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Proposal for dealing with IGO Acronyms

1. TMCH Modifications:
   - ICANN will modify the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) to enable Eligible IGOs to submit, at no cost, up to two acronyms representing their names in up to 2 different languages into the TMCH.
   - Participating Eligible IGOs will designate a contact person to receive email notifications of registrations of their submitted acronyms [for the life of the TMCH].
   - If a third party registers an IGO’s registered acronym, the IGO will receive notification of the registration from the TMCH.

2. URS Modifications
   - ICANN will modify aspects of the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) to enable IGOs to utilize the URS.
   - In cases involving IGO names and acronyms, the URS rules requiring consent to national jurisdiction will not apply and the outcomes of such cases will not be appealable to any court of national jurisdiction.
   - IGOs will not be required to pay for the use of the URS.

3. Arbitration Mechanism
   - At present, the UDRP requires complainants to consent to the jurisdiction of national courts which IGOs cannot do.
   - ICANN (in consultation with IGOs) will develop rules and procedures of an arbitration process to resolve claims of abuse of IGO names and acronyms.

4. Impact of future GNSO PDP on URS modifications and Arbitration Mechanism
   - The terms above concerning modifications to the URS and the creation of an arbitration mechanism for the benefit of IGOs will remain in place unless the Board adopts further improvements to the URS and UDRP pursuant to any GNSO Policy Development Process.
   - ICANN (in consultation with IGOs) will ensure that further improvements to the URS and UDRP will not result in a diminution of the safeguards granted to IGOs, outlined above.

5. Glossary
   - Eligible IGO: An Intergovernmental Organization whose name appeared on the list attached as Annex 2 to the 22 March 2013 Letter from Heather Dryden, Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee to Steve Crocker, Chair, ICANN Board.
   - IGO Acronym: An abbreviation of the names of Eligible IGOs in up to two languages.
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TITLE: Reconsideration Request 13-13

The following attachments are relevant to Reconsideration Request 13-13.

Attachment A is Reconsideration Request 13-13, submitted on 19 October 2013.

Attachment B is the BGC’s Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-13, issued on 12 December 2013.

Attachment C is a printout of GOProud Inc.’s corporate status from the District of Columbia’s Secretary of State website.

Attachment D is printout of GOProud, Inc. 2.0’s corporate status from the State of Delaware Secretary of State website.

Submitted By: Amy A. Stathos, Deputy General Counsel
Dated Noted: 16 March 2014
Email: amy.stathos@icann.org
ICANN’s Board Governance Committee is responsible for receiving requests for reconsideration from any person or entity that has been materially affected by any ICANN staff action or inaction if such affected person or entity believes the action contradicts established ICANN policies, or by actions or inactions of the Board that such affected person or entity believes has been taken without consideration of material information. Note: This is a brief summary of the relevant Bylaws provisions. For more information about ICANN’s reconsideration process, please visit http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#IV and http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/. 

This form is provided to assist a requester in submitting a Reconsideration Request, and identifies all required information needed for a complete Reconsideration Request. This template includes terms and conditions that shall be signed prior to submission of the Reconsideration Request.

Requesters may submit all facts necessary to demonstrate why the action/inaction should be reconsidered. However, argument shall be limited to 25 pages, double-spaced and in 12 point font.

For all fields in this template calling for a narrative discussion, the text field will wrap and will not be limited.

Please submit completed form to reconsideration@icann.org.

1. Requester Information

Name: Christopher Barron
Address: Contact Information Redacted
Email: Contact Information Redacted
Phone Number (optional): Contact Information Redacted

(Note: ICANN will post the Requester’s name on the Reconsideration Request page at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm. Requestors address, email and phone number will be removed from the posting.)

2. Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):
___ Board action/inaction

__X_ Staff action/inaction

My reconsideration request is related to an external panel contracted by ICANN, that is, the ICC and its adjudication of community objections. It is my understanding that the reconsideration request may also apply to external panels contracted to fulfill ICANN procedural issues.

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.

(Provide as much detail as available, such as date of Board meeting, reference to Board resolution, etc. You may provide documents. All documentation provided will be made part of the public record.)

To start, here is a timeline of the events:

- March 12th - GOProud Objection Sent to ICC
- March 15th - Spela sends me an e-mail asking if it’s one complaint or two
- March 28th - ICC sends me an email saying that the objection is over the 5,000 word limit and that I have 5 days (from tomorrow) to respond.
- April 1st - Scott Seitz e-mails Spela at ICC asking what’s up with the GOProud Objection (I am not copied)
- April 4th - I e-mail ICC inquiring about the status of the GOProud Objection
- April 9th – I send another e-mail to ICC inquiring about the status of the GOProud Objection
- April 9th - Hannah at ICC acknowledges my inquiries of April “5”th and April 9th and indicates that we’ve missed the deadline to deal with the issue. She points to the letter of March 28th which the ICC sent to .
- April 10th – I send Letter to ICC (Spela) explaining that I never received their original e-mail explaining that we were over the 5,000 word limit
- April 10th - Spela sends the original March 28th e-mail and a outlooks automatic delivery receipt, which actually states that "no delivery notification was sent by the destination server" (i.e. mine)
- April 16th – I send First Letter to Fadi
- April 29th – I send Second Letter to Fadi along with FedEx
- May 2nd - Christine Schachter acknowledged receipt of the e-mails and said “Your correspondence and inquiries have been forwarded to the New gTLD Program Staff for processing”
- May 6th - I responded with “Thank you for your email below. Please let me know next steps, whether you need anything further from me, and when I can expect to hear results from the processing of my inquiry. In any event, I will follow up with you in a few days to check on the status.”
• May 17th - Letter to Ombudsman
• May 20th - Scott Seitz Letter to Ombudsman and myself
• May 21st - Ombudsman e-mail to Scott Seitz and myself
• May 22st – I respond to Ombudsman
• May 30th - Steve Crocker says they'll get back to Ombudsman quickly
• May 31st - Ombudsman’s e-mail to ICANN Board
• 6/12/13 - Letter to Chris LaHatte with more details which he asked for
• 6/26/13 LaHatte publishes his letter to ICANN & DomainIncite Blogs; argues that there has been unfairness and that my objection should stand.
• 7/13/13 - Resolved (2013.07.13.NG03) the New gTLD Program Committee directs the President, Generic Domains Division, or his designee to forward to the ICC the Ombudsman’s report about GOProud’s objection to a .GAY application and ask the Center for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce to revisit its decision in light of the facts and analysis stated in the Ombudsmans’ report.
• 9/19/13 ICC “…the Standing Committee is currently analyzing the issue and has decided that a further discussion is necessary”
• 10/2/13 ICC (Spela) “The Centre informs you that on 1 October 2013, the Standing Committee reconsidered this matter and decided not to revise the Centre’s decision not to register the present matter. Therefore this matter will not be registered. Accordingly the Centre has now terminated this matter and will close the file. We remind parties that the Filing Fee is non-refundable”

To recap, the ICC claims that my original objection was over 5,000 characters. This is only accurate if one counts every word in the headings, footnotes and standing section - as opposed to the "substantive portion". This was not at all clear from the instructions. I have since fixed this easily by deleting a few words and have resubmitted it. The ICC took my 5,000 euros and cancelled my objection on the basis that I didn't fix this in time. My concerns are:

First, I was unable to address the issues because I did not learn of them in time. To that end, I am prepared to swear under oath that I did not receive the supposed e-mail notification. Further, the only "proof" that the ICC has provided to me is a Microsoft Exchange-based "receipt" that actually states that "no delivery notification was sent by the destination server" (i.e. mine).

Second, and on a related note, the ICC is supposed to notify all parties and ICANN within fourteen (14) days of compliance issues - but they did not do so. Given that I did not receive any notification of the 5,000 word issue (but was notified of a separate compliance issue via a different email address that I had specifically listed as GOProud's official "representative" in the Objection) within the 14-day timeframe, I proceeded under the completely reasonable assumption that my objection was fine. The ICC claims that they (and other DRSPs) had been granted an extension to the admin review deadline, which was supposedly posted to ICANNs new gTLD site at an earlier stage, yet no one has been able to locate the specific page where it is located.
ICC started communicating with me using one of my e-mail addresses and then for no apparent reason switched to using my other address and refused to even CC the first email address (that they had already been using) notwithstanding the fact that the subsequent correspondence had a much greater and more prejudicial impact (namely, complete dismissal of the objection with prejudice).

I have carefully followed the rules in good faith, but the ICC refuses to honor my objection.

4. **Date of action/inaction:**

(Note: If Board action, this is usually the first date that the Board posted its resolution and rationale for the resolution or for inaction, the date the Board considered an item at a meeting.)

The last action taken by the ICC was on October 2nd, when they rejected my objection for the second time. It remains unclear to me if the reconsideration timeline is in “calendar days” or “business days,” and in the case of the former, I must stress to the BGC that I am a newcomer to the ICANN process and was not aware of the reconsideration process, and its ability to apply to external panels, until an article published on October 15th on Domain Incite, (“Reconsideration is not an Appeals Process: ICANN delivers another blow to Amazon’s gTLD hopes”). Thus, given the fact that this avenue of reconsideration has not been widely described, in the AGB or elsewhere, I am still within the 15 day time frame from when this particular article was published.

5. **On what date did you became aware of the action or that action would not be taken?**

(Provide the date you learned of the action/that action would not be taken. If more than fifteen days has passed from when the action was taken or not taken to when you learned of the action or inaction, please provide discussion of the gap of time.)

Most recently, on October 2nd 2013

6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:**
My objection is not allowed to stand, and consequently, my voice and views related to the delegation of the .gay TLD via “Community Priority,” is not being heard. This decision affects my constituents and I greatly, and we are interested in taking a stand against what we see as an aggressive attempt to lump all gay men and women into one community, along with others who may use or be associated with the term, that is, LGBT individuals. A Community Priority .gay TLD ignores our own voice and the diversity of the groups in question.

7. Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.

The entire LGBT populace is being taken advantage of by one company’s attempt to lump them into one group, which they claim they are entitled to speak for. This has the possibility to affect tens of millions of people around the world, and will impact how gay men, LBT individuals, and the world at large use the domain system to interact with one another. The fact that my voice is being silenced on a technicality has repercussions for tens of millions of other people that are not recognized, or unilaterally co-opted, by dotgay LLC’s “community” plans.

8. Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information

**Staff Action:** If your request is in regards to a staff action or inaction, please provide a detailed explanation of the facts as you understand they were provided to staff prior to the action/inaction presented to the staff and the reasons why the staff’s action or inaction was inconsistent with established ICANN policy(ies). Please identify the policy(ies) with which the action/inaction was inconsistent.

The policies that are eligible to serve as the basis for a Request for Reconsideration are those that are approved by the ICANN Board (after input from the community) that impact the community in some way. When reviewing staff action, the outcomes of prior Requests for Reconsideration challenging the same or substantially similar action/inaction as inconsistent with established ICANN policy(ies) shall be of precedential value.

**Board action:** If your request is in regards to a Board action or inaction, please provide a detailed explanation of the material information not considered by the Board. If that information was not presented to the Board, provide the reasons why you did not submit the material information to the Board before it acted or failed to act. “Material information” means facts that are material to the decision.

If your request is in regards to a Board action or inaction that you believe is
based upon inaccurate, false, or misleading materials presented to the Board and those materials formed the basis for the Board action or inaction being challenged, provide a detailed explanation as to whether an opportunity existed to correct the material considered by the Board. If there was an opportunity to do so, provide the reasons that you did not provide submit corrections to the Board before it acted or failed to act.

Reconsideration requests are not meant for those who believe that the Board made the wrong decision when considering the information available. There has to be identification of material information that was in existence of the time of the decision and that was not considered by the Board in order to state a reconsideration request. Similarly, new information – information that was not yet in existence at the time of the Board decision – is also not a proper ground for reconsideration. Please keep this guidance in mind when submitting requests.

