awarded during this process which could lead to unforeseen string confusion now and in the future.

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

Mission/Purpose

18(a). Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

GTA
Mission and purpose of .rugby?
The Applicant's mission and purpose is to create an environment where individuals and companies can interact and express themselves in ways never before seen on the internet, in a more targeted, secure and stable environment. Its aim is to become the premier online destination for such creators and their wide range of users. The Applicant will create an Internet space whose central function is to provide a platform for creating, producing and disseminating informative, creative and innovative content that is easily recognisable as pertaining to its stakeholder group. The Applicant is acutely aware of the importance of ICANN's mission in coordinating the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers and ensuring their secure and stable operation. The Applicant's core focus is to create a second, sustainable, and specialized gTLD, thus supporting ICANN's primary goals for this program in promoting consumer trust, consumer choice, competition and innovation.

Why .rugby?
Rugby is a great leveller. Given the chance, anyone - from the poorest child to the world's richest man - can play rugby. Passion is the essence of rugby, and we hope to capture this within .rugby largely using the valuable platform presented by the internet.

Since its inception the internet has revolutionised the way we communicate, empowered hundreds of millions with knowledge and created a platform where global commerce can thrive. However, access to the countless benefits and opportunities which the internet offers can often be hindered when navigating the ever-expanding sea of irrelevant and sometimes malicious content which also exists.

Thus the aim of .rugby is to create a blank canvas for the online rugby sector set within a secure environment. The Applicant will acknowledge the need for creating a consolidated, versatile and dedicated space for the rugby sector. As the new space is dedicated to those within this affinit group the Applicant will ensure that consumer trust is promoted. Consequently consumer choices will be augmented as there will be a ready marketplace specifically for rugby-related enterprises to provide their goods and services. All stakeholders within the sector will be able to react to new ideas, or gather thoughts on the improvements of established ones. This will drive innovation and competition within the rugby sector as there will be new channels available not yet fulfilled by current market offerings. This new environment will cause registrants to seek new ways to separate themselves from the competition.

How will rugby take shape?
The Applicant believes that the success of the gTLD will be determined largely by the sector's key global stakeholders. These stakeholders will be interested in registering a domain and additionally be motivated to protect their sector from detrimental practices. The Applicant believes that stakeholders should have the opportunity to influence the gTLD and the way it is governed.

Accordingly, the Applicant is establishing a Governance Council ("GCG"), consisting of key stakeholders that will serve as an advisory body.

Why Applicant?
The Applicant has substantial combined experience amongst its team in managing global businesses from a financial, legal and operational perspective and an exceptionally strong financial position. The Applicant's Team has previous experience with the entire gTLD life-cycle significantly lowering any launch and ongoing operational risks associated with this application. The Applicant has engaged a world-class Registry services provider to manage the technical infrastructure of the .rugby gTLD. The Applicant is further advised by the leading sector experts in all other areas required to ensure a responsible and successful launch and ongoing management of the gTLD to the benefit of all stakeholders in the ICANN community.

Information for future studies and reviews
The Applicant recognises the connection of the new gTLD application to the Affirmation of Commitments ("AOC"). To gauge the success of the new gTLD program, the Applicant recognises that an AOC Review Team will be formed one year after the first delegation. To prepare for this, the ICANN Board resolved the creation of a Working Group to formulate definitions of competition, consumer trust and consumer choices and possible metrics for the future AOC team to consider in its gTLD review. The Applicant understands this effort has not been adopted by the ICANN Board, but many of the proposed metrics may be used to gauge the Applicant's gTLD effectiveness and the gTLD program.

The Applicant intends to track costs and benefit metrics to inform future studies and reviews. Proposed definitions are:
- Consumer Choice is defined as the range of options available to registrants and users for domain scripts and languages, and for TLDs that offer choices as to the proposed purpose and integrity of their domain name registrants.
- Competition is defined as the quantity, diversity, and the potential for market rivalry of TLDs, TLD Registry operators, and Registrars.
Given the proposed definition for competition, the Applicant will attain this by contributing to the quantity and diversity within the Registry Operator space. The Applicant is a new entrant enhancing competition among the providers. The Applicant will promote competition for Registrars by amongst other things:

- Building a healthy growth trend of domain registrations
- Measure migration of content from other TLDs
- Maintain competitive pricing of domains

Promoting consumer trust

.rugby will be developed with consumer trust and satisfaction in mind. After 2 years of operations, the Applicant will conduct a survey to measure consumer trust and consumer satisfaction. This survey will be used to improve the service. The Applicant will among other things measure the following:

- Service Availability of Critical Registry Systems
- Abuse and TakeOver incidents
- Rights protection incidents
- WHOIS data accuracy

Promoting consumer choice

The Applicant intends to promote consumer choice by achieving the following:

- Display of registration requirements and restrictions in the gTLD
- Highly available and geographically diverse Registrar channel
- Effective sunrise and sunset services

Domain names will be available globally, although the Applicant’s initial marketing efforts will be predominately directed to potential Registrants represented by the six (6) official languages of the United Nations ("UN Languages"), Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), English, French, Russian and Spanish.

After the initial 2 years it is the Applicant’s aim that:

- Registrants globally should have access to Registrar services for the .gTLD in at least the six UN Languages
- The .gTLD is offered by Registrars covering at least 40 countries and territories globally

Information on the effectiveness of safeguards

The Applicant takes rights protection and abuse prevention and mitigation very seriously and has developed policies accordingly. Amongst others, the Applicant will collect and evaluate data regarding:

- Effectiveness of the Sunrise process in limiting abusive registration practices
- Effectiveness of the additional Abuse Prevention and Mitigation ("APM") and Rights Protection Mechanisms ("RPM") in limiting abusive registration practices

-end-

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

Q18

How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit Registrants, Internet users, and others?

The Applicant’s primary intention is to provide a favorable ecosystem for the growth and evolution of the sector. The key to achieving this aim are significant provisions for brand integrity and protection of intellectual property. The Applicant intends to push the boundaries of what can be done through innovative design of the new top-level domain and associated mechanisms that capitalize on the sector’s needs. A close relationship with the sector’s stakeholders is essential to this purpose, and will enable .rugby to grow in response to both Registrant and user needs. The gTLD also contains significant opportunities as a next generation organizational scheme for online content, including provisions for abuse prevention to defend against malicious registrations. The gTLD has been extensively designed by a team of industry leaders from an array of different fields. This has enabled the creation of an airtime financial strategy, an inspired technological development plan as well as a close and dynamic relationship with the sector community - all critical needs on the path to the enduring success of the gTLD.

18(b)(1) What is the goal of your proposed gTLD in terms of areas of specialty, service levels, or reputation?

Specialty

The Applicant’s key specialty goal is to enable a secure and stable .gTLD dedicated to providing global Internet users with a targeted space for subject matter of interest. This gTLD will serve as a home for both Registrants and end-users who feel an affinity with this sector and its associated content. Consequently they will prefer to register domain names, create and post content and seek information in a highly targeted manner.

Allowing users the ability to create a targeted, unique space within the new gTLD will enable them to customise their online offering and presence. The [string] gTLD will by itself clearly signal the nature and purpose of such websites to Internet users.

The applicant intends to actively promote gTLD specific vertical searching in the gTLD for the benefit of Registrants, end-users and other stakeholders. This specialisation through vertical search will also benefit Internet users seeking authentic online information and products or services as they will no longer have to wade through content completely unrelated to their desired results.

As the gTLD is sector specific it will provide a better context for second level strings allowing for a much higher number of relevant and more concise domain names. This more targeted environment will simplify the user experience across multiple platforms specifically with smartphones and tablets where minimal input is favoured.

Service Levels

The goal of the gTLD Registry is to offer domain name registration services of the highest level, exceeding both TLDN requirements and current industry standards. To achieve these goals, the Applicant has contracted with well established, proven service providers offering the highest possible level of quality in Registry and Registrar services. The expertise of the service providers will ensure that the security and quality of the gTLD will be uncompromised.

The Applicant will further provide the highest level of service to trademark, legal rights owners and second-level domain owners. To achieve this goal the Applicant will be implementing a range of Abuse Prevention and Mitigation policies and procedures. The Applicant is also working toward the protection of Intellectual Property rights and will implement all the mandatory Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) contained in the Applicant Guidelines. As well as these the Applicant will further protect the rights of others through the implementation of additional RPMs. The Applicant’s experience will ensure that the gTLD provides this high level of service to trademark and other legal rights owners to combat abusive and malicious activity within the gTLD.

The Registry will respond to abuse or malicious conduct complaints on a 24/7/365 basis, respond to requests from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies and law enforcement in a timely manner, and promptly abide by decisions and judgments of URS and URS panels, in accordance with TLDN consensus policies.

The Applicant will also provide fast and responsive (24/7/365) customer support to both Registrants and end-users in a number of languages to assist with general queries as well as complaints of abusive or malicious conduct.

Service Levels related to Registry Backend Services

The Applicant will work with Neustar Inc. (hereinafter "RSP") whose extensive experience spans more than a decade. This will ensure delivery of the protected, trusted, and permanently-encrypted Registry infrastructure necessary to reliably host and operate a gTLD. The Applicant will also work with its Registrar to ensure that consumers receive secure, fast, and reliable domain name registration services with the best online customer service support.

Trademark RPMs will be fully implemented in the following fashion:

- end-
currently delivers DNS resolution for several TLD customers and provides low latency query responses with a 100% DNS uptime service level agreement.

The Applicant will further leverage the ISP's existing DNSSEC infrastructure, capabilities, and experience to provide a robust and standards-compliant implementation that ensures DNSSEC services are always available as part of the DNS.

The Shared Registry System ("SRS") to be used for the Applicant's gTLD is a production-proven, standards-based, highly reliable and high-performance domain name registration and management system that has been designed to operate at the highest performance levels. The Applicant's RSP has been able to meet or exceed their SLA requirements nearly every month since it's inception. Their Registry has achieved a 99.99% success rate in meeting SLAs since 2004.

The Applicant's RSP has extensive experience providing ICANN and RFC-compliant WHOIS services for each of the gTLDs that it operates as a Registry Operator for each gTLD and ccTLDs. The RSP's in-house WHOIS solution is production-proven, highly flexible, and scalable with a track record of 100% availability over the past 10 years.

The Applicant will comply with all the data escrow requirements documented in the Registry Data Escrow ("RDE") Specification of the gTLD Agreement and has a contract in place with Iron Mountain Intellectual Property Management, Inc. ("IM") for RDE Services. The Applicant and its RSP will in conjunction with Iron Mountain work to ensure the escrow deposit process is compliant 100% of the time.

Reputation

The Applicant will ensure that the Registry enjoys an excellent reputation through its core focus on creating a secure, sustainable, and specialized gTLD, thus supporting ICANN's primary goals for the new gTLD program in promoting consumer trust, consumer choice, competition and innovation.

The Applicant will strive to become a reputable and successful new gTLD by providing secure, fast and reliable customer service throughout the registration lifecycle of all domains in the gTLD.

