

Dear Akram Atallah,

Our application has been in process well beyond due limits and well in excess of normal delays, with **hurdles in initial evaluation that obstruct Executive/Board attention and that of the ICANN Community to the following benefits of the application:**

1. This application as a TLD idea, originally for the string .IDN, changed to the string .Internet, is to connect web spaces in Internationalized Domain Names across language communities, thereby contributing to ICANN's efforts to preserve the Internet as a Universal space. The purpose is to offer .Internet as an ASCII version of the Registrant's IDN domain name to point to the IDN domain name's web space. This would make web spaces of the IDN Registrants more widely accessible outside the Registrant's IDN language space, otherwise the Internationalized Domain Name is in the Registrant's local script, so gets limited and confined only to the specific language community familiar with that specific script. With this ASCII TLD as the bridge, the IDN web space becomes accessible by users across the Internet, so the knowledge shared in the form of content in local languages is universally identified by the ASCII TLD mapped to the IDN, and becomes accessible across the Internet. This is explained graphically at page <http://nameshop.in> below the timeline, under the heading "The usefulness and larger purpose of the Nameshop new gTLD".
2. The mission of this application for the string .Internet offers a natural solution to the problem of "Universal Acceptance of Internationalized Domain Names", both that of machine level acceptance as has been publicly discussed and that at the human level, most of these difficulties still largely unexplored, to the best of the applicant's knowledge. The ideas contained in this application presents a natural, easy and workable solution to the issues related to the Universal Acceptance of Internationalized Domain Names, ICANN should have seen merit (over and above the several merits of this application in conformity with all the laid down criteria and the various commitments in Global Public Interest) to actually prioritize the processing and delegation of .Internet. On the contrary, you have kept the Application from moving past preliminary evaluation by inexplicable hurdles
3. I am now concerned that because all this comes from a small applicant, noticeably distinct in terms of size, geographic location and business background, definitive action is being delayed. Considering the fact that there are so few applications from small applicants, from such regions as this applicant, ICANN could have avoided negatively discriminating this application, in the interest of a balance, but for some reason, it is taking time.
4. As asserted repeatedly, 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/>

<http://gigaom.com/2014/07/31/facebooks-internet-org-unveils-free-limited-web-access-such-opportunity-but-at-what-cost/>

While it is not reserved by any existing rule, you have not answered a specific question repeatedly raised by the applicant "Is the string .internet a reserved string under existing rules? Or is it reserved for anyone?" It is difficult to interpret your silence on this question.

5. I am still trying to interpret what it means when ICANN in conversation said to me that .net exists, so they couldn't possibly see the value of .internet. This is despite ICANN's profound insight concerning the value of strings in general, even after attention's was brought to a possible valuation given the value being built around the string internet at the second level by a large American business enterprise as can be seen in the link provided above.

6. Nameshop does not request special treatment, on these counts. We simply want a fair and balanced hearing and due evaluation. It would be fair and it would serve ICANN well to process and delegate this string with due and fair attention, without any further delay.

Thank you

Sivasubramanian M  
Proprietor

Chennai  
September 12, 2014