Provide the Required Detailed Explanation here:
(You may attach additional sheets as necessary.)

Please also refer to my response to question #3. This is a question of fairness. The ICC is deciding when it can manipulate timelines, both for itself and for objectors, to the benefit of some and the detriment of others. The ICC DID NOT FOLLOW ITS OWN PROCEDURAL RULES, in that it did not contact me within fourteen (14) days to notify me of compliance issues. They claim to have received an extension to this timeframe from ICANN, BUT THIS WAS NOT ACKNOWLEDGED IN ANY PUBLIC WAY AT THE TIME.

When they did contact me, they used a different email address than the one that had already been used by them to establish contact for another unrelated procedural issue. I DID NOT RECEIVE THE OUTREACH RELATED TO THE WORD LIMIT BEING SURPASSED, and I am prepared to swear under oath to this fact, and the only proof they have is a receipt that acknowledges the murkiness of their claim, the email receipt states: “no delivery notification was sent by the destination server” (i.e. mine).

I contacted them on April 5th and April 9th; the ICC responded on the 9th and acknowledged my outreach from that day and the 5th, and at the same time told me I did not rectify the world limit issue in time, the very same issue that I was never informed of.

The ICANN Ombudsman, Mr. Chris LaHatte, agreed that there was an issue of unfairness. The NGPC implicitly acknowledged this issue by forwarding the Ombudsman’s response onto the ICC.
The ICC has unfairly rejected me on procedural technicalities while holding itself and other objectors to other standards, wherein it has moved its own deadlines and the deadlines for other objectors.

9. **What are you asking ICANN to do now?**

(Describe the specific steps you are asking ICANN to take. For example, should the action be reversed, cancelled or modified? If modified, how should it be modified?)

I want ICANN to direct the ICC to let my objection stand, or to otherwise facilitate the full consideration of my Community Objection against dotgay LLC.

10. **Please state specifically the grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.**

(Include in this discussion how the action or inaction complained of has resulted in material harm and adverse impact. To demonstrate material harm and adverse impact, the requester must be able to demonstrate well-known requirements: there must be a loss or injury suffered (financial or non-financial) that is a directly and causally connected to the Board or staff action or inaction that is the basis of the Request for Reconsideration. The requestor must be able to set out the loss or injury and the direct nature of that harm in specific and particular details. The relief requested from the BGC must be capable of reversing the harm alleged by the requester. Injury or harm caused by third parties as a result of acting in line with the Board’s decision is not a sufficient ground for reconsideration. Similarly, injury or harm that is only of a sufficient magnitude because it was exacerbated by the actions of a third party is also not a sufficient ground for reconsideration.)

I had standing to file a Community Objection with the ICC, and as such, should have standing to request reconsideration. The material harm of this action remains unknown, but it will be felt by my constituents and all other minority gay and LBT groups that are not welcomed into dotgay LLC’s “community,” this is potentially significant and irreversible. This is an issue of disenfranchisement. If the BGC were to direct the relevant parties to allow my objection to stand, my voice and concerns would be fairly heard and respected and as such, the BGC’s actions have the potential to reverse the current harm caused by being unfairly ignored and dismissed.
11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

_____ Yes
__X__ No

11a. If yes, is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties? Explain.

Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?

If you do, please attach those documents to the email forwarding this request. Note that all documents provided, including this Request, will be publicly posted at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm.

Yes. I have attached documents related to the above timeline, including the exchanges between the ICC and myself, and correspondence from the Ombudsman and the NGPC.

Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar.

The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious.

Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing.

The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC.

The ICANN Board of Director’s decision on the BGC’s reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.
On 19 October 2013, Christopher Barron submitted a reconsideration request (“Request”). The Request asked the Board to reconsider the ICC’s¹ decision to dismiss GOProud’s² community objection to the .GAY gTLD.

I. Relevant Bylaws

In pertinent part, Article IV, Section 2.2 of ICANN’s Bylaws states that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN staff action or inaction to the extent that it has been adversely affected by: “(a) one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies).”³ (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.2)

The Board Governance Committee (“BGC”) has previously stated that the action of an Expert Panel issuing a Determination on a New gTLD Program objection proceeding can be challenged as a staff action. (See BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-5 at http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/recommendation-booking-01aug13- en.doc.) Dismissal of a Request for Reconsideration is appropriate if the BGC recommends, and in this case the New gTLD Program Committee (“NGPC”) agrees, that the

¹ International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.
² GOProud, Inc.
³ The grounds for challenging Board action or inaction include whether “one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act” or “one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that are taken as a result of the Board's reliance on false or inaccurate material information.”
requesting party failed to satisfy the standing criteria set forth in the Bylaws. These standing requirements are intended to protect the reconsideration process from abuse and to ensure that it is not used as a mechanism simply to challenge an action with which someone disagrees. The reconsideration process is for situations where the staff acted in contravention of established policies (when the Request is based on staff action or inaction).

The Request was received on 19 October 2013. The ICC confirmed its dismissal of GOProud’s objection on 2 October 2013, which renders the Request untimely under the Bylaws. Barron claims that the Request is timely because it was submitted within fifteen days after the date on which Barron became aware of the reconsideration process, which was on 15 October 2013. (Request, Pg. 4.) Barron’s unfamiliarity with the reconsideration process, however, does not afford him additional time to submit a reconsideration request. Barron also claims that, if calculated in business days, his Request is timely based on his 2 October 2013 receipt of notification from the ICC. The Bylaws make clear that for reconsideration requests that challenge staff actions, requests must be submitted within fifteen days – which are calendar days – after the date on which the party submitting the request became aware of (or reasonably should have become aware of) the challenged action. Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.5. For this reason alone, the BGC could refuse to consider the Request.

Notwithstanding whether the Request is timely, the BGC also finds that the stated grounds for the Request do not support reconsideration.

II. Background

A. Filing An Objection To A New gTLD Application

The New gTLD Program includes an objection procedure pursuant to which objections to applications for new gTLDs are submitted to an independent DRSP. The objection procedures are set out in Module 3 of the Applicant Guidebook
To initiate a dispute resolution proceeding, an objection must comply with the procedures set out in Articles 5-8 of the Procedure. This includes the requirement that objections be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP. (Guidebook, Section 3.2.3; Procedure, Art. 7(a).) Before an objection will be registered for processing, the DRSP will conduct an administrative review to verify compliance with Articles 5-8 of the Procedures and the applicable DRSP Rules. (Procedure, Art. 9(a).)

B. Facts

1. GOProud’s Objection to the .GAY String

dotGay LLC (“dotGay”) applied for .GAY. GOProud objected to dotGay’s application, asserting that there is a substantial opposition to the proposed string from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted (“Objection”). The following is a timeline of the relevant events, beginning with the submission of GOProud’s Objection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 March 2013</td>
<td>GOProud submits two nearly identical objections to ICC from email address <a href="mailto:cbarron@capsouthdc.com">cbarron@capsouthdc.com</a>. (13 March 2013 emails from Barron to ICC; 19 July 2013 Letter from ICC to Willett.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2013</td>
<td>Before commencing proceedings, ICC contacts Barron via email to the address from which the objections were submitted (<a href="mailto:cbarron@capsouthdc.com">cbarron@capsouthdc.com</a>) asking which of the two objections the ICC should use to commence proceedings; Barron advises that the ICC should use the second Objection sent. The ICC confirmed that it would only take the second Objection into account. Per applicable rules, the Objection was filed on an ICC Model Form, which requires the Objector to specify the Objector’s Contact Address that “shall be used for all communications and notifications in the present proceedings.” GOProud designated the email address <a href="mailto:info@goproud.org">info@goproud.org</a> as the contact address for Objector’s Contact Address. (See 19 July 2013 Letter from ICC to Willett.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2013</td>
<td>The ICC sends a letter to Barron via email to his designated Objector’s Contact Address (<a href="mailto:info@goproud.org">info@goproud.org</a>) informing Barron of the receipt of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2013</td>
<td>ICC sends Barron a letter via email to the Objector’s Contact Address to confirm receipt of the Filing Fee and to inform GOProud that the ICC would now begin administrative review. (See Id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2013</td>
<td>ICC notifies Barron via email to the Objector’s Contact Address that the objection is over the word limit and invites GOProud to cure the deficiency within five days from the date of the notification. The email also stated that if the deficiency was not cured within the five days the ICC would dismiss the Objection and close the proceedings. There was no indication that this email bounced back or was not otherwise received by the destination server. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April 2013</td>
<td>The 5-day deadline for the correction of the Objection expired. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April 2013</td>
<td>Eight days later, Barron sends an email to ICC inquiring about the status of the GOProud Objection. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April 2013</td>
<td>Barron sends another email to ICC inquiring about the status of the GOProud Objection. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2013</td>
<td>The ICC advises Barron via email to the Objector’s Contact Address at <a href="mailto:info@goproud.org">info@goproud.org</a> that GOProud missed the deadline to correct the word limitation issue. For courtesy, the ICC also sent a copy of the letter to Barron’s private email address. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2013</td>
<td>Barron sends a letter to the ICC explaining that he never received the ICC’s email of 28 March 2013. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2013</td>
<td>The ICC re-sends to Barron the original email from 28 March 2013 as well as the delivery confirmation that the ICC received when sending that email. The original email from 28 March 2013 was sent to the Objector’s Contact Address and Barron’s personal email address as a courtesy. (See id.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2013</td>
<td>The ICC receives an email from Barron enclosing the corrected Objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2013</td>
<td>ICC notifies Barron that GOProud’s Objection has been dismissed for failure to correct the word limitation issue within the time limit granted and that the proceedings on GOProud’s Objection are closed (the “12 April 2013 Decision”). (See 12 April 2013 Letter from ICC to GOProud.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 2013</td>
<td>Barron sends letter to Ombudsman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 2013</td>
<td>Barron sends Ombudsman more details requested by Ombudsman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July 2013</td>
<td>Ombudsman issues report (“Report”) to ICANN Board indicating that, based on the facts available to him, he had concerns about the possible fairness of the ICC’s decision to reject GOProud’s objection and recommended to the Board (or the NGPC in this case) that the ICC be asked to revisit its decision. (See Meeting of the NGPC, Briefing Materials 2 available at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Rationale/Analysis of The Request – The ICC’s Dismissal of GOProud’s Objection Does Not Demonstrate A Process Violation

Barron seeks reconsideration of the ICC’s 2 October 2013 Decision to not reinstate GOProud’s Objection. More specifically, Barron requests that ICANN direct the ICC to “let the objection stand,” or to otherwise “facilitate the full consideration” of the Objection. (Request, Section 9.) In the Request, Barron contends that he did not receive notification that GOProud needed to cure a deficiency in its Objection until it was too late to cure and the ICC had already reached its 12 April 2013 Decision to dismiss the Objection. Barron claims that because he did not receive the notification in a timely fashion, the ICC has unfairly dismissed GOProud’s Objection. According to Barron, the 28 March 2013 notification of the deficiency in the Objection was sent to a different email address than the one that was listed in the Objection for GOProud’s “representative,” and to a different email address than the one previously used by the ICC to communicate with Barron. (Request, Pgs. 3-4.) Barron also claims that the ICC failed to conduct its administrative review within the 14 days required under the Applicant Guidebook and the Procedure. (Request, Pg. 3.)
As part of the ICC’s Objection Form, in addition to identifying the “Objector” and the “Objector’s Representative(s),” the objecting party is required to provide the “Objector’s Contact Address.” (ICC New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure Objection Form To Be Completed By The Objector (“Objection Form”), available at http://www.iccwbo.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=19327354293.) The Objection Form specifies that:

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

(Objection Form, Pg. 2.)