The Applicant will endeavour to ensure that only non-fraudulent Registrants have domain names in the gTLD via a WHOIS that is secure, user-friendly, and reliable and by being highly responsive to complaints from legal rights owners. The Applicant will further implement an industry leading range of Abuse Prevention and Mitigation policies and procedures as well as RDEs.

The Applicant will provide the financial and operational stability to protect Registrants and ensure the reputation of the Registry. The Applicant has estimated the maximum costs of the critical functions for a three year period by taking the largest single cost estimate (year 0) and multiplying this by 3. If the calculation used a lower figure the costs estimates would not be at the potential high enough during the 5 years and the COI instrument would be too small in order to fund the costs of the 5 critical functions for at least 3 years.

The Applicant has decided to commit to providing the highest level of protection to Registrants and Stakeholders by providing ICANN with a COI for the maximum amount as recommended by ICANN in its COI Guidance. This ensures the Registry is reputable, remains conservative and protects abuse objectives. In a worst case scenario where the Applicant will not receive any revenue Registrants will be protected not only by the COI, but also by the fact that the Applicant has enough capital to operate for over 3 years.

Question 18(b)(1) What do you anticipate your proposed gTLD will add to the current space, in terms of competition, differentiation, or innovation?

It is expected that .rugby will provide significant competition for existing and forthcoming gTLDs. The .rugby gTLD will provide a blank canvas of second level domains that will inevitably lead to increased consumer choice and significant innovation from the sector. It will allow Registrants to seek new and varied ways to separate themselves from the competition.

Competition

The Applicant will enhance competition by allowing new Registrants to create new online products and services serving the global marketplace and connecting geographically diverse Registrants and users with a common affinity for the specialized subject matter exemplified by the new gTLD. The new gTLD process and its resulting gTLDs are likely to incentivize top-level domains to improve the security and quality of their online products and services as well as introducing new ones. Thus, this gTLD will benefit consumers by increasing the likelihood of new innovative online products and services. The addition of a new gTLD such as .rugby will also increase competition between existing registries.

The Applicant will promote competition to the benefit of the Registrants by among other things:

- Building a healthy growth trend of domain registrations to validate the specialty space
- Promote the migration of sector relevant content from other TLDs
- Maintaining competitive pricing of domain

Differentiation

Currently, there is no gTLD available on the Internet that signifies the specialized products, services, and subject matter encompassed by this gTLD. The gTLD string itself will give a clear indication to website visitors that the site has content relevant to the sector. This will result in the gTLD becoming globally recognizable and viewed as a trusted source of goods, services and information.

Innovation

The gTLD will demonstrate innovation through cutting edge RDEs.

Firstly, the Applicant considers the Protection of Intergovernmental Organization ("IGO") name to be very important. The Applicant will use strings registered as second level domains in the .int gTLD as the basis for this protection. To register in the .int domain, the Registrants must be an IGO that meets the requirements found in RFC 1591. The Applicant will reserve these strings and only allow for their future release if an IGO on the 'reserv list' wishes to make use of the protected string in the gTLD and provides the Applicant with sufficient documentation.

Finally, if a Registrant during sunrise and landrush applies to register a domain name identical to a capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard it will receive a Capital City Claims ("CCC") notification stating this. Subsequently they will have to reply unconditionally agreeing to comply with requirements to protect the reputation of the capital city and any further terms.

These functions will enhance Internet stability, security and will demonstrate to Registrants, Registrars, and end-users of the Registry that abusive or malicious conduct will not be tolerated. They will further contribute significantly to the integrity of the gTLD enabling an environment where stakeholders can innovate with confidence.

Question 18(b)(1) What goals does your proposed gTLD have in terms of user experience?

The Applicant's goals for the new gTLD are to provide a trusted, secure, and user-friendly environment whereby domain names and content relating to its specific affinity group can flourish.

The Applicant believes that the success of the gTLD will be determined by the sector's key stakeholders globally. The Applicant believes that stakeholders should have the opportunity to influence the gTLD and the way it is governed. Accordingly, the Applicant is establishing a Governance Council ("GCV") to serve as an advisory body.

.rugby will be developed with consumer trust, choice and satisfaction in mind and after the initial 2 years, the Applicant will conduct a survey to analyse the gTLD's success in these areas to help further improve the user experience.

To ensure a high level of service the Applicant will further measure:
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The Applicant intends to promote consumer choice by providing the following:
- Service Availability Targets for the Critical Registry Functions
- The number of abuse incidents and take-downs
- ICANN Compliance
- Rights protection incidents (i.e. UDRS and URS)
- WHOIS data accuracy

The Applicant is highly available and geographically diverse Registrar distribution channel.
- Effective sunrise and trademark services.

Question 18(b)(iv): Provide a complete description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the goals listed above.

Registration Policies

The purpose and goal of the Applicant's policies are to ensure competition, fairness, trust and reliability for Registrars, Registrants, and the user community, while maintaining security and stability for the gTLDs.

General Policy

Aside from certain start-up mechanisms, all domain names will generally be registered on a first-come, first-served basis. A Trademark Claims Service will be offered for the first 90 days of general registration, with the intent of providing clear notice to potential Registrants of the existing rights of trademark owners with registered trademarks in the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Registration Policies

As per ICANN's requirements, the Applicant will be operating both a Sunrise and Landrush period ahead of general availability for the gTLD.

Governing Council

The Applicant is establishing the gTLD to be comprised of key sector stakeholders that will serve as an advisory body. Each gTLD will elect its own Board of Directors, which will be responsible for self-governance, the recommendation of sector-specific registration policies, the formulation of guidance on intellectual property and other best practices related to the gTLD.

The Applicant aims to develop an Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Working Group in conjunction with the GC. It will give the Applicant's team advice on abuse prevention and mitigation and how this may effect registration policies. The group will meet to regularly discuss the latest trends in domain abuse and the most effective way to prevent and remedy them.

Question 18(b)(v): Will your proposed gTLD impose any measures for protecting the privacy or confidential information of Registrants or users? If so, please describe any such measures.

Data and Privacy Policies

The Applicant shall comply with all the Data, WHOIS, and Privacy requirements in the Applicant Guidebook required by ICANN. The Applicant will take all possible steps to maintain the security and privacy of information or data that it may collect in connection with the planned function and usage of names domains, and will remain in compliance with all confidentiality and security regulations in relevant jurisdictions. This data will be held by the Applicant in accordance with the Registry Agreement that the Applicant will execute with ICANN.

The Applicant has further ensured that its suppliers also understand that keeping information secure and private is of crucial importance and will take all available steps to maintain the security and privacy of information collected from the Applicants in the Sunrise, Landrush and General Availability Phases.

Question 18(b): Describe whether and in what ways outreach and communications will help to achieve your projected benefits.

The Applicant plans on making the gTLD the premier gTLD where individuals and organizations can register, build and maintain websites relating to their specific interest area. Thus, communication with the public and development of an outreach campaign are important goals in connection with the gTLD.

During the gTLD evaluation process, the Applicant plans to conduct a two-to-three month communications campaign aimed at reaching sector stakeholders and informing them of the gTLD's mission and the opportunity to participate in the GC. The communications outreach will include email communications to hundreds of leading sector organizations. It will also be accompanied by the launch of a website for communicating information about the gTLD and allowing interested members of the related sector to express interest in serving on the GC. Other communications efforts, including but not limited to, press releases and social media campaigns may also be initiated to raise further awareness regarding the gTLD.

Shortly after completing the evaluation process and being awarded the gTLD, the Applicant will institute marketing and outreach efforts to inform the public about the new gTLD, its launch schedule, and its intended Affinity group. The Applicant will use different outreach and communications methods and venues to get the new gTLD message and mission out to the public, including but not limited to the following: online and print press release, communications with various media outlets, domain name sector groups, mobile apps and various social media platforms. The GC will be used as a further means of outreach and communication to the Internet community.

18(c). What operating rules will you adopt to eliminate or minimize social costs?

Q18C 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?

The Applicant fully appreciates the concerns of ICANN, the GAC and other consumer protection authorities about the need to operate new gTLDs in ways that minimize social costs, consumer vulnerabilities as well as other time and financial resource costs. To achieve these goals, the gTLD will not only employ the ICANN mandated abuse protections, but will also deploy the following innovative protection measures that will put the gTLD at the forefront of addressing these critical issues:

1. Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Policies and Procedures

The Applicant's core mission and purpose is to create an environment where individuals and companies can interact and express themselves in ways never before seen on the Internet, in a targeted, secure and stable environment. To achieve this goal, the Applicant will be implementing a range of Abuse Prevention and Mitigation ('APM') policies and procedures.

These Policies and Procedures will include:
1) gTLD AUP Plan, 2) Policies and Procedures to Minimize Abusive Registrations, 3) Abuse Point of Contact, 4) Policies for Handling Complaints Regarding the Abuse Policies, 5) Acceptable Use Policy ('AUP'), 6) Proposed Measures for Removal of Orphan WHOIS Records, 7) WHOIS verification process, 8) Monitoring and proactive WHOIS registration data for accuracy and completeness, 9) Registrar WHOIS self-certification, 10) WHOIS data remediation process, 11) Reclaiming falsified WHOIS, 12) Registrar verification of WHOIS, 13) Abuse Response Process, 14) Policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, 15) Service Level Requirements for resolution regarding APM issues, 16) Service Level Requirements for Law enforcement requests regarding APM issues. 17) Coordination of APM efforts with sector Groups and Law Enforcement, 18) Rapid takedown and suspension, 19) Controls to Ensure Proper Access to Domain Functions, 20) Enabling two-factor authentication from Registrants to process update, transfer, and deletion requests, 21) Enabling notification of multiple unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests, 22) Enabling the notification of multiple, unique points of contact to request and approve transfer, update, and deletion requests.
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Rights Protection Mechanisms

The Applicant firmly committed to the protection of Intellectual Property rights and to implementing all the mandatory Rights Protection Mechanisms ("RPMs") contained in the Applicant Guidebook and detailed in Specification 7 of the Registry Agreement. Use of domain names that infringe upon the legal rights of others in the gTLD will not be tolerated and preventing abusive registrations is a core objective of the Applicant. The nature of such uses creates security and stability issues for the Registry, Registrars, and Registrants, as well as for users of the Internet, in general. The Applicant will minimize time or financial resources costs by preventing abusive registrations and reduce opportunities for behaviors such as phishing or pharming. This will be achieved by implementing comprehensive registration, anti-abuse, and rights protection guidelines as defined in its AUP, as well as innovative additional RPMs such as the Mechanism to Protect WHOIS Names by blocking second level labels currently present in the .int zone file and the Mechanism for Further Protection of Capital City Names, as described below. In order to identify and address the abusive use of registered names on an ongoing basis, the Applicant will also incorporate and abide by the following RPMs and all other RPMs as specified in Specification 7 of the Registry Agreement and as adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors as ICANN Consensus Policies.

