



Sivasubramanian M <isolatedn@gmail.com>

Nameshop new gTLD application with its string change request

Sivasubramanian M <isolatedn@gmail.com>

Mon, Jan 6, 2014 at 12:22 PM

To: Akram Atallah <akram.atallah@icann.org>

Cc: Cherine Chalaby <cherine.chalaby@icann.org>, Fadi Chehade <fadi.chehade@icann.org>, Christine Willett <christine.willett@icann.org>, john.jeffrey@icann.org, steve.crocker@icann.org, sivasubramanian muthusamy <6.internet@gmail.com>

Dear Akram Atallah,

Thank you for meeting me during ICANN Buenos Aires, on Thursday, 21 November. Please accept and acknowledge this note:

Core Issue

To reiterate my core issue and concerns, I am convinced ICANN has not sufficiently evaluated Nameshop's string change request against the background of the adverse SARP panel decision which further confuses the issue on account of the rationale that the application may not proceed in the absence of Applicant Support.

Applicant's Request

The applicant requests ICANN to separate the Applicant Support Request from the Change Request and evaluate the merits of the Change Request independent of the SARP decision on Applicant Support. ICANN's framework of rules permits and would require ICANN to evaluate these requests independent of each other. And they are properly distinct and severable.

Following our meeting during ICANN Buenos Aires, I am hopeful that that opportunity to quietly express our views have enabled ICANN to reconsider and view my change request for .Internet not as exceptional but well within the framework of rules laid down for the new gTLD program, accord due process for fair and equal evaluation of its gTLD application in general and of the Change Request in particular.

I am asserting the Change Request process did not restrict the scope of change that can be requested by the process. I am further asserting the existing rules neither prohibit or exact any process regarding the request for change of strings; all applicants may apply for a change of string, so long as the original submission was in error and the request for change of string confirmed to the seven criteria laid down. The concern expressed in certain quarters that one string change would prompt more such requests is without merit since every request must be evaluated against on its own particular set of meritorious claims.

I am asserting the string chosen in the change request - .internet - is not previously requested and thusly not in contention, not in conflict with any that is applied for.

I am asserting the request for .internet is not hampered by any existing reservation or rule; it is not a two or three character country code, nor geographic in any manner, is neither reserved by ICANN, nor reserved by the Internet Engineering Task Force. See <http://tools.ietf.org/search/rfc2606>

We note further the string is also not reserved at the second level since existing Registries have allotted Internet.tld to applicants without restraint. See examples here:

<http://www.technologyreview.com/review/522671/facebooks-two-faces/>

Despite the fact that the application was drawn by the random process to be prioritized as No 150 out of 1500+ applications, there is a time delay occurring in the evaluation process. Nameshop could and is willing to bear a reasonable delay. But if the evaluation of the string .Internet is to be delayed for a longer period or postponed, it would be severely unfair to Nameshop as a small applicant from a developing economy to which the cost of the simplest ICANN process is relatively expensive.

We are increasingly concerned that given the public notoriety now associated with the string .internet following, there are various scenarios that would threaten the value of the string to Nameshop if delayed beyond a certain point. The question of severe economic harm to Nameshop's interest then arise.

While Nameshop does not request special treatment, especially on this count, ICANN might view this application as an opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to Internalization and fairness across geographical regions. This application could be viewed as an application that happens to be a symbolic string, which happens to be from a region without a significant number of new gTLD applications, by a small firm, not a large corporation, not an existing Registry or a domain business of any prior significance. Fair and transparent evaluation would further the world's confidence in ICANN as an institution.

Nameshop intends to manage this TLD with commercial and contractual help from one of the most experienced Registry Service Providers, Afiliis, perhaps utilizing their expanded offering of Managed Registry Services.

Nameshop remains committed to ICANN and its new gTLD program, to the overall DNS and reaffirms its faith in the overall ICANN multi-stakeholder processes.

Nameshop is a Proprietary firm, free of any direct or indirect partnerships, which makes it possible to be unrestrained in its Public Interest Commitments.

11/28/2018

Gmail - Nameshop new gTLD application with its string change request

http://www.scribd.com/mobile/doc/148292123?secret_password=1vn7ch71587elqhtb3a7&width=360

Thank you.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy
India
<http://nameshop.in>