As noted above, the “Objector’s Contact Address” is the address that the ICC would use “for all communication and notifications in the present proceedings.” In the Objection Form, Barron (identified as the Objector’s Representative) specifically provided an email address as the official Objector’s Contact Address that was not his personal email address. (GOProud’s Objection, Pg. 2.) Although Barron could have provided his personal email address as the Objector’s Contact Address, he did not do so. Barron was therefore obligated to check the email address that he provided as GOProud’s official Objector’s Contact Address and the ICC had no obligation to send notifications to any other email address.

Based on the Request and supporting exhibits, it appears that every communication from the ICC to Barron relating to GOProud’s Objection, after the proceedings were initiated, was sent to GOProud’s Objector’s Contact Address, including the ICC’s 28 March 2013 correspondence notifying GOProud that the Objection did not comply with the Procedure, and
giving GOProud five days to cure the deficiency. (28 March 2013 Letter from the ICC to
GOProud.)

The only exceptions to this practice of communicating through the Objector’s Contact
Address involved a communication sent to Barron’s personal email before the proceedings were
initiated, and two courtesy emails the ICC sent to Barron at his personal email in addition to the
primary Objector’s Contact Address after Barron notified the ICC that he had not received the
ICC’s prior correspondences. For courtesy reasons only, the first email sent to Barron’s personal
email address sought clarification from Barron as to which of the two nearly identical objections
that Barron submitted should be considered by the ICC as initiating the proceedings. (19 July
2013 Letter from ICC to Willett.) The ICC also attempted to contact Barron by telephone. The
fact that one initial clarifying email to figure out which objection should be used to initiate the
proceedings was submitted to Barron’s personal email address does not create any reasonable
expectation that GOProud would not be held to the designation of the Objector’s Contact
Address. Barron had no justification to believe that a single email attempting to sort out which
objection was to be considered would change the official Objector’s Contact Address,
particularly when Barron had specifically designated a different email address as the Objector’s
Contact Address. Barron was obligated to check the Objector’s Contact Address and his failure
to do so does not demonstrate a process violation by the ICC. Rather, the ICC followed process
and sent the notifications to the Objector’s Contact Address as provided in the Objector Form.

Barron further claims that he did not receive the 28 March 2013 communication
providing GOProud notification of the deficiency in the Objection and the only “proof” provided
that the email was actually sent is a delivery receipt from the ICC that states “no delivery
notification was sent by the destination server.” (Request, Pgs. 3 & 6.) Barron’s contention is
misplaced. The delivery receipt confirms that the ICC sent the communication to GOProud’s official Objector’s Contact Address. (Exhibit C to undated letter from Barron to Spela Kosak.)

The fact that no delivery notification was sent by GOProud’s email server does not in any way mean that the email was not sent. When Barron provided an official Objector’s Contact Address for GOProud’s Objection, the ICC specifically followed its procedures by using that email address to communicate regarding the proceedings. If Barron failed to ensure that the email address he provided as the Objector’s Contact Address was operating properly, that is his burden to bear; it has no bearing on whether the ICC followed its policies or procedures. The documentation provided by Barron supports that the 28 March 2013 email was sent to Barron by the ICC, and there is no documentation to support that the email was not received.

Finally, Barron claims that the ICC did not follow its own procedural rules by failing to inform him of any compliance issues within fourteen days. (Request, Pg. 6.) Article 9(a) of the Procedure provides:

The DRSP shall conduct an administrative review of the Objection for purposes of verifying compliance with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and inform the Objector, the Applicant and ICANN of the result of its review within fourteen (14) days of its receipt of the Objection. The DRSP may extend this time limit for reasons explained in the notification of such extension.

(Procedure, Art. 9(a).) Here, the ICC received two nearly identical objections from GOProud on 13 March 2013. It was not until 15 March 2013 that Barron confirmed that only the second objection should be considered by the ICC, and it was not until 16 March 2013 that the filing fees for the Objection were credited/received by the ICC. Accordingly, on 19 March 2013, the ICC sent a letter to GOProud (via the official Objector’s Contact Address) to “confirm receipt of the Filing Fee and to inform the Objector that the Centre would now conduct the administrative review.” (19 July 2013 Letter from the ICC to ICANN, Pgs. 3-4 (emphasis added).) Nine days
later, on 28 March 2013, the ICC advised GOProud of the compliance issue associated with its Objection and, pursuant to Article 9(c) of the Procedure, invited GOProud to correct the issue within five days from the day following the communication. (28 March 2013 Letter from the ICC to GOProud.)

Based on the above, the ICC conducted the administrative review of GOProud’s Objection in a timely manner in accordance with the Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules. The identified deficiency was not cured within the time provided, and pursuant to Article 9(d) of the Procedure, the ICC dismissed the Objection and closed the proceedings.

After the NGPC’s 13 July 2013 resolution, the ICC followed the directive issued and reviewed the dismissal of GoProud’s Objection. Following that review, on 2 October 2013 the ICC notified GoProud that the Objection would not be reinstated. As the ICC’s earlier actions do not demonstrate any policy or process violation, and the ICC then acted in accord with the NGPC’s resolution, there are no policy or process violations identified by GoProud that support reconsideration of this matter.

IV. **Recommendation and Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Request has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration. While it appears that the Request was not submitted in a timely fashion and could be dismissed on that ground alone, the lack of substantive grounds for reconsideration also supports our recommendation that Barron’s Request be denied without further consideration.

As there is no indication that the ICC violated any policy or process in deciding to dismiss GOProud’s Objection, this Request should not proceed. To avoid the timing confusion raised in the Request, the BGC recommends that staff more clearly specify on the timing
diagram for Reconsideration that the 15-day deadline for invoking the Reconsideration Process for submitting requests are calendar days.

The BGC recommends that it would be appropriate for the NGPC to consider this Request and the BGC’s Recommendation given that the NGPC had previously considered and took action on the Ombudsman’s report and recommendations.
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Summary Background
While the full background can be found in the documentation attached to this Reference Materials, Reconsideration Request 14-7 brought by Asia Green IT System Ltd. (“Requester”) seeks reconsideration of the NGPC’s 5 February 2014 resolution deferring the contracting process for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings until certain noted conflicts have been resolved. The Requester also seeks reconsideration of an alleged staff action implementing the NGPC’s resolution; namely, the 7 February 2014 letter from Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board, to Requester.

The BGC considered Request 14-7 at its 13 March 2014 meeting and concluded that that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration. As detailed in the Recommendation and the documents attached to this Reference Materials, the BGC concluded there is no indication that the NGPC failed to consider material information in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. Rather, the record demonstrates that the NGPC was well aware of the information Requester claims was material to the 5 February 2014 Resolution. In addition, the Requester has not identified an ICANN staff action that violated an established ICANN policy or procedure. Instead, the action challenged by the Requester was that of the Board, not staff, and, in any event, the Requester has failed to identify any ICANN policy or procedure violated by that action. The BGC recommended to the NGPC that this Request be denied without further consideration.

Document/Background Links
The following attachments are relevant to the BGC’s recommendation regarding Reconsideration Request 14-7.

Attachment A is Reconsideration Request 14-7, submitted on 26 February 2014.
Attachment B is the Updated Exhibit A to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.

Attachment C is Miscellaneous Attachments Part 1 to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.


Attachment E is Miscellaneous Attachments Part 3 to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.

Attachment F is Miscellaneous Attachments Part 4 to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.

Attachment G is Miscellaneous Attachments Part 5 to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.

Attachment H is Miscellaneous Attachments Part 6 to Request 14-7, submitted to 28 February 2014.

Attachment I is the BGC’s Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 14-7, issued on 13 March 2014.

Submitted by: Amy A. Stathos
Position: Deputy General Counsel
Date Noted: 15 March 2014
Email: amy.stathos@icann.org
1. **Requester Information**

   Name:  Asia Green IT System Ltd.
   Address:  Contact Information Redacted

   Email:  Contact Information Redacted

   (Note: ICANN will post the Requester’s name on the Reconsideration Request page at [http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm). Requestors address, email and phone number will be removed from the posting.)

2. **Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):**

   - X Board action/inaction
   - X Staff action/inaction

3. **Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.**

   Applicant seeks reconsideration of the following NGPC decisions in its Feb. 5th Resolution: 1) to refuse to initiate contracting with Applicant to operate the .Islam and .Halal gTLD applications; 2) to provide effective veto power over just these two applications, to just two countries’ governments and two IGOs.

   Applicant also seeks reconsideration of the following Staff decisions in implementing the NGPC Resolution, embodied in Dr. Crocker’s letter to Applicant dated Feb. 7th: 1) to fail to provide clear definition of the purported “conflicts” mentioned in Dr. Crocker’s letter, and clear criteria for Applicant to “resolve” those
purported conflicts; and 2) to fail to explain how any such conflicts, if any, have not
already been resolved by (i) Applicant’s PICs and proposed governance model, (ii)
the relevant Independent Objector determination, (iii) the relevant Expert
determinations in the Community Objections, (iv) the manifest lack of GAC Advice
against the applications, and/or (v) Applicant’s compliance with all other rules and
procedures set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

4. **Date of action/inaction:**
   
   February 7, 2014. Date of letter from Dr. Crocker to Applicant.

5. **On what date did you become aware of the action or that action would not be taken?**
   
   February 11, 2014. Date the aforementioned letter was emailed to Applicant.

6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:**
   
   Applicant has invested more than USD 750,000 in its applications to operate
these gTLD strings that are **not** prohibited, and thus allowed, by ICANN’s own policy
as documented within the Applicant Guidebook. Applicant, a Turkish corporation
owned and operated by devout Muslims, intends to bring these TLDs to all of the
various Muslim communities around the world, for all Muslim communities’ mutual
benefit. Applicant reasonably estimates a multi-million dollar business opportunity
from operating these gTLDs.

   Applicant has paid application fees to ICANN, and COI fees as required by
ICANN. At significant expense, Applicant has passed ICANN’s Initial Evaluation as to
both strings, without any issues for Extended Evaluation.
At further significant expense, Applicant subsequently has responded to ICANN’s Independent Objector’s inquiry, which was made in light of GAC Early Warnings from the governments of the UAE and India. The IO issued two final rulings, refusing to file either a Limited Public Interest Objection or a Community Objection against Applicant with respect to .Islam1:

For all these reasons, the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “.Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community. …

The IO considers that guarantees presented by the applicant properly address his initial concerns. Therefore and for all these reasons, the IO is finally of the opinion that an objection on community ground is not warranted.

On June 4, 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution2 as a consequence to the communique3 received from the GAC at the conclusion of the GAC’s secretive and closed Beijing meetings. The NGPC responded to this communique by producing a Scorecard,4 and committing to further dialogue with the GAC. This Scorecard further referenced the Community Objection filed by the UAE government with ICC

---

3 The GAC only noted in the Beijing Communique that “some GAC members” believed the applications “lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.” [https://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf)
against .ISLAM and .HALAL, and said that “these applications cannot move to the contracting phase until the objections are resolved.”

At significant expense, Applicant then successfully overcame those Community Objections filed against both applications by the Telecom Regulatory Authority of the UAE government. In those cases, in October 2013, the ICC expert found\(^5\) there was no substantial opposition to these applications and that, "The Objector has certainly not provided any evidence that the Respondent is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the Muslim community." Consequently, the expert found in both cases that there would be no material detriment to any community of Muslims.

Then in November 2013, Dr. Crocker forwarded a letter\(^6\) from the Organization of Islamic States to the GAC Chair, which requested the GAC to “kindly consider this letter as an official opposition of the Member States of the OIC ... [to] use of these [TLDs] by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.” GAC further discussed these applications and that letter during the Buenos Aires meetings, and decided not to issue any formal advice against the applications. Instead, the GAC stated\(^7\) that “it concluded its discussion on these strings” six


months earlier in Beijing. The GAC Chair clarified in her letter\(^8\) to Dr. Crocker that “no further GAC input on this matter can be expected.” Thus, at most, “some GAC members” objected nearly a year ago, without any specific rationale provided by GAC or ICANN to Applicant. But the GAC has not recommended and will not recommend that the applications be rejected.