These Rights Protection Mechanisms will include the following:

1. Trademark Clearinghouse
2. Trademark Claims Service
3. Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy
4. Uniform Rapid Suspension System
5. Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure
6. Mechanism to Protect WHOIS Names
7. Mechanism for Further Protection of Capital City Names
8. Efforts to promote WHOIS accuracy
9. Searchable WHOIS database
10. Semi-annual audits to ensure accurate WHOIS information
11. Policies on Handling Complaints Regarding Abuse and Rights Issues
12. Registry Acceptable Use Policy ("AUP")
13. Monitoring for Malicious Activity

Governance Council Structure

The Applicant believes that sector stakeholders should be afforded the opportunity to influence the manner in which the gTLD is governed. Accordingly, the Applicant will establish a Governance Council (the "GC") comprised of key sector stakeholders that will serve as an advisory body tasked with defining best practice recommendations for the gTLD space. The Applicant believes that the success of the gTLD will be determined largely by the sector's key stakeholders. Not only will these stakeholders have the primary interest in registering domains in the gTLD, but they will also be motivated to protect the sector from practices that would negatively impact the sector overall. The GC is intended to provide guidance on matters related to best practices, intellectual property, authorization, certification, and other matters of importance to the sector and will elect its own Board of Directors, which will be responsible for self-governance, the recommendation of sector-specific policies, and other best practices related to the gTLD.

BITZ and Coalition for Online Accountability ("COA") Recommendations

The Applicant will further structure its policies around the BITZ and COA Recommendations where relevant to this gTLD. The Applicant's goal is to provide a safe and secure experience for consumers. A domain within this gTLD that is owned, operated by or compromised by a malicious party could cause harm to consumers, to the gTLD's reputation, and to the reputation of the Internet itself. As such, additional controls are in place relating to the validity of registrations, as well as measures to ensure the correct identity of both Registrants and Registrars relating to changes made within the SRS, and to protecting the integrity of the DNS service as a whole.

The Security Standards Working Group (SSWG) formed by BITZ drafted a set of policy recommendations that should be adopted by ICANN in evaluating any applicant of a financial gTLD. The recommendations were posted by BITZ in the form of a letter to ICANN at [http://www.icann.org/en/correspondence/aba-bits-to-beckstrom-crocker-zwick2012-ap-sswg.pdf].

The Coalition for Online Accountability has drafted a set of policy recommendations, also endorsed by many other international organizations representing the creative industries, that should be applied to entertainment gTLDs - especially those dependent on copyright protection. The policy comprises a set of 7 recommendations that should be adopted by ICANN in evaluating any applicant for an entertainment-based gTLD. The recommendations were posted by COA in the form of a letter to ICANN at http://bit.ly/ICANNReq.

We welcome the recommendations from BITZ and COA and will strongly consider the recommendations relating to the implementation of this gTLD as considered relevant.

Registry Operators Startup Plan

The Applicant proposes to implement the following start-up plan so that the new gTLD is introduced in an orderly, transparent and stable manner. This will safeguard competition, fairness, trust and reliability for Registrants, the User Community, ICANN Accredited Registrars and other Stakeholders.

The Applicant's startup plan is designed to minimize social costs (e.g., time or financial resources costs, as well as various types of consumer vulnerabilities) by instilling a number of RPMs as well as AUPs. The plan consists of the following multi-phase process that will be monitored by the Registry Operator. The timeline for the gTLDs start-up process and associated RPMs in the Applicants' gTLD is as follows:

Phase 1 - Sunrise Process:

- Day 1: Sunrise round opens
- Day 60: Sunrise round closes
- Day 61: Sunrise Allocation including contention resolution mechanisms open
- Day 71: Sunrise Allocation contention resolution mechanisms close

The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:

- Trademark Clearinghouse ("TNC")
- Trademark Eligibility Requirements ("TDR")
- Trademark Dispute Resolution Policy ("TRP")
- Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP")
- Uniform Rapid Suspension System ("URS")
- Mechanism for the Protection of WHOIS Names ("WHOIS")
- Trademark Claims Service ("TCS")

Phase 2 - Landrush process:

- Day 72: Landrush opens
- Day 102: Landrush closes
- Day 103: Landrush contention resolution mechanism opens
- Day 113: Landrush contention resolution mechanisms close

The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:

- UDRP
- URS
- PIN
- Mechanism for Further Protection of Capital City Names ("CCCN")

Phase 3 - General Availability/Registrations:

- Day 114: General availability begins

The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:

- UDRP
- URS
- PIN
ICANN New gTLD Application

18(c)(i) How will multiple applications for a particular domain name be resolved, for example, by auction or on a first-come/first-serve basis?

Sunrise and landrush periods:

During the gTLDs launch period, multiple applications for a particular domain name will be resolved through a Contention Resolution Mechanism ("CRM") involving auctions. These CRMs will apply to the Sunrise and Landrush application phases. The CRMs will be conducted by Sedo GmbH, an experienced provider of domain auction services. The mechanisms involved will involve closed auctions whose only specific bidders can participate.

During the Applicant's Sunrise process, if there are two or more eligible applicants for one domain name string, then the contention will be resolved by auction. Auctions held during the Sunrise phase ("Sunrise Auctions") will be closed and the only bidders will be eligible applicants according to the gTLDs Sunrise eligibility requirements including the TRPN.

During the Applicant's Landrush process, if there are two or more eligible applicants for one domain name string, then the contention will be resolved by auction. Auctions held during the Landrush phase ("Landrush Auctions") will be closed and the only bidders will be eligible applicants according to the gTLDs Landrush eligibility requirements.

General Availability:

After the two initial startup phases of the Registry the allocation of domain names will occur on a first-come/first-serve basis, taking into account the registries ADN and ARN mechanisms.

18(c)(ii) Explain any cost benefits for registrants you intend to implement (e.g., advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts).

Incentive, Marketing and Outreach Programs

The Applicant will implement a number of incentive, marketing assistance, awareness and PR programs to assist the Registrar channel in providing a sector leading experience to end-users and to provide cost benefits for registrants. The Applicant will work with the global Registrar channel to ensure that the new gTLD offer is clearly visible on registrar sites resulting in an increase in the awareness and number of new gTLD registrations. With awareness and in the number of new gTLD registrations. With achieving this visibility requires (1) a clear business case and incentive for registrants to motivate them and (2) mechanisms and assets to make it easy for them to do so.

The Applicant will work with the Registrar to deploy incentive programs that will deliver cost benefits to registrants through the use of advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts or other similar mechanisms. The Applicant is aware of Specification 3 - Registry Operator Code of Conduct and will not directly or indirectly show any preference or provide any special consideration to any Registrar in its marketing efforts.

Incentive mechanism the Applicant will provide to the registrars may include:

Marketing Incentives

The Applicant intends to provide expertise, tools and creative assets to the Registrar as part of general marketing and co-marketing programs. There is a significant cost saving if the expertise, tools and creative assets are developed centrally and the costs amortized across the Registrar base. Significant cost savings can occur relating to Market Research, Social Customer Relationship Management ("SCRM"), Content Management Systems ("CMS"), Direct Marketing Tools, Marketing Collateral and Analytics Solutions.

The Applicant will employ some or all of the following marketing techniques jointly with registrars globally: (1) Direct Response Print, (2) General Web Marketing, (3) Email campaigns without Incentive, (4) Email with Incentive, (5) Online Marketing - Prospect List, (6) Email Marketing - Sponsored Newsletter, (7) Direct Marketing with Incentive, (8) Web Marketing with Incentive, (9) Social Marketing (Social, Video, Microsites), (10) Delivering User Experience Improvement best practices, (11) Develop Search Engine Optimization best practices, (12) Email Marketing - Registrar List

As an example of a marketing initiative, the Applicant will forward leads to the Registrars "buy" pages as an incentive via the means of Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") search marketing. The Applicant will run multiple PPC campaigns targeting gTLD Registrars and point these to landing pages on the Registrar's websites. Conversions are directly trackable from all PPC campaigns and keywords with a high Click-Through-Rate ("CTR") or conversions will also be leveraged for SEO best practice purposes.

PR and Awareness Incentives:

In addition to the core outreach to the Registrar channel, the Applicant will engage in a wider outreach to build awareness of the new gTLD with customers, end-users and other stakeholders. The Applicant will engage with a number of high profile individuals associated with the gTLD and will seek to reach and engage customers through webcasts, podcasts, traditional broadcast TV as well as radio.

Provision of customer retention toolkits to Registrars:

The Applicant will use propensity modelling to build retention marketing programs to minimize churn whilst building renewal sustainability. The Applicant will develop econometric models designed to measure the likelihood of a customer segment to purchase a product or offer bundle, at a critical point in the relationship lifecycle. They are used to predict the best time, and the best combination of products, to offer to customers who match a certain profile. They are especially effective where there are large numbers of customers and reliable data can be gathered. The Applicant expects that registration volume in the gTLD will provide sufficient data for this modelling.

Measure, benchmark and improve the customer experience:

The Applicant will engage in a program to develop best practice policies related to the customer experience at differing levels of the channel. This will include the entire ecosystem from Registry through Registrar to Resellers and finally end-users. One key metric might be, for example, to reduce the number of clicks to make a purchase equivalent to the most customer friendly e-commerce sites in the world.

The Applicant might, for example, provide website performance tracking tools to registrars, which would benchmark current performance and provide insights into customers' needs and behaviour at the point of purchase.

The Applicant will engage in a Social Customer Relationship Management Program to monitor social media feedback to questions, concerns or other issues. The Applicant will further seek to measure marketing communication expenditure and activity.

Other initiatives that will be considered by the Applicant in its outreach efforts:

(a) Customized Vertical Search App for major mobile platforms.
(b) Designated Twitter channel for the stakeholder community.
(c) Social Media outreach through Facebook and other social media solutions.

Translation into other languages:

At present, the Applicant plans to translate marketing collateral and other content that it considers to have geographically diverse appeal into the 6 official UN languages, namely Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), English, French, Russian and Spanish.

18(c)(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 increases? If so, please describe your plans.

The Applicant will consider this factor in our initial discussions with potential registrars.
ten years of experience managing numerous gTLDs that utilize standard and unique business rules and lifecycles.

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, the registration term for registered names may not exceed ten (10) years. Further, the 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.

The Applicant plans to review domain name registration rates on an annual basis and will make a determination at that time regarding adjustments, depending upon market factors. Thus, at this time, the Applicant does not plan to make specific guarantees regarding pricing increases.

The Applicant will provide ICANN and each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the registry–registrar agreement for the gTLD 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) that complies with the requirements as outlined in the New gTLD Registry Agreement.

---

Community-based Designation

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

No

20(a). Provide the name and full description of the community that the applicant is committing to serve.

20(b). Explain the applicant's relationship to the community identified in 20(a).

20(c). Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

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

20(e). Provide a description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

20(f). Attach any written endorsements from institutions/groups representative of the community identified in 20(a).

Attachments are not displayed on this form.

Geographic Names

21(a). Is the application for a geographic name?

No

Protection of Geographic Names

22. Describe proposed measures for protection of geographic names at the second and other levels in the applied-for gTLD.