Thus, Applicant has withstood every potential challenge to these applications set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, at great expense of both time and money. And still, the NGPC has now unilaterally decided that there is one more hurdle, unique only to Applicant and these two applications. Dr. Crocker stated in his Feb. 7 letter, directly contrary to the ICC expert’s determination made after full legal briefing and evidence from the government of the UAE and the Applicant, that “a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings.” And so these two applications are sent to a unique, ICANN-imposed purgatory, with no inkling whatsoever as to how they ultimately will be evaluated by ICANN. This causes clear harm to Applicant, and to the entire Muslim world.

7. Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.

Internet users who seek to use domain names within the .Islam and .Halal TLDs are harmed by their continued unavailability, particularly when soon .Catholic and other ‘religious’ strings will be operational. The GNSO constituencies, Working Group members, and public commenters, who considered religious strings in the many Policy Development and implementation processes leading to adoption of the

Applicant Guidebook, will be harmed by the NGPC and Staff refusals to adhere to the consensus recommendations set forth therein. ICANN itself will suffer further degradation in community interest in PDP participation, if the consensus recommendations are ignored by NGPC. And ICANN itself will suffer further degradation in the perception of people in the Muslim world, who will not understand why ICANN has singled out these applications for disparate, discriminatory treatment.9

8. Detail of Board and Staff Action

I. The NGPC Resolution did not consider material information provided since May 23, 2013.

The NGPC Resolution dated Feb. 5, 2014, imposing open-ended delay upon these applications, with no criteria whatsoever to end such delay, cites only one document from Applicant as a source upon which the NGPC relied. That document, the Applicant’s response to the GAC's Beijing communique, was dated May 23, 2013.

Given all of the other matters discussed both in the Resolution and in the many various applicants’ responses to the GAC's Beijing communique, it is highly doubtful that any NGPC member actually even read the Applicant’s response before coming to its omnibus Resolution this month. Moreover, much has happened in the 8½ months in between, of which the NGPC apparently has not been made aware.10

9 Applicant notes that ICANN has approved the .kosher gTLD application, to be operated by a private entity with a multi-stakeholder governance model no more inclusive than the model proposed by Applicant for .halal and .Islam. How will ICANN explain this to Muslim people who live halal lifestyle?

10 Applicant incorporates by reference its voluminous archive of letters of support from prominent Muslim organizations and individuals. See infra, § 12, with
Dr. Crocker’s letter dated Feb. 7, 2014, conveying the Staff’s interpretation of this Resolution to Applicant, mentions just four governmental letters which purportedly comprise the “substantial body of opposition” to the applications. Yet this purported opposition – supposedly from the Cooperation Council for Arab States of the Gulf (“CCASG”), Lebanon, OIC and Indonesia – thoroughly has been addressed by the Applicant, and generally has been deemed insubstantial by both the Independent Objector and the ICC expert arbitrator. It is also effectively insubstantial per the terms of the Applicant Guidebook, since no GAC Advice has been or will be rendered against the application. Regardless, much of the crux of what is said in these letters is supportive of Applicant and its promised governance model.

a. **CCASG/UAE Objections have been denied by ICC Expert.**

A prominent CCASG and OIC member state, the UAE (represented by a highly prominent legal firm in the Middle East), filed a formal Community Objection with ICC and soundly was defeated. Not only was the purported community opposition deemed insubstantial, but also the expert found no likelihood of material detriment to any purported Muslim community. The Objections failed on both bases, and so the Objector proved only two of the four required elements.

ICANN has no right to second-guess this expert finding, which was based upon the procedures set forth in ICANN’s contract with Applicant (referencing the Summary at Exhibit A. Many of these letters have been provided since last May 23, particularly in context of the Community Objection proceeding in which the Expert allowed additional submissions per the request of the Objector.
Applicant Guidebook), and which was fully briefed by lawyers retained by one of the
wealthiest per capita nations in the world. The CCASG arguments were
unconvincing to the honorable ICC expert, as they previously had been found
unavailing by ICANN's own Independent Objector.

The Applicant Guidebook specifically indicates that the ICANN Board should
consider the advice of experts in making determinations about new gTLD
applications which raise sensitive government issues. Guidebook §3.1 re GAC
Advice specifically provides: “The ICANN Board may consult with independent
experts, such as those designated to hear objections in the New gTLD Dispute
Resolution Procedure, in cases where the issues raised in the GAC advice are
pertinent to one of the subject matter areas of the objection procedures.” And of
course, the Guidebook contains specific lengthy provisions about the Independent
Objector and the Community Objection procedures. Here, not only has the GAC not
advised ICANN to reject the application, but two of ICANN's appointed experts have
advised ICANN not to reject the applications. What reasonable basis exists for this
determination? It seems clear that the NGPC did not consider this material
information in coming to its latest Resolution as to these applications.

b. Applicant proposes a model complying with these governments' only stated criteria.

As specifically found by ICANN's own Independent Objector, Applicant
indeed has proposed a multi-stakeholder governance model as suggested by the
government of Lebanon (“neutral, non-governmental multistakeholder group”) and
by the OIC (“entity representing the collective voice of the Muslim people”).
Applicant has even committed to contractual PICs in this regard. The NGPC has not acknowledged this proposed governance model or the PICs in its Resolution, and so presumably did not consider them.\textsuperscript{11}

Instead, NGPC assumes there is “conflict” between Applicant’s proposed governance model, and the concerns expressed in the four cited letters. But neither the Resolution nor Dr. Crocker’s letter make any effort whatsoever to explain any such purported conflict, nor how such conflict was not fully resolved by the Applicant’s governance model, the Independent Objector, the Community Objection expert, and/or the lack of any GAC Advice against the applications. This notion of conflict is belied by the critical text of both the Lebanese and OIC “opposition” quoted above. Applicant has documented via PIC and otherwise its commitment to a multi-stakeholder, inclusive operational model representing the collective voice of the Muslim world. These are the criteria set forth by Lebanon and the OIC in their letters of purported opposition.

c. **ICANN violates established policy by failing to provide objective evaluation criteria, and by giving late veto to a few government actors.**

ICANN gives Applicant no guidance whatsoever as to how it can pass this hurdle and resolve such unexplained and illusory “conflict”, thus overcoming the special veto that ICANN appears to have given to these two governments and two IGOs. ICANN must reconsider this ill-advised decision to place just these two

\textsuperscript{11} Dr. Crocker did reference the governance model in his letter, and thus at least ICANN has received it, even if it was not considered by NGPC.
applications into an interminable limbo, with no guidance whatsoever as to how they ultimately will be evaluated by ICANN and/or these out-of-bound ‘objectors’.

This new policy is directly contradictory to the policy set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, and thus can only be based upon insufficient and/or inaccurate material information. In effect, ICANN is currently ignoring two experts’ well-considered opinions that Applicant’s governance model is sufficient to overcome governmental objections. And ICANN is currently ignoring the fact of no GAC Advice against the applications, indicating insufficient governmental objections per ICANN’s consensus policy as adopted in the Applicant Guidebook.

Not one Advisory Committee, Supporting Organization, Stakeholder Group, Constituency, Working Group, Review Panel, Implementation Team, Independent Expert or any other ICANN creation is or ever has been opposed to these applications. Only a “few governments”, at various times, have opposed the applications -- with the latest OIC letter coming far too late to be given weight against these applications.

Yet ICANN’s Board, eighteen months after the application window closed and the Guidebook was finalized, now appears to give veto power over just these 2 applications to 2 countries and 2 IGOs -- without any clear means for ICANN and/or Applicant to override such vetoes. There is no precedent for such a decision. It is a foolish decision if ICANN hopes to remain independent of governmental interference in its operations. Thus it can only be based upon insufficient and/or inaccurate information, and must be reconsidered.
And ICANN’s Staff, via Dr. Crocker’s letter, has not provided any criteria by which Applicant will be evaluated in this next step of the application process, and effectively has given a veto to two select governments and two select IGOs, over just these two applications. This is directly contrary to ICANN’s stated Principle “A” underlying the New gTLD Program:12

New generic top-level domains (gTLDs) must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.

Further, it is directly contrary to Recommendation 1, 9 and 12:13

(1) The evaluation and selection procedure for new gTLD registries should respect the principles of fairness, transparency and non-discrimination.

All applicants for a new gTLD registry should therefore be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria, fully available to the applicants prior to the initiation of the process. Normally, therefore, no subsequent additional selection criteria should be used in the selection process.

(9) There must be a clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria.

(12) Dispute resolution and challenge processes must be established prior to the start of the process.

It is also directly contrary to ICANN’s Principle “G”:14

The string evaluation process must not infringe the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law.

13 Id.
14 Id.
This freedom of expression principle was cited by both the Independent Objector and the Community Objection expert, in deciding that Applicant’s applications were important for the Muslim world’s freedom of expression rights, and that this outweighed potential governmental concerns over control of these TLDs.

These Principles and Recommendations were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council in late 2007, and almost unanimously by the ICANN Board in early 2008. The Applicant Guidebook represents the implementation of these Principles and Recommendations. Yet the NGPC and Staff have now gone completely outside the bounds of these bedrock principles underlying the New gTLD Program, and outside the bounds of all of the various processes set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, pertaining inter alia to the Independent Objector, Community Objection, and GAC Advice. Instead they apparently have allowed a last-minute veto to a few governmental actors, with no input from any ICANN stakeholder group, for no discernible purpose whatsoever, and with no discernible means for the applications to be further evaluated.

d. **Halal should proceed, regardless of concerns about .Islam.**

The NGPC and Staff appear to have ignored important details relating to the difference between the two applications at issue here. Thus they have based the decision to lump the two applications together on insufficient and/or inaccurate information.

First, Indonesia only objected to .Islam, and specifically endorsed Applicant’s operation of .Halal. “In principle, Indonesia approves the proposal and use of
domain name .halal, provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.”

Similarly, the Independent Objector did not even inquire about .halal as potentially problematic, focusing only on .islam.

Moreover, Applicant has provided a specific letter of support from the OIC’s affiliated HalalWorld Institute. This is the single largest halal certification organization in the world, with specific backing from the OIC. Indeed it is an Institute within the OIC’s Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). It is OIC’s own unified Halal Standard project operator; its developed Halal Food Standards were approved by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) in 2010, and now its scope of activities was expanded into new sectors like “Halal science,” “Halal regulations,” and “Halal code of conduct”. The ICRIC has also provided three specific letters of support to Applicant.

In addition, ICANN cannot discriminate between the .halal and .kosher applications. From a government “sensitivity” perspective, they must be deemed equal, as essentially the words mean the same thing -- halal referring to Muslim lifestyle and kosher referring to Jew lifestyle. Apparently the NGPC did not realize in its Resolution, and Staff in its implementation, that the .kosher application has been approved by ICANN and is nearing delegation. As certainly ICANN cannot explain to the Muslim communities how and why .kosher can be operated by a

16 http://www.halalworld.org/about/2?lang=en#.UwemefldXjV
17 Id.
private entity with an inclusive governance structure, yet .halal cannot. At minimum, ICANN immediately should release the .halal application from the discriminatory purgatory created by the NGPC Resolution.

9. **What are you asking ICANN to do now?**
   
   Approve both applications for contracting, immediately. Or at least approve .halal for contracting, immediately.

   If both applications are not immediately approved for contracting, then: 1) provide clear definition of the purported “conflicts” mentioned in Dr. Crocker’s letter, and provide clear criteria for Applicant to “resolve” those purported conflicts; and 2) explain how such conflicts have not already been resolved by (i) Applicant’s PICs and proposed governance model, (ii) the Independent Objector determination, (iii) the Expert determinations in the Community Objections, (iv) the manifest lack of GAC Advice against the applications, and/or (v) Applicant’s compliance with every other rule and procedure set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

10. **Please state specifically the grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.**

    Please see Applicant’s response to items 6 through 9, *supra*.

11. **Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)**

    ___ Yes
    __X__ No

12. **Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?**

    Applicant refers to its archive of support letters, contained at this Dropbox
link. This archive is far too voluminous to attach to email. A summary of this archive is attached as Exhibit A.

By: [Signature]

Mike Rodenbaugh
RODENBAUGH LAW
Attorneys for Applicant

February 26, 2014
.ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs
Endorsement Letters
Who supports .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs?

.ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs, applied for through Asia Green IT System have received several endorsement letters from different Islamic organizations and famous people around the world, and from different branches of Islam (Shia and Sunni as the main branches).

AGIT as the Muslim company applying for .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs, has an ongoing task to promote .ISLAM and .HALAL new gTLDs to the Muslim community to receive new supporting letters.

As a strategic approach, AGIT has tried to make International Islamic organizations be involved in the governance of .ISLAM and major Halal certification bodies to be involved in .HALAL policy making.

AGIT has been succeeded in receiving supporting letter for .ISLAM and .HALAL from the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). We have also been succeeded in involving HALALWORLD, the only HALAL certification body which is accepted by all Islamic countries. There are many Halal certification bodies around the world but all of them are supported by one or few countries. HALALWORLD is OIC (Organization of Islamic Cooperation)’s Halal certification standard project which is accepted by all Islamic countries.

In particular these international organizations could act as a potential sponsoring organization. AGIT is currently working out the formalities of such relationship.

Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) in association with the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) was established in 2003. ICRIC has a Board of directors consisting of 9 members from Malaysia, Jordan, Egypt,… plus Secretary General of ICCI and acts within the framework of its articles of association approved by the Islamic Chamber and with regard to 16 strategic principles included in its mandate for elevation of trade and economic ties among Islamic Countries.

AGIT has also recently started to open the opportunity to Muslim people to express their interest in .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLDs through online social media like Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/DotIslam and https://www.facebook.com/DotHalal) with thousands of fans.
List of .ISLAM and .HALAL gTLD supporters¹:
(updated on January 15, 2014)

1. Prominent Organizations and Leaders representing the Muslim community

1.1. Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ICRIC is a subsidiary of Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)², the 2nd largest international organization after UN with 57 Islamic member countries. ICRIC is responsible for research and information activities of ICCI and operates some of OIC and ICCI’s projects. OIC has created ICCI in line with the goal of development for all Islamic communities, and its continuous consideration on the promotion of commercial and economic relations among its Member States to achieve the goal of sustainable and comprehensive development. ICRIC acts as the research and development wing of ICCI in terms of new ideas and technologies, and is known as the most relevant subsidiary of OIC and ICCI to these subjects.


1.2. Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad³ (.ISLAM)

The former president of Malaysia and the man who moved Malaysia to an advanced country. He is with no doubt the most popular figure in Malaysia and many other countries. Dr. Mahathir was one of the first who supported us and his support has brought a great credit for AGIT, because everybody knows that he will not support a non-eligible entity to hold the sensitive TLD of .ISLAM.

Malaysia has a 17 million Muslim population⁴ and we believe Dr. Mahathir Bin Mohamad is the best representative of this community.


1.3. The Management Center for Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The management center for Twelver or Imami Shia Schools of thought (Hawza’s) in Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India, Bahrain, Syria, Lebanon etc… operate under this center’s supervision.⁵

Shia’s population is around 200 Million⁶. 85% of them (170 Million) are Twelver or Imami Shia’s. All Imami Shi’a’s follow the thoughts of religious leaders which are trained in schools of thoughts in different countries under the supervision of this center. This center is the main training management system of Shia schools in terms of religious content and can be counted as the representative of 170 million Twelver or Imami Shia’s around the world.


1.4. The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is a multi-cultural organization that several hundreds of Islamic leaders (both Shia and Sunni) cooperate with, in its consideration about creation of peace and proximity between different Islamic sects.

The forum holds the “Islamic Unity Conference” each year with participants from around the world, including mostly religious leaders of different Sects of Islam. The followers of these leaders are Muslims from all sects of Islam all around the world.


1.5. HALAL WORLD Center (.HALAL)

Halal Research & Development Center (HALAL WORLD) is the only unified Halal standard and certification project of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC). ICRIC operates under Islamic Chamber of Commerce and affiliated with OIC.


---

1.6. Supreme Islamic Shia Council, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

One of the highest level Islamic centers in Lebanon.

Mr. Mohamad Rizk Chief, Info Center, www.Shitecouncil.com or .org or .net or .gov.lb, +961 1456701 - +961 1450070/+9613696698

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Islamic-Shia-High-Council.jpg

1.7. The ECO cultural institute (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

ECO Cultural Institute is one of the specialized agencies under the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO), an intergovernmental organization consisting of Islamic State of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan Republic, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Tajikistan, Republic of Turkey, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan. Among ECO member states, 9 out of 10 are members of OIC. ECO Cultural Institute has supported .ISLAM as a subsidiary of the Economic Corporation Organization (ECO) which is most likely related to governmental attitudes of its member states.


1.8. Muslim Religious Community, Belarus (.ISLAM)

The main organization of Muslims in Belarus (total Muslim population: 51,000)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Belarus_Muslim_Religious_Community.jpg

2. Islamic Religious Institutes / Associations / Organizations

2.1. Islamic United Council, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

One of the main Islamic Societies in Pakistan.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Islamic_United_Council.jpg

2.2. Islamic Center Hamburg, Germany (.ISLAM)

Germany has the largest Muslim population in Western Europe after France. Approximately 3 to 3.5 million Muslims live in Germany, and 80% of them do not have German citizenship; 608,000 are German citizens. 70% of the Muslim population is of Turkish origin. (http://www.euro-islam.info/country-profiles/germany/)
The **Islamic Centre Hamburg** (German: *Islamisches Zentrum Hamburg*) is one of the oldest Shia mosques in Germany and Europe.

Established in Hamburg, in northern Germany, in the late 1950s by a group of Hamburg-based emigrants and business people it rapidly developed into one of the leading Shia centers in the Western world.

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Center_Hamburg.jpg)

### 2.3. Association AlGhadir Islamique, France (.ISLAM)

A Shia Islamic training institute in France (with 350,000 Shia’s out of 5 million Muslims)

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_AlGhadir_Islamique.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_AlGhadir_Islamique.jpg)

### 2.4. Centro Islamico No Brasil (.ISLAM)

The main Islamic organizations in Brazil (Muslim population of around 900,000) ([http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_num_of_mus-religion-islam-number-of-muslim](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/rel_isl_num_of_mus-religion-islam-number-of-muslim))

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Center_in_Brazil.jpg)

### 2.5. Islamic Institution Arresalla, Brazil (.ISLAM)

An Islamic institute offering cultural, religious services to a large group of Muslim community in Brazil.

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Islamic_Institution_Arresala.jpg)

### 2.6. Association Culturelle Musulmane de Roissy en Brie, France (.ISLAM)


**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_Culturelle_Musulmane_de_Roissy_en_Brie.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_France_Association_Culturelle_Musulmane_de_Roissy_en_Brie.jpg)

### 2.7. Aras Justice, Freedom and Solidarity Association, Turkey (.HALAL)

Established in 2012 in Istanbul, As a Non-government and non-profit organization, Aras’s mission is to support victims and protect their rights and help them to solve...
their problems. And creating public awareness in order to uphold political freedom and prevent inhumane conduct.

For this reason, Aras organizes panels, Symposiums and conferences in Turkey and Azerbaijan. Aras is kept public informed through the release of periodicals, press releases. Aras makes use of the internet, as well as radio and TV broadcasts preparing, organizing contests, demonstrations, dinners and evening performances.

Apart from these, Aras finances scholarships for poor student and opens the student dormitory.


### 2.8. El-IRSCHAD Berlin a.v. Germany (ISLAM and HALAL)

Islamic religious center in Berlin

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_El-Irschad.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_El-Irschad.jpg)

### 2.9. Beyan Cultural Center, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Beyan started its activities in 2012 in Istanbul. The main object of the Beyan Cultural Center is to provide better understanding of Islam for Muslims and non-Muslims in Turkey. Therefore, they organize such activities as conference, symposium, and meetings.


### 2.10. Harekat-el-Omma Association, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

Lebanese Islamic Association.

Mr. Issam Ghandour, Secretary General, [www.alomma-lb.org](http://www.alomma-lb.org), +961 1304658 - +961 1304597/+9613337562

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AlOmma.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AlOmma.jpg)

### 2.11. Kudus-Der, Turkey (ISLAM)

Founded in 2012, the association's headquarters in Istanbul. The association was founded to help the Palestinian people.

Kudüs Der assistance not only humanitarian aid but also inform Turkish public about Palestinian issue by organizing media conferences, meetings in Turkey.

2.12. Halal Supreme Council, Iran (.HALAL)


2.13. Fatih Akincilari Social and Cultural Association, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Akincilar social solidarity and cultural association was founded in the 1970s in Istanbul district Fatih.

Akincilar aims to meet the needs of those who are suffering poverty or hunger.

Social Aid: food aid and organizations during the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner, Qurban programs.

Educational Aid: delivering school bags, educational sets, and supplementary materials to needy students.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Turkey_Akincilar_Social_Solidarity_and_Cultural_Association.pdf


2.15. Diplomatic Correspondents Association, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

The association of Diplomatic Journalists of Pakistan, with thousands of members, all active in the media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_DCAP.jpg

2.16. Peoples Youth Organization, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

A famous civil socia Islamic organization, very active in Islamic cultural activities in Pakistan.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Peoples_Youth_Organization.jpg
2.17. Brasil Halal Foods, Brazil (ISLAM and HALAL)

The main institute in Brazil working as a certification body for Halal foods (Foods certifying Islamic criteria on religious approved foods and drinks) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halal)

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Brazil_Brazil_Halal_Foods.jpg

2.18. Baheth Center for Palestinian Studies, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

An Islamic Educational institute for Palestinian Strategic Studies. Mr. Walid Mohamad Amro, President, www.bahethcenter.net, contact@bahethcenter.net, +961 1621218 - +961 1842882

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Baheth-Center-for-Palestine-Studies.jpg

2.19. Ehlibeyt Alimleri Derneği / Ehla Der, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Ehlibeyt Alimleri Derneği (Association of Ahlulbayt Scholars) was founded in May 31, 2011 in Istanbul.

The short name is Ehla-Der and the Head Office is in Yenibosna - Istanbul. Currently, 18 people work in Headquarters Building. There are 190 Ahlulbayt Scholar members of the association who work in different cities in Turkey.

The purpose of Ehla-Der is contributed to the spread of social unity and brotherhood in the country. And provide correct information about Ahlulbayt.

Ehla-Der organizes cultural and social activities throughout Turkey.


2.20. Dar El Feta El Jafari, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

An Islamic Shia religious educational center in Lebanon.