Q22

Introduction

The Applicant is aware of the substantial amount of work and effort that has gone into developing policy to address the issue of the registration and release of geographic names under new gTLDs, including the valuable input from ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee ("GAC"), the Generic Names Supporting Organization Reserved Names Working Group, Registry Operators and from elsewhere within the ICANN community.

The Applicant is aware of and understands the requirements set forth in the 11 January 2012 version of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (New gTLD Applicant Guidebook) and the GAC advice for protection of geographic names and will implement appropriate measures to ensure that it complies in all respects with ICANN policies and rules regarding both the reservation and release of geographic names at the second level (or other levels).

In addition to this, the Applicant proposes to implement an additional mechanism for the protection of capital city names at the second level that exceeds the requirements in the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook. See description of Capital City Claim service described below.
mistake. Domains that have been erroneously transferred or hijacked by another party can be transferred back to the original registrar through various means including contacting the Registry.

Auto-Renew-Delete Grace Period
The Auto-Renew-Delete Grace Period associated with the domain was auto-renewed. Domains may be deleted for credit during the 120 hours after an auto-renewal. The grace period is intended to allow Registrars to correct domains that were mistakenly auto-renewed. It should be noted that domains are deleted during the auto-renew delete grace period and that the grace period lasts for 45 days from the expiration date of the domain name. Registrars are not required to provide registrants with the full 45 days of the period.

Redemption Grace Period
The auto-renew delete period is a special grace period intended to provide registrants with an extra amount of time, beyond the expiration date, to renew their domain name. The grace period lasts for 45 days from the expiration date of the domain name. Registrars are not required to provide registrants with the full 45 days of the period.

27.3 State Diagram
Figure 27.3-1 provides a description of the registration lifecycle. The different states of the lifecycle are active, inactive, locked, pending transfer, and pending delete. Please refer to section 27.1.1 for detail description of each of these states. The lines between the states represent triggers that transition a domain from one state to another.

27.2.1 EPP RPC Consistency
As described above, the domain lifecycle is determined by ICANN policy and the EPP RPCs. Neustar has been operating ICANN TLDs for the past 10 years and is consistent with all the ICANN policies and related EPP RPCs.

27.3 Resources
The registration lifecycle and associated business rules are largely determined by policy and business requirements; such as the Product Management and Policy teams will play a critical role in working with Applicant to determine the precise rules that meet the requirements of the TLD. Implementation of the lifecycle rules will be the responsibility of Development/Engineering team, with testing performed by the Quality Assurance team. Neustar’s EPP implementation is very flexible and configurable, and in many cases development is not required to support business rule changes.

The Applicant’s registry will be using standard lifecycle rules, and such no customization is anticipated. However should modifications be required in the future, the necessary resources will be pulled from the pool of available resources described in detail in the response to Question 31. The following resources are available from those teams:

- Development/Engineering - 19 employees
- Registry Product Management - 4 employees

These resources are more than adequate to support the development needs of all the TLDs operated by Neustar, including the Applicant’s registry.

- End-

28. Abuse Prevention and Mitigation

Q28
The Applicant’s core mission is to create an environment where individuals and companies can interact and express themselves in ways never before seen on the Internet, in a more targeted, secure and stable environment. To achieve this goal the Applicant will be implementing a range of Abuse Prevention and Mitigation policies and procedures. The following is an overview of initiatives undertaken by the Applicant:

1. gTLD Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Implementation Plan
2. Policies and Procedures to Minimize Abusive Registrations
2.1. Implementation plan for Abuse Point of Contact
2.2. Policies for Handling Complaints Regarding the Abuse Policies
2.3. Purposes and Procedures for Removal of Orphaned Entities
2.4. Procedures for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance of, the Abuse Prevention and Mitigation initiatives
2.5. Measures to promote WHOIS accuracy both directly by the Registry and by Registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement

1.1. Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness
1.2. Registrar WHOIS policy self-certification and authentication
1.3. Registrar WHOIS data post-registration review
1.4. Establishing policies and procedures to ensure Registrar compliance with WHOIS policies, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means
1.5. Programs and initiatives to promote WHOIS verification
1.6. Registrar semi-annual verification of WHOIS
1.7. Policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behaviour
1.8. Service Level Requirements for resolution
1.9. Service Level Requirements for Law enforcement requests
1.10. Coordination with ICANN and Law Enforcement
1.11. Controls to Ensure Proper Access to Domain Functions
1.12. Enabling two-factor authentication from Registrants to process update, transfer, and deletion requests
1.13. Enabling the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted

- End-
ICANN New gTLD Application

1. gTLD Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Implementation Plan

The Applicant will be implementing a thorough and extensive Abuse Prevention and Mitigation plan, designed to minimize abusive registration and detrimental activities that might occur within the new gTLD space. This plan includes the establishment of 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 gTLD through all Registrars of record, including those involving a reseller. Details of this plan will be published on the Applicant’s website. Strong abuse prevention for a new gTLD is an important benefit to the internet community. The Applicant and its backend services provider agree that a Registry must not only set the highest standards of technical and operational competence, but also needs to act to ensure the space on behalf of the internet community and ICANN in promoting the Registry’s stakeholders’ interests. The Applicant’s backend services provider brings extensive experience establishing and implementing registration policies. This experience will be leveraged to help the Applicant combat abusive and malicious domain activity within the new gTLD space.

2. Policies and Procedures to Minimize Abusive Registrations

Regardless of how well intentioned its user-base is, a Registry must have the policies, resources, personnel, and expertise in place to combat abusive practices. The Applicant’s Registry backend services provider is at the forefront of the prevention of such abusive practices. We also believe that a strong program is essential given that Registrars have a reasonable expectation that they are in control of the data associated with their domains, especially its presence in the DNS zone. Because domain names are sometimes used as a mechanism to host illegal or illegitimate activities on the Internet, often the best preventative measure to thwart these attacks is to remove the names completely from the DNS before they can impart harm, not only to the domain name Registrar, but also to millions of unsuspecting Internet users.

3. Coalition for Online Accountability (COA) Recommendations

The Coalition for Online Accountability (COA) Recommendations provide a set of policy recommendations that should be adopted by ICANN in evaluating any applicant for an entertainment-based gTLD. The Coalition for Online Accountability (COA) Recommendations are based on a hearing on the subject on 9 September 2010 by a panel of experts and stakeholders from various industries involved in the online economy.

4. BITS Recommendations

The BITS Recommendations are based on a hearing on the subject on 9 September 2010 by a panel of experts and stakeholders from various industries involved in the online economy. The BITS Recommendations provide a set of policy recommendations that should be adopted by ICANN in evaluating any applicant for an entertainment-based gTLD. The recommendations were posted by ICANN in the form of a letter to ICANN at [http://www.icann.org/en/communities/aba-bits-technology-and-copyright-20101009-en.pdf]. We welcome the recommendations from BITS and will strongly consider the recommendations relating to the implementation of this gTLD where considered relevant.

As required by the Registry Agreement, the Applicant will establish and publish on its website a single abuse point of contact responsible for addressing inquiries from law enforcement and the public related to malicious and abusive matters requiring expedited resolution.
and their resellers. The Applicant will also provide such information to ICANN prior to the delegation of any domain names in the gTLD. This information shall consist of, at a minimum, a valid name, e-mail address dedicated solely to the handling of malicious conduct complaints and a telephone number and mailing address for the primary contact. The Applicant will ensure that this information will be kept accurate and up to date and will be provided to ICANN if and when changes are made. In addition, with respect to inquiries from ICANN-accredited Registrars, the Applicant's Registry Backend Services Provider shall have an additional point of contact, as it does today, handling requests by Registrars related to abusive domain name practices.

2.2 Policies for Handling Complaints Regarding the Abuse Policies

In order to operate under the new gTLD, Registrars must accept the Acceptable Use Policy. The new gTLD Registry's Acceptable Use Policy clearly states that the types of activities associated with an abusive domain name registration. In addition, the policy will be incorporated into the applicable Registry-Registrar Agreement ("RRA") and reserve the right for the Registry to take the appropriate actions based on the type of abuse. This will include locking down the domain name preventing it from being transferred to the contact and email server information associated with the domain name. In the case of a complaint being received from an ICANN accredited Registrar, the Registrar's email and domain name server information will be made unavailable rendering the domain name non-resolvable, transferring the domain name to another Registrar, and/or in cases in which the domain name is associated with an existing law enforcement investigation, substituting named servers to collect information about the DNS queries to assist the investigation. When appropriate, the Applicant will also share information with law enforcement. Each ICANN and gTLD accredited Registrar must agree to pass the Acceptable Use Policy on to its Resellers (if applicable) and ultimately to the gTLD Registrars. The Registry's initial Acceptable Use Policy that the Applicant will use in connection with the gTLD is outlined in a section below.


As the Security and Stability Advisory Committee of ICANN ("SSAC") rightfully acknowledges, although orphaned glue records may be used for abusive or malicious purposes, the "dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS." See http://www.icann.org/2007-07-04-ssac.pdf.

While orphan glue records often support the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS, we understand that such glue records can be used maliciously to point to name servers that host domains used in illegal phishing, botnets, malware, and other abusive behaviour. Problems can arise when the parent domain does not have its glue record on file but its children glue records will remain. Thus, the Registry Operator will remove orphan glue records (as defined at the above link) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious activity. Registrars are required to delete/move all dependent DNS records before they are allowed to delete the parent domain.

To prevent orphan glue records, the Registry’s Registry Backend Services Provider performs the following checks before removing a domain or name server.

- Checks during domain delete:
  - If the parent domain delete is not allowed if any other domain in the zone refers to the child name server.
  - If the parent domain is the only domain using the child name server, then both the domain and the glue record are removed from the zone.

- Check during explicit name server delete:
  - If the parent domain references the child name server and if other domains in the zone also reference it and if the parent domain name is assigned a server hold status, then the parent domain goes out of the zone but the name server glue record does not.
  - If no domains reference a name server, then the glue record is removed from the zone file.

2.4 Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance of, the Abuse Prevention and Mitigation initiatives

Details related to resourcing plans for the initial implementation and ongoing maintenance of the Applicant’s abuse plan are provided in Section 7 of this response.

3. Measures to promote WHOIS accuracy both directly by the Registry and by Registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement ("RRA")

The Applicant acknowledges that ICANN has developed a number of mechanisms over the past decades that are intended to address the issue of inaccurate WHOIS information. Such measures alone have not proven to be sufficient and the Applicant will offer a mechanism whereby third parties can submit complaints directly to the Applicant about inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data. Such information shall be forwarded to the Applicant and shall be reviewed by the Applicant. The Applicant shall respond to those complaints within thirty days. When forwarding the complaint to the Registrar, the Applicant will examine the current WHOIS data for names that were alleged to be inaccurate to determine if the information was corrected, the domain name was deleted, or any other action was taken. If the Registrar has failed to take any action, or it is clear that the Registrar was either unwilling or unable to correct the inaccuracies, the Applicant reserves the right to suspend the applicable domain name(s) until such time as the Registrar is able to cure the deficiencies. Further efforts to pre-empt inaccurate WHOIS data may be made by the Applicant will include:

1. The Applicant will in general discourage the use of proxy registration services. The Applicant understands that there are instances when proxy registrations may be required and will develop best practices for when these instances occur.