Mr. Ali Charaf, Chief Info Center, www.iftaajafari.com, +9611834801


2.21. Halal Export Consortium, Iran (HALAL)


2.22. Rawdat Religious Guidance, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)
Cheikh Diab Al Mihdawi, President, mdm20201@hotmail.com, +9613867973

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.23. Religious Guidance Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Diab Al Mihdawi, President, mdm20201@hotmail.com, +9613867973

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.24. Association Assembly of Religious Scholars, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Hassane Abdullah, President, www.tajamo.net, info@tajamo.net, +9611554668 / +9613644000

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.25. Mosque and Center of Holly Koran, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Saleem Al Lababeedy, www.ar-ar.facebook.com/salimlababedi, abohamzix@hotmail.com, +9613355031 / +9613355031

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

2.26. Research Services Group, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Mr. Faysal Al Ashmar, Editor in Chief, www.rsgleb.org, researchservices.group@gmail.com, +96170801354

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Research-Services-Group.jpg

2.27. Islamic Unity House for Media And Documentation, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

3. Islamic Media / Newspapers / Publications

3.1. Medya On4 Radyo Televizyon Yayınıncılık A.Ş is the owner of On4 TV; On4 TV is a nation-wide television channel in Turkey. The channel was established by the Turkish businessmen in 2012.

On4 TV delivers the latest breaking news and information on the latest top stories, weather, business, entertainment, politics, and more.

Headquarters is located in Istanbul and more than 100 journalists, reporters etc. work in it.


3.2. KUDUS TV, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

One of the leading Islamic TV channels in Turkey: [http://www.kudustv.com/](http://www.kudustv.com/)


3.3. Kevser Basin Yayin Organization, Turkey (ISLAM and HALAL)

Kevser Basın Yayıncılık (Kevser Press Publishing) has about 200 branches and distribution networks throughout Turkey and 10 distribution networks abroad. Headquarters is located in Istanbul Asaray and one of the leading Press publishing companies in Turkey.


3.4. Aden Live TV, Yemen (ISLAM and HALAL)

Yemen’s Islamic TV Channel.

Mr. Abdel Nasser Al Jaari, General Manager, [www.adenlivetv.net](http://www.adenlivetv.net), contactus@adenlivetv-live.tv, +961 5461967 - +961466032


3.5. Al Ahed News, Lebanon (ISLAM and HALAL)

Lebanese Islamic News Agency: [http://alahednews.com.lb](http://alahednews.com.lb), alintiqadnews@gmail.com, +961 1555712/+9611555732
3.6. Athabat Satellite TV, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Daily newspaper / Media in Lebanon.
Mr. Khalil Haidar, Executive Director

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_AthabatSatTV.jpg

3.7. Al-Sahat Satellite TV, Yemen (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Islamic Satellite Radio and TV channel in Yemen: http://www.al-sahat.tv/

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Halal_IRTVU_Sahat.jpg

3.8. Daily Nijat, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_Islam-Pakistan_Daily_Nijat.jpg

3.9. Al Bilad Magazine, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Islamic Cultural monthly magazine in Lebanon, Mr. Mostafa Khazem, Editor in Chief, www.albilad.com.lb, +961 70801354

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-Pakistan_Daily_Nijat.jpg

3.10. Al Intiqad Center, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

www.alintiqad.com, intiqad@gmail.com, +961 1555712/+9611555732

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM-HALAL_Lebanon_Al-Intiqad-Weekly.jpg

3.11. Daily Spokesman, Pakistan (.ISLAM)

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Daily_Spokesman.jpg

3.12. Arenas Space Channel, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Mr. Raydan Al Mokaddem, General Manager, +967 1539370

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf
3.13. **Daily Wisdom, Pakistan (ISLAM)**

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan


Islamic Satellite Radio and TV channel in Lebanon.

Mr. Nafeth Abo Hasanah, Executive Director, [www.paltoday.ps](http://www.paltoday.ps), info@paltoday.com,
+961 1842087 - +961 1842107/+9613678365


3.15. **Ath-Thabat Daily, Lebanon (ISLAM and .HALAL)**

Daily newspaper / Media in Lebanon

Mr. Abdullah Jabri Editor in Chief, [www.athhabat.net](http://www.athhabat.net), info@alhabat.net, +961 1360807 - +961 1368256


3.16. **Inbaa News, Lebanon (ISLAM and Halal)**

News agency in Lebanon, Mr. Mahmoud Raya, Editor in Chief, [www.inbaa.com](http://www.inbaa.com), info@inbaa.com, +961 3034313 - +961 3934313


3.17. **Islamic Unity Magazine (Wahda Islamiya), Lebanon (ISLAM and .HALAL)**

The Lebanese Islamic organization’s magazine on the unity of Islam Branches.

Cheikh Mohamad Amro, General Manager, [www.wahdaislamya.org](http://www.wahdaislamya.org), +961 1544671/+9611554667-8-9


3.18. **Mr. Malik Abdul Qayum Khan, Pakistan (ISLAM)**

Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

**Link to download the letter:** [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Malik_Abdul_Qayum_Khan.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Pakistan_Malik_Abdul_Qayum_Khan.jpg)
3.19. **Al Doha Company for Press and Media, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**
Mr. Ghaleb Rashed Sirhan, Editor in Chief, www.alintiqad.com, +961 1555712

3.20. **Haqooq Ul Awam, Pakistan (.ISLAM)**
Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

3.21. **Shown Book Association (Koran), Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**
Cheikh Maher Abdullah, President, www.lkdg.org/node/5512 , +9613688190

3.22. **Page International, Pakistan (.ISLAM)**
Daily newspaper / Media in Pakistan

4. **Famous Muslim Researchers / Academic figures**

4.1. **Daawa Islamic University, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**

4.2. **Islamic Academy, Germany (.ISLAM)**
One of the oldest and most well-known Islamic educational centers in Germany with over 50 years of activity. Many Islam fans are trained in this center.
Link to download the letter: [http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Academy_Germany.jpg](http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS_ISLAM_Germany_Islamic_Academy_Germany.jpg)

4.3. **Cheikh Ahmad Al Zein, Ex Sharee'ah Judge of Saida, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)**
Judge Sharee'ah, info@tajamo.net , +9613333125
4.4. Mr. Nureddin Sirin, Turkey (.ISLAM)

Well-known journalist by Islamic circles in Turkey. He was born in Trabzon and knows English, Arabic and Persian.

He has worked as a journalist with different News Papers and Magazines till 1997. In 1997 military memorandum he was arrested and sentenced to a prison term of 17.5 years, in the prison Type-F of Kandira. He released in 2004. During that time his name has become a symbol for victims.

He currently works for Kudüs TV.


4.5. Dr. Pere Michel Lelong, France (.ISLAM)

Famous Islamologist in France with lots of researches and publishing.


4.6. Brotherhood Association for development and Education, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Ali Mohamad Khodr, President, www.lkdg.org/node/869, +9613865011

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

4.7. Islamic Da'wa Institute for Islamic Studies, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)


4.8. Call Center for KoranTeaching, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Maher Abdulrazaq, President, Abdullahmaher@hotmail.com, +9613688190

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

4.9. Dr. Majid Tafreshi, UK (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

University Professor and history Researcher, and the manager of a cultural publishing institute.

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/LOS-ISLAM-Dr.Tafreshi.pdf
4.10. Group of Turkish Religious Leader, Turkey (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

4.10.1. Yasar Kara
4.10.2. Onur Adiguzel
4.10.3. Necati Talap
4.10.4. Muhammed Yasin Sakalli
4.10.5. Kemal Kicik
4.10.6. Kadir Kaya
4.10.7. Ismail Sen
4.10.8. Isa Erkan
4.10.9. Hoseyin Memis
4.10.10. Enes Haz
4.10.11. Ali Ekber Talan
4.10.12. Nicat Cebraloglu
4.10.13. Kazim Celikbilet
4.10.14. Hayreye Eksi
4.10.15. Fohri Kaya
4.10.16. Ekrem Eksi
4.10.17. Cenksuha Tatlises
4.10.18. Burkan Bozkurt
4.10.19. Ali Osman Celikbeilk
4.10.20. Ali Kocalar

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/ LOS.ISLAM-HALAL_Turkish-Religious.pdf

5. Cultural Organizations and Institutes in Islamic Countries

5.1. International Council Association for Arabic Language, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Global institution dealing with cultural scientific interest in Arabic to preserves its integrity, seeking to promote classical Arabic, promoting its beauty and ability to absorb modern scientific terminology, to raise and defend it in the face of contemporary challenges, and the conspiracies being hatched against it. It is licensed under the Lebanese law based on the approval of the Council of Ministers on 12/30/2005 under No. 370, and includes a selection of the world's scientists.

Mr. Hussein Atwi, Director Public Relations, www.cil-a.org, cil-a@cil-a.org, +961 1854069 - +961 1854072
5.2. The Danish-Palestinian Friendship Association, Denmark (.ISLAM)
An NGO active in Humanity helps to Palestinians


5.3. Ilaf Association for Cultural and Social work, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Ghazi Hneineh, President, +9613350860

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.4. Hope and Charity Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Zuhair Al Jaeed, President, www.amalataa.org, aljeaid@yahoo.com, +9613216166

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.5. Brotherhood Association for Culture and Charity, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Maher Chafiq Mezher, President, www.lkdg.org/node/203, mmkmezher@hotmail.com, +9613004219

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.6. Al Bayan Social Association for Culture and Charity, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Yussef Hussein Sbeity, President, hawzetjawad@hotmail.com, +9613745245

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.7. Say and Work Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Ahmad Al Kattan, President, www.lkd.org/node/1197, kawlana@hotmail.com, +9613096246

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.8. Arabic Sports Club, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)
Cheikh Zuhair Al Jaaed, President, +9613216166
5.9. Cooperative Association for the Manufacture of Agriculture and Livestock Production, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Maher Abdullah, President, Abdullahmaher@hotmail.com, +9613688190

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf

5.10. Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association, Iran-Tajikistan (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

A multinational NGO working on cultural activities to tighten the relationships of Farsi-Speaking Muslims in Iran and Tajikistan.


5.11. Kindness Charity Association, Lebanon (.ISLAM and .HALAL)

Cheikh Mohamad Al Homsi, President, www.markazalihsan.org, markaz_al_ihsan@hotmail.com, +961 1644236 / +9613894180

Link to download the letter: http://www.agitsys.com/pdf/supports-islam/Lebanon_support_letter-1.pdf
Overview of the comments against the controversial applications

The application for the new gTLD .Islam has given rise to numerous comments on the public comments webpage of ICANN. Several articles have also been posted on the Internet. Most of the comments raise identical issues.

Opponents to the launch of the gTLD .Islam mainly argue that the applicant lacks legitimacy to represent the Muslim community. They underline that religions are very sensitive subjects. “Within religions there are different sub groups and sects who may have many differences and diversities. It is a very difficult task to unite all of these differences under one TLD unless it is run and supported by an organization that represent the community or its majority”. Therefore, according to opponents to the launch of the gTLD, a private entity, namely the limited company Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., should not be authorized to have control over a gTLD in relation to religion.

The Independent Objector’s position

In the present case, the IO, eager to lead a fair and transparent assessment, first expressed his concerns, regarding certain issues raised by the application, to the applicant through the initial notice procedure. Indeed, as encouraged but not required by ICANN, both parties are given the choice to participate in mediation or negotiation processes. The Initial Notice procedure opened up an opportunity for settling the pending issues.
A detailed note, including the reasons why the IO considered that an objection against the application might be warranted, has been sent to the applicant in order to give them the opportunity to react to the IO’s first assessment. It is only after careful review of their comments and feedbacks that the IO conducted a second assessment of the application. Still for the sake of transparency, to which the IO is fully committed, the present comment aims at informing the public of the results of the IO’s second evaluation of the application, including the reasons why the IO first considered that an objection could be warranted and why he finally considers that it in principle is not the case.

As he is acting in the best interests of the public using the Internet, the IO is convinced that the public should know about the subject matter and extent of his exchanges with the applicant. Indeed, it is important that all relevant facts are known in case his final decision is to not object to an application against which he first considered that an objection could be warranted. Therefore, the applicant’s response is attached to the present comment.

It should be noted that, acting in the interests of global Internet users, the IO has the possibility to file objections against applications on the community and limited public interest grounds.