2. The Applicant will establish a complaint-based form for third parties to submit claims regarding false and/or inaccurate WHOIS data and the Applicant will forward credible claims to the Registrar for investigation/resolution. The Applicant will follow up to verify that the claim has been satisfactorily resolved. Failure of the Registrar or the Registrant to resolve the problem may result in the Applicant taking action.

3. The Applicant’s Registry Backend Services Provider will regularly remind Registrars of their obligation to comply with ICANN’s WHOIS Data Verification Policy. This policy requires Registrars to validate the WHOIS information provided during the registration process, to investigate claims of false or incomplete information, and to cancel domain name registrations for which WHOIS information is determined to be invalid.

4. WHOIS Verification by Registrars. As part of their Registry-Registrar Agreement all accredited Registrars will be required to revalidate WHOIS data for each record they have registered in the gTLD. The Applicant will leave the ultimate determination of how this procedure takes place to the Registrar, but it must include one of the following approved methods. (1) Email notification (2) Outbound telemarketing effort to the individual listed as the administrative contact for the domain.

3.1 Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness

As part of their Registry-Registrar Agreement, all of the Applicant’s Registrars will be required to revalidate WHOIS data for each record they have registered on a bi-annual basis. This revalidation will require the Registrar to notify its Registrants in the gTLD about the process. While the Applicant reserves the view that it is important that the domain names that are not verified in a timely manner, the Applicant will engage in other outreach to the Registrant prior to suspending any domain name. As part of the monitoring of the gTLD, users can report missing or incomplete WHOIS data via the Registry website. The Applicant will also perform random audits of verification processes to ensure compliance with the requirements and accuracy of data and information and accuracy of data and information.

3.2 Registrar WHOIS policy self-certification and authentication

The self-certification program consists, in part, of evaluations applied equally to all operational ICANN-accredited Registrars for the gTLD and is conducted from time to time during the year. Process steps are as follows:

The Registry Backend Services Provider sends an email notification to the Registrar primary contact, requesting that the contact go to a designated URL, log in with his/her Web ID and password, and complete and submit the online form. The form must submit the form within 15 business days of receipt of the notification.

When the form is submitted, the Registry Backend Services Provider sends the Registrar an automated email confirming that the form was successfully submitted.

The Registry Backend Services Provider reviews the submitted form to ensure the certifications are complete.

The Registry Backend Services Provider sends the Registrar an email notification if the Registrar is found to be compliant in all areas. If a review of the response indicates that the Registrar is not in compliance or if the Registry Backend Services Provider has followed-up
If the Registrar does not respond within 15 business days of receiving the original notification, or if it does not respond to the request for additional information, the Registry Backend Services Provider sends the Registrar a Breach Notice and gives the Registrar 30 days to cure the breach.

If the Registrar does not cure the breach, the Registry Backend Services Provider may terminate the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA).

3.3 WHOIS data reminder process.

The Registry Backend Services Provider regularly reminds Registrars of their obligation to comply with ICANN’s WHOIS Data Reminder Policy, which was adopted by ICANN as a consensus policy on 27 March 2003 (http://www.icann.org/en/registrars/wdrp.htm). The Registry Backend Services Provider sends a notice to all Registrars once a year reminding them of their obligation to be diligent in validating the WHOIS information provided during the registration process, to investigate claims of fraudulent WHOIS information, and to cancel domain name registrations for which WHOIS information is determined to be invalid.

3.4 Establishing policies and procedures to ensure Registrar compliance with policies, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means.

The Applicant will require as part of the RRA obligations that all accredited Registrars for the gTLD participate in the abuse prevention and mitigation procedures and policies, as well as efforts to improve the accuracy and completeness of WHOIS data. In addition, the Applicant will work to develop an economic incentive program, such as Market Development Funds for Registrars who meet certain SLAs for performance in this area.

3.5 Registry bi-annual WHOIS verification

Additionally, the Applicant will, of its own volition and no less than twice per year, perform a manual review of a random sampling of gTLD Registrars, in accordance with ICANN’s policy to test the accuracy of the WHOIS information. Although this will not include verifying the actual information in the WHOIS record, the Applicant will be examining the WHOIS data for prima facie evidence of inaccuracies. In the event that such evidence exists, it shall be forwarded to the sponsoring Registrar, who shall be required to address those complaints with their Registrants. Thirty days (30) after forwarding the complaint to the Registrar, the Applicant will re-examine the current WHOIS data for names that were alleged to be inaccurate to determine if the information was corrected, the domain name was deleted, or some other action was taken. If the Registrar has failed to take any action, or if it is clear that the Registrar was either unwilling or unable to correct the inaccuracies, the Applicant reserves the right to suspend the applicable domain name(s) until such time as the Registrar is able to cure the deficiencies.

3.6 Registrar bi-annual verification of WHOIS

The Applicant will require in the Registry-Registrar Agreement that all accredited Registrars in this gTLD will be obliged to verify WHOIS data in the record they have registered in the gTLD twice a year. Verification can take place via email, phone or any other method to confirm the accuracy of the WHOIS data associated with the domain name. The Applicant will randomly audit WHOIS records to ensure compliance and accuracy. As part of the gTLD Abuse reporting system, users can report missing or incomplete WHOIS data via the Registry website.

4 Policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behaviour

The Applicant has developed policies and procedures that define malicious and abusive behaviour. More information on these policies and procedures can be found in section 14 - Acceptable Use Policy.

4.1 Service Level Requirements for resolution of APN related activities

As pertains to the Applicant’s service level requirements for resolution, we aim to address and potentially rectify the issue as it pertains to all forms of abuse and fraud within 24 hours. Once abusive behaviour is detected or reported, the Applicant’s Customer Support team will react within one business day from receiving the request. This support team is operational 24/7/365. A preliminary assessment will be performed in order to determine whether the abuse claim is legitimate. We will classify each instance of legitimately reported abuse into one of two categories based on the probable severity and immediacy of harm to Registrants and Internet users.

Category 1:
- Probable Severity or Immediacy of Harm: Low
- Examples of types of abusive behaviour: Spam, Malware
- Mitigation steps:
  - Investigate
  - Notify Registrar
  - Response times: up to 3 days depending on severity.

Category 2:
- Probable Severity or Immediacy of Harm: Medium to High
- Examples of types of abusive behaviour: Phishing, Illegal Access to other Computers or Networks, Phishing, Hotnet command and control
- Mitigation steps:
  - Suspect domain name
  - Investigate
  - Registrar’s use of domain name
  - Response times: up to 1 day.

4.2 Service Level Requirements and Coordination regarding Law enforcement APN requests

With the assistance of its Registry Backend Services Provider, the Applicant will meet its obligations under Section 2.8 of the Registry Agreement where required to take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports from law enforcement, governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the gTLD. The Registry will respond to legitimate law enforcement inquiries within one business day from receiving the request. Such a response shall include, at a minimum, an acknowledgement of receipt of the request, questions or comments concerning the request, and an outline of the next steps to be taken by the Applicant for rapid resolution of the request.

In the event such request involves any of the activities which can be validated by the Registry and involves the type of activity set forth in the Acceptable Use Policy, the sponsoring Registrar is then given 24 hours to investigate the activity further and either take down the domain name by placing the domain name on hold or by deleting the domain name in its entirety or providing a compelling argument for the Registry to keep the name in the zone. If the Registrar has not taken the requested action after the 24-hour period (i.e., is unresponsive to the request or refuses to take action), the Registry may place the domain on ‘suspend’.

4.3 Coordination with sector Groups and Law Enforcement

One of the reasons for which the Registry Backend Services Provider was selected to serve as the Registry Backend Services Provider by the Applicant is the Registry Backend Services Provider’s extensive experience and its close working relationship with a number of law enforcement agencies. The Registry Backend Services Provider is also a participant in a number of sector groups aimed at sharing information amongst key security and abuse prevention leaders and using domain names. Through these organizations the Registry Backend Services Provider shares information with other registries, Registrars, ccTLDs, law enforcement, security professionals, etc. Not only on abusive domain name registrations within its own gTLD, but also provides information uncovered with respect to domain names in other registries. The Registry Backend Services Provider has often found that the Registry is the only one to report the abusive domain name registrations. This information is passed on to the appropriate law enforcement agencies and is also shared with other gTLDs. The Registry Backend Services Provider routinely provides this information to the other registries so that it can take the appropriate action.

With due consideration in accordance with the Registry Agreement, plans will result in compliance with contractual requirements. The Applicant believes that the proposed collection of protections that involve both proactive and reactive mechanisms outlined above will provide an unmatched level of security and anti-abuse activity within the gTLD. These mechanisms will be part of both the Registry-Registrar Agreement as well as the Registrar Registration Agreement.
The Applicant is committed to ensuring that the use of the internet within its Registry is compliant with all relevant laws and legal directions. The Applicant notes that its role as the Registry operator is not one of judge and jury in all jurisdictions and as such shall direct all complaints to the legal process in the relevant jurisdiction. Upon receiving a valid and enforceable legal judgment or direction it shall comply forthwith with the appropriate action which shall include rapid take-down and/or suspension.

5. Controls to Ensure Proper Access to Domain Functions
5.1 Enabling two-factor authentication from Registrants to process update, transfer, and deletion requests;
To ensure proper and secure access to domain functions, the Applicant will develop best practices for its Registrars relating to enabling its Registrars to utilize two-factor authentication in its interactions with their Registrar and ultimately the Registry.

5.2 Enabling multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests;
The Applicant will investigate the costs and benefits for introducing a service whereby a Registrar can elect to designate multiple points of contact for each domain registered to approve changes to a domain before they are effectuated. The Applicant is of the opinion that these additional checks could improve the security of each domain and will look for ways to deploy them in the most cost-effective and user-friendly manner possible.

5.3 Enabling the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted;
The Applicant will investigate the costs and benefits for introducing a service whereby a Registrar can elect to designate multiple points of contact for each domain registered to receive notification of changes to a domain when they are effectuated. The Applicant is of the opinion that these additional checks could improve the security of each domain and will look for ways to deploy them in the most cost-effective and user-friendly manner possible.

6. Additional Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Initiatives
6.1 Additional Mechanism for Protection of Capital City Names
In parallel with the Landrush Period defined in the answer to question 18, the Applicant will implement a Capital City Claim ("CCC") service whereby additional protection will be granted to the capital city names of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. The CCC process is as follows:
1. Any prospective domain name Registrar applying to register a domain name identical to the capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard will receive from the Applicant a CCC notification highlighting the fact that the applied-for domain name corresponds to a capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.
2. A potential domain name Registrar receiving a CCC notification will have to send a response to the Applicant whereby it will undertake to comply with the required warranties as to registration and usage of the domain name in question should the Registrar be successful in the Landrush period.
3. Upon registration during the Landrush period of a domain name identical to a capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, the Applicant will send a notification in writing to the ICANN Government Advisory Committee ("GAC") Chair.