**Limited Public Interest Objection**

When assessing whether an objection against an application would be warranted on the limited public interest ground, the IO examines if the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under fundamental principles of international law.

1. The IO acknowledges that religions are very sensitive issues. This is particularly true due to the place that religion sometimes plays in the social life and debate. However, this question is more relevant in national legal systems. Indeed, the role of religions varies from State to State depending, notably, on whether it is a secular State or if it has a State religion. In view of the framework established by the applicant guidebook for limited public interest objections, the IO limits his review of the application to its compliance to fundamental principles of international law and rules of international law aimed at protecting common values of the international society, such as prohibition of genocide, slavery, torture or sexual exploitation of children.
2. It should be noted that the understanding of international morality is not uniform within the international society. It is difficult to list such principles since those value judgments, even when fundamental, also change over time. When reviewing applications, the IO makes his assessment in the light of those value judgments that have been transcribed in international norms, and not with regard to specific religious or national moral values. However, it does not mean that the IO cannot examine and discuss issues relating to religion.

3. In fact, the IO notes with interest for the present review that international law is concerned with issues related to religion. The fundamental notion of equal sovereignty, today enshrined in article 2 of the United Nations Charter, stemmed from the right of each State to choose its religion without any foreign intervention (Treaty of Westphalia (1648)).

4. International law still addresses issues related to religion, notably since it prevents international relations from conflicts to promote international peace and security and when protecting religious diversity. Thus, the freedom of religion or belief is one of the fundamental principles protected by international law.

5. The principle is enshrined in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that “1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching. 2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. 3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. 4. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions”.

6. Protection of religious diversity is also, inter alia, enshrined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which defines genocide in its article 2 as certain “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group” or in article 8 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe, which states that “The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to manifest his
or her religion or belief and to establish religious institutions, organisations and associations”.

7. The same right is incorporated in article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”.

8. Other non-binding international instruments also set important benchmarks for the freedom of religion. This is the case in particular for the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which affirms in its article 3 that “Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations”.

9. In its resolution on “Combating Intolerance, Negative Stereotyping and Stigmatization of, and Discrimination, Incitement to Violence, and Violence Against Persons Based on Religion or Belief”, the Human Right Council also called for “strengthened international efforts to foster a global dialogue for the promotion of a culture of tolerance and peace at all levels, based on respect for human rights and diversity of religions and beliefs”.

10. Similar safeguards are also provided at the regional level and particularly by article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights which stipulates that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance”. Article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights also underlines that “Everyone has the right to freedom of conscience and of religion. This right includes freedom to maintain or to change one's religion or beliefs, and freedom to profess or disseminate one's religion or beliefs, either individually or together with others, in public or in private”. Similarly, Article 8 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights states that “Freedom of conscience, the profession and free practice of religion shall be guaranteed.
No one may, subject to law and order, be submitted to measures restricting the exercise of these freedoms”.

11. The issue of religion is finally approached from the perspective of the principle of non-discrimination. This principle is notably enshrined in various key international instruments:

- **Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, which states that “everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”.

- **The United Nations Charter and its Article 1(3)**, which defines one of the purposes of the United Nations as being the promotion and encouragement for the “respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion »

- **According to Article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**, States parties agree to “undertake to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

- **Similarly, Article 2 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child** says that “States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status”.

- **Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** also requires States parties to “guarantee that the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”.
FIRST AND FINAL ASSESSMENT: For all these reasons, the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “.Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community.

Community Objection

For the IO to consider filing a community objection, there must be a substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a representative portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Therefore, the community named by the IO must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection.

When assessing whether a community objection is warranted, the IO bases his review on four preliminary tests.

1. As for the first test, (the IO determines if the community invoked is a clearly delineated community), the IO notes that the notion of “community” is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s guidebook for the new gTLD program. It can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethnical, religious, linguistic or similar community. Moreover, communities can also be classified in sub-communities (i.e. the Jewish community in New York or the Italian community on Facebook). However, beyond the diversity of communities, there are common definitional elements.

For the IO, a community is a group of individuals who have something in common (which can include their place of residence – i.e. the French, South-East Asian or Brazilian community – or a common characteristic – i.e. the disability community), or share common values, interests or goals (i.e. the health, legal, internet or ICANN community). For the purpose of the IO evaluation, it is clear that what matters is that the community invoked can be clearly delineated, enjoys a certain level of public recognition and encompasses a certain number of people and/or entities.

In this case, the IO acknowledges that public comments made on the community ground tend to prove the existence of such a community, being the global Muslim community, and
generally express an opinion in the name of the designated community. Muslims are adherent of Islam and share common religious values and interests. The community is composed of individuals, whether they are religious officials or ordinary Muslims, as well as non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organization such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). According to some comments, the latter would represent the majority of the community since it “has membership of 57 states spread over four continents”. “The Organization is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensuring to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various people of the world”.

2. As for the second and third tests, (The IO verifies if there is a substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted), the IO pays a particular attention to the representative nature of entities or persons expressing opposition as well as well as the level of recognized stature or weight among sources expressing opposition.

In this regard, the IO particularly notes that the GAC representatives of the governments of India and the United Arab Emirates have issued two early warnings. The United Arab Emirates give three reasons for the issuance of their early warning. First, they argue that “Religious terms and subjects are very sensitive areas. The applicant is a commercial entity. Strict boundaries, measures and policies must be set to ensure that applicant business activities do not conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. They also underline that there is a “lack of community involvement and support” and that “the application lacks any sort of protection to ensure that the use of the domain names registered under the applied for new gTLD are in line with Islam principles, pillars, views believes and law”. As to the Indian government, they argue that “the applicant intends to run the “.islam” gTLD on an exclusive basis, without any regard to the diverse and wide-ranging needs of India’s 120 million plus Muslims”.

The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates has also expressed its concern about the application on the public comments webpage of ICANN. “The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (TRA) of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has been established according to the UAE Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003 – Telecom Law. TRA is responsible for the management of every aspect of the telecommunications and information technology industries in the UAE. TRA, and as determined by its mandate, is entrusted with a wide range of responsibilities related to the
Telecommunications and Information Technology Sector, both within and outside the UAE”.

Finally, the Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia also expressed concerns on the application. It is “the information and communications technology sector (ICT) regulator in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Telecommunications Act (enacted in June 2001) and its Bylaws (issued in July 2002) provide the basis for regulatory framework of the sector. The Act includes a number of objectives, including: provision of advanced, sufficient and affordable communications services; creating the proper climate to encourage fair competition; utilizing frequencies efficiently, transferring telecommunications technology and keeping breast with its developments, and realizing clarity and transparency in processes procedures, in addition to achieving the principles of equality and non-discrimination and protecting the public interest as well as the interests of users and investors. The Commission enjoys the juridical personality and financial independence to achieve its objectives stipulated in the Telecommunications Act, its Bylaw and the Ordinance of the Communications and Information Technology Commission”.

Furthermore, regarding the question as to whether the gTLDs implicitly or explicitly target the invoked community, the link in the present case is to say the least obvious and explicit. Indeed, the applicant itself specifies that “There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this”.

3. Finally and as for the fourth test (the IO conduct when assessing whether an objection is warranted or not, the application for the Top-Level Domain name must create a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted), the IO holds that comments against the application have been made by major representatives of the “Muslim world”. They notably state that the applicant lacks support from the Muslim community, which it did not consult prior to its decision to operate the gTLD. In fact, comments against the application suggest that a more representative entity should operate such a gTLD. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation would have greater legitimacy according to them. They also underline that a “.Islam” gTLD should not be operated by a commercial entity, which furthermore does not offer sufficient safeguard for preventing “conflict with the
religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. Also, considering that actors that are among the most important of the community have made comments, it is reasonable to believe that the application could interfere with the legitimate interests of, at least, the above-mentioned stakeholders.

FIRST ASSESSMENT: Therefore, as for his possibility to object on the community ground, the IO was of the opinion that an objection against the application for the new gTLD “.Islam” could have been warranted. However, the IO clarified that he would certainly hesitate to object in case a representative community objector would be in position to object, as it clearly seems to be the case in the present case.

FINAL ASSESSMENT: As a result of the initial notice procedure, the IO now considers that applicant appropriately addresses his first concerns.

In their response, Asia Green IT System (AGIT) notably emphasized that they “agree with most of the Public Comments on ‘sensitivity’ of .Islam and try to create a Governance Platform with cooperation of OIC to address such concerns. AGIT does not want to position itself as the ‘judge’ of ‘choosing suitable candidates for using .Islam gTLD’ without the Muslim community leaders' involvement. As a private Company with Technical and Managerial capabilities, [they] would like to be mostly involved in operational side of [their] .Islam gTLD application.” They assured that they “will do [their] outmost to include OIC into governance of .İslam gTLD. [Their] proposal to OIC is establishing OIC ICT organization as the Sponsor of .İslam gTLD and in charge of the governance entity”.

They added that an “alternate Governance approach would be formation of "dot-ISLAM Advisory Council", consisting of prominent Islamic leaders like former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Muhammad, personalities and NGOs that acceptable to all Muslim faithful.”.

AGIT also attached to their response numerous letters of support and assured that they had “a plan to increase the level of support [they] can receive from Islamic communities around the world”. However, the IO noted that unfortunately, none of those letters emanated from current officials of governments concerned by this gTLD or from International Organizations such as the OIC.
Following this first exchange, the IO contacted again AGIT in order to clarify certain remaining issues. Indeed, the IO main concern was about the legitimacy of AGIT to represent the Islamic community and operate a gTLD in its sole interests. In order to dispel his doubts as to this issue, the IO sought clarification with regards to what did AGIT exactly meant when they proposed to share the governance of the gTLD and to what extent the OIC could be involved. The IO also wished to have a more precise idea of the entities AGIT could include in the “Dot Islam Advisory Council” in case the OIC does not intend to get involved in the management of the gTLD and what will be the exact role of the “Dot Islam Advisory Council”.

In a second response, AGIT attached a draft proposal on the governance of the gTLD “.Islam”, which was also shared with governments’ representatives for their feedbacks, including those who issued an early warning against their application. They stated that “the main core of [their] proposed .ISLAM governance is “.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC)” which will have great powers in different aspects of operation of a TLD, including Registration Policy Making, Dispute Resolutions, Content Monitoring Policies and activities etc…”. They have proposed “the PAC to include 3 main groups: a) The Governments’ representatives, b) Religious leaders, c) Civil society. And on the head (as PAC Chairperson) [they] would like to benefit from the representative of an international Islamic Organization (like OIC or ICCI)”. They assured that “PAC will be a non-for-profit board elected from interested members, and will have designed enough dynamicity to include representatives of different stakeholder time to time, through its rotating system”.

As an alternative to a representative of an International Organization, like the OIC, appointed as the PAC chairperson, they had contact with the “Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC)”, which gave its support to this initiative.

They also mentioned a fruitful consultation with the GAC representative of the United Arab Emirates as well as several “organizations and associations which can be considered as representatives of specific groups of Muslims”.

The IO considers that guarantees presented by the applicant properly address his initial concerns. Therefore and for all these reasons, the IO is finally of the opinion that an objection on community ground is not warranted.
Moreover, it is the public policy of the IO not to make an objection when an established institution representing and associated with the community having an interest in an objection can lodge such an objection directly. This does not exclude that the IO deems it nevertheless appropriate to file a community objection in particular circumstances, e.g., if the established institution representing and associated with the community has compelling reasons not to do so, if the community has no representative established institutions entitled to file a community objection, or when several communities are in the same interest and an application could raise issues of priority or in respect to the modalities of the objection.