6.2 Additional Mechanisms to Protect and Reserve IGO Names
The Applicant considers the Protection of Intergovernmental Organizations ('IGO') names to be very important. The Applicant will use strings registered as second level domains in the .int gTLD as the basis for this protection. To register in the .int domain, the Registrars must be an IGO that meets the requirements found in RFC 1591. The .int domain is used for registering organisations established by international treaties between or among national governments and which are widely considered to have independent international legal personality. Thus, the names of these organisations, as with geographic names, can lend an official imprimatur, and if misused, be a source of public confusion or deception.

Reservation of IGO names:
In addition to the mandated and additional reservation of geographic names as provided for in response to Question 22, the Applicant will reserve, and thereby prevent registration of, all names that are registered as second level domains in the most recent .int zone as of late November 2011. By doing so, the Applicant will extend additional protection to IGOs that comply with the current eligibility requirements for the .int gTLD as described at http://www.int.org/whatsnew/changes-must-apply-to-the-int-gdbrd/, and that have obtained a second-level registration in the .int zone.

Release of IGO names:
In the future, should any of the IGOs wish to make use of the protected strings, the Registry will release and assign the domain to the respective IGOs using the following process:

a) The IGO submits a request to the Applicant in the hope of the reserved name being assigned to themselves and provides the necessary documentation and details of the proposed registrar entity for the domain name registration.

b) The Applicant will validate and authenticate the request to establish that it is a genuine bona fide request.

c) Once the request has been approved the Applicant will notify the requesting IGO as well as ICANN and the IGO of the approval for the assignment of the domain name.

d) The Applicant will issue a unique authorization code to the proposed IGO registrar.

6.3 Governance Council
The Applicant believes that the success of the gTLD will be determined in large by the gTLD's stakeholders. Not only will these stakeholders have the primary interest of registering domains on the gTLD, but they will also be motivated to protect the sector from practices that would negatively impact the sector overall. The Applicant further believes that sector stakeholders should be afforded the opportunity to influence the manner in which the gTLD is governed. Accordingly, the Applicant is establishing a Governance Council (the "GC"), to be comprised of key sector stakeholders that will serve as an advisory body.

The GC will elect its own Board of Directors, which will be responsible for self-governance, the recommendation of sector-specific policies, and the formulation of guidance on intellectual property and other best practices related to the gTLD. This will lead the policy development process of defining how the APN Reporting Website should best reflect the options users, rights holders, etc., have for addressing infringing content or other issues.

7. Resource Planning
7.1 Resource Planning Specific to Backend Registry Activities
Responsibility for abuse mitigation rests with a variety of functional groups. The Abuse Monitoring team is primarily responsible for providing analysis and conducting investigations of reports of abuse. The Customer Service team also plays an important role in assisting with the investigations, responding to customers, and notifying Registrars of abusive domains. Finally, the Policy/Legal team is responsible for developing the relevant policies and procedures.

The necessary resources will be pulled from the pool of available resources described in detail in the response to Question 31. The following resources are available from those teams globally distributed:
Policy/Legal - 2 people
The resources are more than adequate to support the abuse mitigation procedures of the Registry.

7.2 Administrative Services Provider - Famous Four Media Limited
In addition to those resources set out above provided by the Registry's backend services provider the Applicant's Administration Services Provider shall provide the following extra resources:

- Sunrise Validation Team - This shall comprise of 11 employees of which at least one shall be a qualified lawyer specializing in intellectual property law.
- Domain Rights Protection Team - This shall comprise of 11 employees of which at least one shall be a qualified lawyer specializing in intellectual property law.

The two key objectives of the Sunrise Validation Team and the Ongoing Rights Protection Team (together the "Rights Team") is to:

a. Prevent abusive registrations; and
b. Identify and address the abusive use of registered names on an ongoing basis.

Because rights protection is a fundamental core objective of the Applicant it has contracted with its Registry Administration Services Provider that the number of full time permanent roles available to the Applicant will be 12% of the estimated requirement to ensure that at all times the Applicant is over resourced in this area. In addition the Applicant shall instruct outside Counsel in any relevant jurisdiction on all matters that are unable to be adequately dealt with by the Sunrise Validation Team or the Ongoing Rights Protection Team.

8. ICANN Prescribed Measures
In accordance with its obligations as a Registry operator, the Applicant will comply with all requirements in the "gTLD Applicant Guidebook." In particular, we will comply with the following measures prescribed by ICANN which serve to mitigate the potential for abuse in the gTLD:

- DNSSEC deployment, which reduces the opportunity for phoning and other man-in-the-middle attacks. We will encourage Registrars and Internet Service Providers to deploy DNSSEC capable resolvers in addition to encouraging DNS hosting providers to deploy DNSSEC in an easy-to-use manner in order to facilitate deployment by Registrars. Prohibition on Wildcarding as required by section 5.3 of Specification 6 of the Registry Agreement.
- Removal of Orphan Glue records (discussed above in section 4).

9. Increasing Registrar Security Awareness
In order to operate a secure and reliable gTLD, the Applicant will attempt to improve Registrar awareness of the threats of domain name hijacking, Registrar impersonation and fraud, and emphasize the need for and responsibility of Registrars to keep registration (including WHOIS) information accurate. Awareness will be raised by:

- Publishing the necessary information on the Abuse page of our Registry website in the form of presentations and FAQs.
- Incorporating language in the 'bad actors' and the creation of blacklists mitigates the potential for abuse by preventing individuals known to take part in such behaviour from registering domain names.

For a Registrar to be placed on a list of bad actors, the Applicant will examine the factors noted above, and such determination shall be made by the Applicant at its sole discretion. Once the Applicant determines that a Registrar should be placed onto the list of bad actors, the Applicant will notify its Registry Backend Services Provider, who will be instructed to cause all of the Registrar's second-level domains in the gTLD to resolve to a page which notes that the domain has been disabled for abuse-related reasons. The second-level domain list will remain in this state until the expiration of the Registrar's registration term or a decision from a UDRP panel or court of competent jurisdiction requires the transfer or cancellation of such domains.

10. Restrictions on Proxy Registration Services
The Applicant will in general discourage the use of proxy registration services. The Applicant further understands that there are instances when proxy registrations may be required and will develop best practices when these instances occur. Whilst it is understood that implementing measures to promote WHOIS accuracy is necessary to ensure that the Registrar may be tracked down, it is recognised that some Registrars may wish to utilise a proxy registration service to protect their privacy. In the event that Registrars elect to offer such services, the following conditions apply:

- Registrars should take the best practice guidance developed by the Applicant and the Governance Council for the gTLD into account when making proxy registration services available to its Registrants.
- Registrars must ensure that the actual WHOIS data is obtained from the Registrar and must maintain accurate records of such data.
- Registrars must provide law enforcement agencies ("LEAs") with the actual WHOIS data upon request of a verified request.

These conditions will be implemented contractually by inclusion of corresponding clauses in the EBA as well as being published on the Abuse page of the Registry website. Individuals and organisations will be encouraged through the Abuse page to report any domain names they believe to be on the above restrictions, following which appropriate action may be taken by the Registry Backend Services Provider. Publications of these conditions on the Abuse page of the Registry website ensures that Registrars are aware that despite their use of a proxy registration service, the actual WHOIS information will be provided to LEA upon request in order to hold Registrars liable for all actions in relation to their domain names.

11. Registry Lock
Certain mission-critical domain names such as transactional sites, email systems and sites supporting applications may warrant a higher level of security. Whilst the Applicant will take efforts to promote the awareness of security among Registrants, it is recognized that an added level of security may be provided to Registrants by 'Registry locking' the domain name and thereby prohibiting any updates at the Registry operator level. The Registry lock facility will be offered to all Registrars who may request this service on behalf of their Registrants in order to prevent unintentional transfer, notification or deletion of the domain name. This facility mitigates the potential for abuse by prohibiting any unauthorized updates that may be associated with fraudulent behaviour. For example, an attacker may update nameservers of a mission-critical domain name, thereby redirecting customers to an illegitimate website without actually transferring control of the domain name. Upon receipt of a list of domain names to be placed on Registry lock by an authorized representative from a Registrar, the Registry
1. Validate that the Registrar is the Registrar of record for the domain name.
2. Set or modify the status codes for the names submitted to serverUpdateProhibited, serverDeleteProhibited and/or transferProhibited depending on the request.
3. Monitor the domain names in the shared registration system (SDS).
4. Provide a monthly report to Registrars indicating the names for which the Registrar lock service was provided in the previous month.

13. Scope/Scale Consistency

The Applicant believes that the proposed collection of protections that involve both proactive and reactive mechanisms outlined above will provide an unmatched level of security and anti-abuse activity within the gTLD and is appropriate for the size and scale of the gTLD.

13.1 Scope/Scale Consistently Specific to Backend Registry Activities

The Registry Backend Services Provider is an experienced backend Registry provider that has developed and uses proprietary system scaling models to guide the growth of the gTLD supporting infrastructure. These models direct the Registry Backend Services Provider’s infrastructure scaling to not be limited, but to be server capacity, data storage volume, and network throughput that are aligned to new and usage patterns. The Registry Backend Services Provider periodically updates these models to account for the adoption of more capable and cost-effective technologies.

The Registry Backend Services Provider’s scaling models are proven predictors of needed capacity and related cost. As such, they provide the protection to potential implementation costs. The projected usage volume for the most likely scenario (defined in Question 46. Template 1 - Financial Projections: Most Likely) as an input to its scaling models. The Registry Backend Services Provider derived the necessary infrastructure required to implement and sustain this gTLD and its AMP policies.

14. Acceptable Use Policy

This Acceptable Use Policy gives the Registry the ability to quickly lock, cancel, transfer or take ownership of any domain name, either temporarily or permanently, if the domain name is being used in a manner that appears to threaten the stability, integrity or security of the gTLD or any of its Registry systems, or to safeguard the stability, integrity or security of the Registry or the users and other Registry or users at risk. The process also allows the Registry to take preventive measures to avoid any such criminal or security threats.

The Acceptable Use Policy may be triggered through a variety of channels, including, among other things, private complaint, public alert, government or enforcement agency outreach, and the on-going monitoring by the Registry or its designees will alert the Registry’s Registrar partners about any identified threats, and will work closely with them to bring sending sites into compliance.

The following are some (but not all) activities that may be subject to rapid domain compliance:

- Phishing: a criminal activity employing tactics to defraud and define Internet users via sensitive information with the intent to steal or expose credentials, money or identities. A phishing attack often begins with a spoofed email posed as a trustworthy electronic correspondence that contains hijacked brand names e.g., financial institutions, credit card companies, e-commerce sites. The Hannibals persuade the user by generating either fear and/or excitement to ultimately lure the recipient to a fraudulent Web site. It is paramount for both the phishers and Web site to appear credible in order for the reader to influence the recipient. As with the spoofed email, phishers aim to make the associated phishing Web sites appear credible. The legitimacy of a site is mirrored to make the fraudulent site look professionally designed. False third-party security endorsements, spoofed address bars, and spoofed padlock icons falsely lend credibility to fraudulent sites as well. The persuasive influence of the language of the email combined with a legitimate looking Web site is used to convince recipients to disclose sensitive information such as passwords, credit card data numbers, social numbers and more under false name.
- Malware: malicious software that is intentionally developed to infiltrate or damage a computer, mobile device, software or operating infrastructure or website without the consent of the owner or authorized party. This includes, amongst others, Viruses, Trojan horses, and worms.

Domain Name or Domain Theft: the act of changing the registration of a domain name without the permission of its original Registrant.

- Botnet Command and Control: Services run on a domain name that is used to control a collection of compromised computers or "zombies," or to directly distribute Denial of Service attacks ("DDos attacks")
- Distribution of Malware: the intentional creation and intentional or unintentional distribution of malicious software designed to infiltrate a computer system without the owner’s consent, including, without limitation, computer viruses, worms, keyloggers, and Trojans.
- Fast Flux Attack/Rootkit: A technique used to shelter Phishing, Pharming, and Malware sites from detection and to provide rapid denial of service attack; such attacks work by hijacking the IP addresses associated with fraudulent sites and changing them rapidly so as to make the true location of the sites difficult to find. Hacking: the attempt to gain unauthorized access (or exceed the level of authorized access) to a computer, information system, user account, confidentiality, database, or software system.
- Pharming: The redirection of unknown users to fraudulent sites or services, typically through, but not limited to, DNS hijacking or poisoning.
- Spam: The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited bulk messages. The term applies to email spam and similar abuses such as instant messaging spam, mobile messaging spam, and spawning of websites and Internet forums.
- Child Pornography: the storage, publication, display and/or dissemination of pornographic materials depicting individuals under the legal age in the relevant jurisdic-tion.
- Further abusive behavior includes, but are not limited to: Cybergagging, Front-Running, Gripe Sites, Deceptive and/or Offensive Domain Name Registrations, Cross-Registration Scam, Name Spinning, Pay-per-Click, Traffic Diversion, False Affiliations, Domain Kiting / Tasting, fast-flux and 419 scams.

The Registry reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to take any administrative and operational actions necessary, including the use of computer forensics and information security technological services, among other things, in order to implement the Acceptable Use Policy. In addition, the Registry reserves the right to deny, cancel or transfer any registration or transaction, or place any domain name on hold or in a similar status, that is determined, at its discretion: (1) to protect the integrity and stability of the Registry; (2) to comply with any applicable laws, government rules or requirements, requirements or resolution process; (3) to avoid any liability, civil or criminal, on the part of the Registry as well as its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, and/or employees under the terms of the terms of the agreement or (5) to correct mistakes made by the Registry or any Registrar in connection with a domain name registration. The Registry also reserves the right to place any domain lock, hold or similar status a domain name during resolution of a dispute.

The Registry reserves the right to deny, cancel or transfer any registration or transaction, or place any domain name on hold or in a similar status that is determined, at its discretion: (1) to protect the integrity and stability of the Registry; (2) to comply with any applicable laws, government rules or requirements, requirements or resolution process; (3) to avoid any liability, civil or criminal, on the part of the Registry as well as its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, and/or employees under the terms of the terms of the agreement or (5) to correct mistakes made by the Registry or any Registrar in connection with a domain name registration. The Registry also reserves the right to place any domain lock, hold or similar status a domain name during resolution of a dispute.

15. Abuse Response Process

The Registry is committed to ensuring that those domain names associated with abuse or malicious conduct in violation of the Acceptable Use Policy are dealt with in a timely and decisive manner. These include taking action against those domain names that are being used to threaten the stability and security of the gTLD, or are part of a real-time investigation by law enforcement.

Once a report is received from a component of the Registry, the Registry will use commercially reasonable efforts to verify the information in the complaint. If that information can be verified to the best of the ability of the Registry, the sponsoring Registrar will be notified and be given 48 hours to investigate the activity. This will result in either the take down of the domain name by placing the domain name on hold or the deletion of the domain name in its entirety or providing a compelling argument to the Registry to keep the domain name in the zone. If the Registrar has not taken the requested action after the 48-hour period (i.e., is unresponsive to the request or refuses to take action), the Registry may place the domain name on "ServerHold". Although this action removes the domain name from the gTLD zone, the domain name record still appears in the gTLD WHOIS database so that the name and entities can be investigated by law enforcement should they desire to get involved.
Additionally, the Applicant will require Registrars to adhere to the following abuse-prevention procedures:

- Each new gTLD accredited Registrar must provide and maintain a valid primary point of contact for abuse complaints. The Applicant will require this as part of the new gTLD ERA.
- The Applicant will explicitly define for Registrars what constitutes abusive behaviour including but not limited to, malicious, negligent, and reckless behaviour. The definition of abusive behaviour will be contained in the AUP and the Applicant will require this as part of the new gTLD ERA.
- Registrars must notify the Registry Operator immediately regarding any investigation or compliance action including the nature of the investigation or compliance action by ICANN or any outside party (e.g., law enforcement, etc.), along with the gTLD impacted. This will be required as part of the new gTLD ERA.
- The Applicant will initiate an Abuse Prevention and Mitigation Working Group. This group will be developed in conjunction with the gTLD Governance Council mentioned above. Its aim will be to give the Applicant’s team alternate perspectives about handling incidents of abuse and ways to mitigate them. The group will meet regularly to discuss the latest trends in domain name abuse and the most effective way to prevent and remedy them for the gTLD.

-end-

29. Rights Protection Mechanisms

Q29

The Applicant will be implementing an extensive range of Rights Protection Mechanisms ("RPMs") designed to minimize abusive registrations and other activities that may affect the legal rights of others. The Applicant will implement and comply with all ICANN required RPMs and will in addition implement further measures to better protect the rights of others and minimize abusive registrations.

The following is an overview of the Applicant’s response to Q29:

1. Rights Protection as a core objective
2. Plans for Rights Protection Mechanisms as part of Start-Up
3. ICANN Mandated Rights Protection Mechanisms
   3.1. Trademark Clearinghouse ("TMCN")
   3.2. Applicant’s Sunrise Period ("ASR")
   3.3. Trademark Claims Service ("TCS")
   3.4. Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP")
   3.5. Uniform Rapid Suspension System ("URS")
   3.6. Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure ("PDRP")
4. Additional Rights Protection Mechanisms to be implemented by the Applicant on a Voluntary Basis
   4.1. Mechanisms to protect ISO Names ("FSF")
   4.2. Mechanisms for Further Protection of Capital City Names ("CC")
   4.3. Efforts to promote WHOIS Accuracy
   4.4. Semi Annual Audits to Ensure WHOIS Accuracy
   4.5. Policies Handling Complaints Regarding Abuse and Rights Issues
   4.6. Registry Acceptable Use Policy ("AUP")
   4.7. Monitoring for Malicious Activity
   4.8. Resourcing Plans Specific to Backend Registry Activities
   4.9. Registry Backend Services Provider Experience with Rights Protection Measures

1 Rights Protection as a core objective

The Applicant is firmly committed to the protection of Intellectual Property rights and to implementing the mandatory RPMs contained in the Applicant’s Guidebook and detailed in Specification 7 of the Registry Agreement. Use of domain names that infringe upon the legal rights of others in the gTLD will be not be tolerated and preventing abusive registrations is a core objective of the Applicant. The nature of such uses creates security and stability issues for the Registry, Registrars, and Registrants, as well as for users of the Internet in general. The Applicant will prevent abusive registrations and reduce opportunities for behaviours such as phishing or phishing by implementing comprehensive registration, anti-abuse, and rights protection guidelines as defined in its AUP, as well as innovative additional RPMs such as FSF and the CCC, as described below. In order to identify and address the abusive uses of registered names on an ongoing basis, the Applicant will also incorporate and abide by all mandated RPMs as specified in Specification 7 of the Registry Agreement and as adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors as ICANN Consensus Policies.

2 Plans for Rights Protection Mechanisms as part of Start-Up

The timeline for start-up RPMs in the Applicant’s gTLD is as follows:

Phase 1 - Sunrise Process:
   - Day 1: Sunrise round opens
   - Day 2: Sunrise round closes
   - Day 3: Sunrise round opens
   - Day 41: Sunrise Allocation including Contention Resolution Mechanisms ("CRM") opens
   - Day 71: Sunrise Allocation CRM closes
   - The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:
     a. TMCN
     b. Sunrise Eligibility Requirements ("SER")
     c. Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy ("SDRP")
     d. UDRP
     e. URS
     f. FSF
     g. TCS

Phase 2 - Landrush Process:
   - Day 72: Landrush opens
   - Day 101: Landrush closes
   - Day 102: Landrush CRM opens
   - Day 113: Landrush CRM closes
   - The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:
     a. UDRP
     b. URS
     c. FSF
     d. CCC
     e. TCS

Phase 3 - General Availability/Registrations:
   - Day 114: General availability begins
   - The following Rights Protection Mechanisms apply:
     a. UDRP
     b. URS
     c. FSF
     d. CCC
     e. TCS (90 days)
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New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 19 April 2013

Application ID: 1234-567890
Application ID: kam
Priority Number: 163
Applicant Name: dot Agency Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: Pass

Congratulations!
Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and advisories), your application has passed Initial Evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening: Eligible
Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity: Pass or Correction
The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability: Pass
The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Names: Not a Geographic Name: Pass
The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services: Pass
The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:
Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26: DNS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: EPP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IPv6 Reachability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Failure Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: IDNs (Optional)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44*  

**Financial Capability**  

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:  

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No zero score allowed on any question**  

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the 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 website at <newgtld.icann.org>. 
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Agency Limited

String: cam

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012

Application ID: 1-1234-83704

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Agency Limited

2. Address of the principal place of business
   6A Queenway
   Gibraltar GX11 1AA
   GI

3. Phone number
   +350 216 50000

4. Fax number
   +35020051071

5. If applicable, website or URL

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Pour Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   +350 216 50000

6(e). Fax Number
   +350 200 510 71
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 20 May 2013

Application ID: 1139-43487
Application For: BASKETBALL
Priority Number: 274
Applicant Name: Baskettball Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: Pass
Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and revisions), your application has passed initial evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening Result: Eligible

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to request and charge eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity Panel Result: Pass - Contention
The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability Panel Result: Pass
The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Names Panel Result: Pass - Match Geographic Name
The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services Panel Result: Pass
The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability Panel Result: Pass
The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: WHOIS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No zero score allowed on any question**

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. All applications are subject to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Combined Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification II of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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 website at <newgtlds.icann.org>. 

**Financial Capability**

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICANN

New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Basketball Limited

String: basketball
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1199-43437

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Basketball Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Cees Jan Manshian

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Stetson & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar companies act 1930

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PCC Limited

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

[Domain Management Limited] [Director]
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>1-1227-18477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String</td>
<td>.bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Number</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>.bid Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Initial Evaluation Summary**

**Initial Evaluation Result**

Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and advisories), your application has passed initial evaluation.

**Background Screening Summary**

Background Screening: Eligible

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

**Panel Summary**

**String Similarity**: Pass - No Connection

The String Similarity Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and your applied-for string is not in contention with any other applied-for strings.

**DNS Stability**: Pass

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

**Geographic Names**: Not a Geographic Name - Pass

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not meet the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

**Registry Services**: Pass

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

**Technical & Operational Capability**: Pass

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: BRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass** 8

**No zero score allowed on any question**

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. All applications are subject to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification R of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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>.
Application Details

Application ID: 1-1227-15477

Applicant: dot Bid Limited

Prioritization Number: 242

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Web Site: Contact Information Redacted

Primary Contact: Mr. Geir Rasmussen

Phone Numbers: Contact Information Redacted

Email: Contact Information Redacted

Attachments (9):

- 24 (CSV) .EPP Schema Files - Notepad++ (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/DownloadAttachment/124/27.cvs?tag=1220)
- 24 (Question 24 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/DownloadAttachment/1215/27.cvs?tag=1220)
- 32 (Questions 26 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/DownloadAttachment/1215/57.cvs?tag=1220)
- 20 (Governance_Council_short.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadAttachment/1213/72.cvs?tag=1220)
- 29 (CODA_BR.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadAttachment/1215/57.cvs?tag=1220)
- 70 (ICANN_RandP.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadAttachment/1214/57.cvs?tag=1220)
- 31 (Launch_Plans.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadAttachment/1214/57.cvs?tag=1220)


© 2013 Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Bid Limited

String: bid

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012

Application ID: 1-1227-16477

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Bid Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe and Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar companies act 1930

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PCC Limited

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

Domain Management Limited, Director
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 20 May 2013

Application ID: 1-125-36982
Applied-for String: DIET
Priority Number: 248
Applicant Name: dot Diet Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and addenda), your application has passed initial evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Panel Summary

String Similarity

The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Names

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: IPS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Lifecycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IP-IX Resolvability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Failover Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: IDNs (Optional)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 28

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass* 22

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44

### Financial Capability

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections &amp; Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 8

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass** 8

**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Combined Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the 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 website at [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org).
Application ID: 1-1226-26682

String: DIET

Applicant: dot Diet Limited

Prioritization Number: 248

Address: 6A Queenway, Gibraltar, GX11 1AA, GI

Website:

Primary Contact: Mr. Geir Reurnussen

Phone Number: +350 216 50000

Email: icannfas43@famousfourmedia.com

Attachments (8):

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 turn your operating system and applications (including antimalware definitions if applicable) as fully updated. Proceed at your own risk.

- 24 (Cpp) EFIP Schema Files - Notespdf.pdf (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/119292?arc=1202)
- 24 (Question 24 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/119233?arc=1202)
- 25 (Question 25 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/119281?arc=1202)
- 26 (Question 26 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/119270?arc=1202)
- 27 (Question 27 Tables and Graphics.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/119259?arc=1202)
- 38 (Governance_Council_short.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/132669?arc=1202)
- 29 (Launch Plan.pdf) (application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/downloadattachment/126829?arc=1202)


© 2013 Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Diet Limited

String: diet

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012

Application ID: 1-1225-36982

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Diet Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Wisterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe and Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar companies act 1930

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PPC Limited

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

[Domain Management Limited Director]
Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Results: Pass

Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and addenda), your application has passed initial evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening: Eligible

Based on a review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reprocess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>String Similarity</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, posing a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNS Stability</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Names</th>
<th>Not a Geographic Name</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry Services</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical &amp; Operational Capability</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Technical &amp; Operational Capability Panel determined that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your application meets the Technical &amp; Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: WHOIS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Capability</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Capability Panel determined that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No zero score allowed on any question**

Disclaimer: Please note that these Initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. Limited dates the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at our discretion, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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 ICAHN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Poker Limited

String: poker
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1202-1720

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Poker Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Hromussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner – Sceptre & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar companies act 1939

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PTE Limited

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

[Domain Management Limited Director]
New gTLD Program  
Initial Evaluation Report  
Report Date: 17 May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>1-174-59554</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String</td>
<td>.SPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Number</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>dot Sport Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Initial Evaluation Summary**

**Initial Evaluation Pass**

Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including relaxed supplemental notes and advisories), your application has passed initial evaluation.

**Background Screening Summary**

**Eligible**

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

**Panel Summary**

**String Similarity**

The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

**DNS Stability**

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.3.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

**Geographic Names**

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

**Registry Services**

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

**Technical & Operational Capability**

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: DNS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IPv6 Reachability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Failover Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: DNS (Optional)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass*</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44

### Financial Capability

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. All applications are subject to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 6 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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 <www.gtds.icann.org>.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Sport Limited

String: sport
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1174-59954

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Sport Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   C
   Mr. Geir Andreas Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winnenfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Stptoo & Johnson LLP

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
Limited liability company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1990

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PLLC Limited

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
Domain Management Limited [Director]
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 May 2013

Application ID: 1-1276-11213
Applied-for String: WEBCAM
Priority Number: 323
Applicant Name: dot Webcam Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: PASSED

Congratulations!
Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and advisories), your application has passed initial evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to re-evaluate and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity: PASSED - No Controversy

The String Similarity Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and your applied-for string is not in contention with any other applied-for strings.

DNS Stability: PASSED

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Name: PASSED - Not a Geographic Name

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services: PASSED

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability: PASSED

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Capability

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass** 8
**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these Initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. All applications are subject to due diligence at contract time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the 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 website at <www.gtld.icann.org>.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Webcam Limited

String: webcam
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1238-11213

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Webcam Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1939

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PLC Limited

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

Domain Management Limited Director
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 24 May 2013

Application ID: L-1210-89939
Applicant String: DELIVERY
Priority Number: 405
Applicant Name: dotDelivery Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: Pass - Contention

Congratulations!
Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and addendums), your application has passed Initial Evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening: Eligible
Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity: Pass - Contention
The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applicant string is visually similar to another applicant string, creating a possibility of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.3.1.1 and 2.3.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability: Pass
The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 3.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Names: Not a Geographic Name - Pass
The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services: Pass
The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability: Pass
The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: RPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34: Geographic Diversity 2
35: DNS Service 1
36: IPv6 Reachability 1
37: Data Backup Policies & Procedures 1
38: Data Escrow 1
39: Registry Continuity 2
40: Registry Transition 1
41: Failover Testing 1
42: Monitoring and Fault Resolution 2
43: DNSSEC 1
44: IDNs (Optional) 1

Total 26
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass * 33

*No zero score allowed except on optional IDNs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Capability</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 8
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass ** 8

**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these Initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Dorelled Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the 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>.
APPLICATION DETAILS

Application ID: 1-1220-89939

String: DELIVERY 4.0
Public portion of application 1-1220-89939
Application status: 1-1220-89939

Applicant: 4.0 Delivery Limited

Priority Number: 400

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Web Site:

Primary Contact: Mr. Ger Andres Rasmussen

Phone Number: Contact Information Redacted

Email: Contact Information Redacted

Attachments [12]:

Caution: These files were prepared and submitted by a party other than ICANN, and ICANN is not responsible for the content. This file could contain scripts or embedded items that might execute or open automatically. You should make your own judgment and applications (including antenna detections & suspects) are fully updated. Proceed at your own risk.

- 24 (full text: PDF)
- 26 (full text: PDF)
- 27 (full text: PDF)
- 28 (full text: PDF)
- 29 (full text: PDF)
- 30 (full text: PDF)

IE Result:

Please refer to the ICANN reference details at the URL: https://gnldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/apply...
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Delivery Limited

String: delivery

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1220-89939

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Delivery Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Bakkenesen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Fawous Pour Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1920

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

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

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

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

Applicant Background

11(a). Name(s) and position(s) of all directors

[Signature]

Domain Management Limited, Director
New gTLD Program  
Initial Evaluation Report  
Report Date: 31 May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1-1234-567894</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appliend for String:</td>
<td>CMAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Number:</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>dot Chat Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: 

Congratulations!

Based on the review performed to date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Background Screening Summary

Eligible

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity: Pass - Contention:
The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability: Pass

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Names: Pass

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services: Pass

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability: Pass

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: SRS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34: Geographic Diversity 2
35: DNS Service 1
36: IPv6 Reachability 1
37: Data Backup Policies & Procedures 1
38: Data Escrow 1
39: Registry Continuity 2
40: Registry Transition 1
41: Follower Testing 1
42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation 2
43: DNSSEC 1
44: IDN: Optional 1

Total 28
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass* 22

*No zero score allowed except optional Q4

**Financial Capability: Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 8
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass** 8

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases, the results might be subject to change. All applications are subject to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Contract Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification B of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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 Name-gTLDs website at <www.gtld.icann.org>.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Chat Limited

String: chat
Originally Posted: 13 June 2012
Application ID: 1-1237-60534

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Chat Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Four Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Steptoe & Johnson LLP

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
Limited Liability Company

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1990

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PLC Limited

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
[Domain Management Limited Director]
New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
Report Date: 31 May 2013

Application ID: 1-1233-26092
Applied for String: TICKETS
Priority Number: 528
Applicant Name: dot Tickets Limited

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result: Pass

Congratulations!

Based on the review of your application against the relevant criteria in the Applicant Guidebook (including related supplemental notes and advisories), your application has passed Initial Evaluation.

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening: Eligible

Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Panel Summary

String Similarity: Pass - Continuation

The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.

DNS Stability: Pass

The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Geographic Name: Not a Geographic Name - Pass

The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.

Registry Services: Pass

The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.

Technical & Operational Capability: Pass

The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Technical & Operational Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24: BIS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: EPP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Whois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Registration Lifecycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Security Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Technical Overview of Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Database Capabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Geographic Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: DNS Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: IPv6 Reachability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Data Escrow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Registry Continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Registry Transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Fallover Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: DNSSEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: IONc (Optional)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass*: 22

*No zero score allowed except on optional Q44

**Financial Capability**

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45: Financial Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Projections Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Costs and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Funding and Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Contingency Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Funding Critical Registry Functions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**: 8

**No zero score allowed on any question

Disclaimer: Please note that these initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification & of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. 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 Application Submitted to ICANN by: dot Tickets Limited

String: tickets

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012

Application ID: 1-1233-26032

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name
   dot Tickets Limited

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

Primary Contact

6(a). Name
   Mr. Geir Andreas Rasmussen

6(b). Title
   Chief Executive Officer - Famous Pop Media Limited

6(c). Address

6(d). Phone Number
   Contact Information Redacted

6(e). Fax Number
   Contact Information Redacted
Contact Information Redacted

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Brian Winterfeldt

7(b). Title
Partner - Staples & Johnson LLC

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
Limited Liability Company.

8(b). State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).
Incorporated under the Gibraltar Companies Act 1934

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

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

9(b). If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.
Domain Venture Partners PCC Limited

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

Domain Management Limited Director