In the present case, the IO is of the opinion that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is an established institution representing and associated with a significant part of the targeted community. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is already fully aware of the controversial issues and is better placed than the IO to file an objection, if it deems it appropriate. That is also for this reason that the IO, who is primarily acting as a “safety net”, does not in principle intend to file an objection on the community ground.
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

 قناة الساحات الفضائية

إلى: هيئة تقييم الطلبات الجديدة (New GTLD)

الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لزوم تسجيل النظامات الجديدة .HALAL و .ISLAM

..ISLAM

بموجب هذه الرسالة نحن قناتنا الساحات الفضائية نؤكد على تأييدها الكامل للفضاء .ISLAM.

..HALAL

وعندما يستخدم هذه الرسالة نحن يدلنا السماح في GTLD، في برنامج ICANN، في برنامج GTLD الجديد.

ونصفي التمثيلية كمدير عام لها، أؤكد أن لدي السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لكم.

TLDS

نحن نؤمن أنه في المجال المتاح والمرحب به من قبل ICANN للعديد من النظامات مختلف المجتمعات (من ضمنها النظامات التي تعتبر مع القائم الإسلامية)، يحتاج المجتمع المسلم أيضاً لنظاماته، حيث أن النظامات .HALAL و .ISLAM

تستطيع أن تلعب دوراً كبيراً في تعزيز القيم في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالإضافة إلى مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الإحتراق المتبادل للأدبيان.

شكركم لكم الفرصة المتاحة لنا للتعبير عن تأييدها لهذه النظامات.

بكل إخلاص

اسم: ريان المقدم

التوقيع: [ลาย]

الموقع: [موقع]
موضوع: حمایت از دامنه های .HALAL و .ISLAM

مدیریت محتوم موسسه آیکن
با سلام

سازمان کانال اون دورت (14) بدن و سیله حمایت کامل خود از ثبیت دامنه .HALAL و .ISLAM های سطح بالای جدید اینترنتی و موسسه آیکن مورد بررسی است ابراز می‌دارد.

اینجا ب موسی آیینی به عنوان مدیر سازمان فوق اعلام می‌دارم که حق امضای رسمی استاد سازمان فوق را دارا هستم.

این سازمان ضمن تشکر از اقدام آیکن در فراهم نمودن فرصت حضور جوامع و اقوام مختلف در فضای اینترنت که اقدامی ارزشمند در راستای کشش فرهنگ عمومی است، و به عنوان عضوی از جامعه مسلمانان جهان، ثبت پسوندهای مخصوص مسلمانان را اقدامی مثبت و فرصتی ارزشمند برای مسلمانان برای رسیدن پیام صلح و دوستی خود به جهانیان می‌داند.

همچنین این سازمان اعتقاد دارد که در فضای کنونی که تمامی اقوام و صاحبان عقالی فرصت حضور در فضای اینترنت را در قالب نامه‌ای دامنه سطح بالا به دست آورده اند، مسلمانان نیز به عنوان بخش بزرگی از شهروندان جهان می‌توانند از این امکان بهره‌مند گردد.

با سپاس
موسی آیدین
رئیس هیئت مدیره

MEDYAM 14 RADYO
TELEVIZYON YAYINCILIK A.S.
Mahmutbey Mah.Küçük Halkalı Caddesi
Baran Plaza No:16 Kat:10 Beşiktaş / IST.
Numisa.V.D 613 070 2289
Fatih-İSTANBUL
Tlf: 0212 659 63 12
Fax: 0212 659 50 48

Sayın: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Dikkat: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Konu: Yeni .ISLAM ve .HALAL için destek mektubu.

Bu mektup KÜDÜS MEDYA A.Ş’in ICANN’in yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde yapılan .ISLAM ve .HALAL başvurularına tam destek verdiği ni ifade etmek için yazılmıştır.

Kurum’un Yönetim Kurulu Başkanı olarak, bu mektup’ta yazdığınız şeylere yetkimi olduğunu onaylıyorum.

Bizler, ICANN’in farklı toplulukların (İslami değerlerle uyuşmayan TDL’ler dahil) TDL’lerini barındığı alanları olumlu karşılamadığına inanıyoruz ve aynı şekilde Müslüman toplulukların da bu alanlarda kendi TDL’lerinin olması gerektiğini düşünüyoruz. Ayrıca, ISLAM ve HALAL başka dini dinlere saygı, temel insan hakları ifade ve inanç özgürlüğine dayalı olarak, siber alanda İslami değerleri desteklemesi noktasında önemli rol oynayabilirler.

Bu TDL’leri destekleme fırsatı verdiği ni için teşekkürler.

Saygılarımla

ALİ YAZICI
Kudüs Medya A.Ş
Yönetim Krl. Bşk.
ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

İnternet Tahsisli Sayılar ve İşimler Kurumu / ICANN Müdürlüğüne

Bizler Kevser Basın Yayınçılık olarak internette .halal , .üslam uzantılarının kaydedilmesi ve kullanımla olanak sağlanılması başvurusunda bulunun, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Şirketinin bu talebini desteklemektediriz.


Müdür
Çetin AKYÜZ

Contact Information Redacted
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support fo .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Faysal Alashmar as the representative of Research Services Group, website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domians submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Name: Faysal Alashmar

Position in Organization: editor in chief
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد تسجيل نطاقات - ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد;

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها تسجيل النطاقات في مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى "HALA - ISLAM". المقدم من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمثّل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتداداتها المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطردهم الدينية، من خلال اتباع ساحة التواصل المتمايزة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً مبدعةً موثقةً في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الاقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

مسؤول المكتب الإعلامي
محمد روزق

بيروت في : ٣ /١٣ /٢٠١٣
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Mahmoud Raya as the representative of INBAA website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domians submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Mahmoud Raya

Position in Organization : editor in cheif

INBAA website
التاريخ: ٢٠١٣/٤/١

الإلى:

ICANN

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد تسجيل نطاقات .HALAL — .ISLAM

نحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا تسجيل النطاقات في مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى المقدم من شركة: HALA L. — .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أتماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الدوني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

مدير المكتب الإعلامي

علي شرف
الموضوع: رسالة تأكيد لوزم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة (HALA-ISLAM)

يمكن تأكيد أن في معهد الدعوة الجامعي للدراسات الإسلامية نؤكد على تأنيتنا الكاملة لنطاقات gTLD التي تم تقديمها إلى ICANN (ICANN).

ولجود التسجيلات كرئيس لمعهد الدعوة الجامعي للدراسات الإسلامية، أؤكد أن لدى السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لكل.

نحن نؤمن أنه في المجال المناهج والمرحب به من قبل المجتمعات (من ضمنها النطاقات باللغة العربية) يتعارض مع القيام الإسلامية تعاون المجتمع المسلم أيضاً لانطلاقته حيث أن النطاقات TLDs تُعتبر أن تلعب دورًا كبيرًا في تعزيز القيم في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك الارتقاء على مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإمامة، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاحترام المتبادل للأديان.

نشكر لكم الفرصة لناحية لنا للتعبير عن تأنيتنا هذه النطاقات TLDs والنساء بقبول في التقدير والإحترام.

رئيس المعهد

م. ش. د. درويش

الذكرى: 29/5/2013م.

الرقام: 

جنب السادة:

ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way

Marina del Rey, CA 90292

(NowgTld)
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنترنت للمسى HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات، التي سوف توفر المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهلة، فتوفر بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقًا "قيما" وأفكارا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: د.ب.أ. 
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآعلى على الإنترنت للمسيحي: HALAL و ISLAM.

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحقيق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً. بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

توقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الأنترنت للمسمى .HALAL و .ISLAM، المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثناءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 
التاريخ: 
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأليتنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الآلي على الإنترنت للمسمي HALAL و ISLAM.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti،
gTLD الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبة، فتربب بينهم وتفخف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمات المقدمة من شركة .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

الcontinental ضمن برنامج ICANN

gTLD الجديد.

 وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتكشف من حدة تطورهم الديني، من خلال إتباع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فيما" وأفكاراً بناء موثقة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع

اسم: 

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخير وعاد
رئيس الجمعية

0/10/0/
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواقعي في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف انتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمlesi .HALAL و .ISLAM

" Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتفاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفاتهم الدينية، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأيد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المتقدمة من شركة " Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج الجديد.

وكانت ناقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفيهم الديني، من خلال إسهام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قينا" وأفكاراً "بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين جانب الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتيازاتهم المذهابة، فتقوم بينهم وتخفف من حالة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنسجام ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً و أفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ... 
التوقيع: ...
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبة، فすること بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطهيرهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمستقبل .HALAL و .ISLAM من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى برنامج ICANN الدولي ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف مناطقهم المذهبية، فتتbió بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً قيماً وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها تأثيراتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدير جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييداً على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة 

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتقلب بينهم وترتفع من حدة تطرفهم الإثني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤززة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ما هى كمال

التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فتقلّب بينهم ونخفق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ومجال الوطن المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقًا "قيما" وأفكارا" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ____________________________
التوقيع: ____________________________
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسا .HALAL و .ISLAM

المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل ممتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبيه، فترازم بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنتاج سلسلة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيما وأفكارا" بناءً مؤثره في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نتشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: ما هدير كمال
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد


إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "فهماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل "HALAL" و "ISLAM"

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي "HALAL" و "ISLAM"

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف انتماءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم وتقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [الاسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
الوزير: [الوزير]
الثقة: [الثقة]
القرار: [القرار]
الأخبار: [الأخبار]
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The Independent Objector's Comments on Controversial Applications (.ISLAM)

http://www.independent-objector-newgtlds.org/home/the-independent-objector-s-comments-on-controversial-applications/islam-general-comment/

Overview of the comments against the controversial applications

The application for the new gTLD .Islam has given rise to numerous comments on the public comments webpage of ICANN. Several articles have also been posted on the Internet. Most of the comments raise identical issues.

Opponents to the launch of the gTLD .Islam mainly argue that the applicant lacks legitimacy to represent the Muslim community. They underline that religions are very sensitive subjects. “Within religions there are different sub groups and sects who may have many differences and diversities. It is a very difficult task to unite all of these differences under one TLD unless it is run and supported by an organization that represent the community or its majority”. Therefore, according to opponents to the launch of the gTLD, a private entity, namely the limited company Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. ve Tic. Ltd. Sti., should not be authorized to have control over a gTLD in relation to religion.

The Independent Objector’s position

In the present case, the IO, eager to lead a fair and transparent assessment, first expressed his concerns, regarding certain issues raised by the application, to the applicant through the initial notice procedure. Indeed, as encouraged but not required by ICANN, both parties are given the choice to participate in mediation or negotiation processes. The Initial Notice procedure opened up an opportunity for settling the pending issues.
A detailed note, including the reasons why the IO considered that an objection against the application might be warranted, has been sent to the applicant in order to give them the opportunity to react to the IO’s first assessment. It is only after careful review of their comments and feedbacks that the IO conducted a second assessment of the application. Still for the sake of transparency, to which the IO is fully committed, the present comment aims at informing the public of the results of the IO’s second evaluation of the application, including the reasons why the IO first considered that an objection could be warranted and why he finally considers that it in principle is not the case.

As he is acting in the best interests of the public using the Internet, the IO is convinced that the public should know about the subject matter and extent of his exchanges with the applicant. Indeed, it is important that all relevant facts are known in case his final decision is to not object to an application against which he first considered that an objection could be warranted. Therefore, the applicant’s response is attached to the present comment.

It should be noted that, acting in the interests of global Internet users, the IO has the possibility to file objections against applications on the community and limited public interest grounds.

**Limited Public Interest Objection**

When assessing whether an objection against an application would be warranted on the limited public interest ground, the IO examines if the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under fundamental principles of international law.

1. The IO acknowledges that religions are very sensitive issues. This is particularly true due to the place that religion sometimes plays in the social life and debate. However, this question is more relevant in national legal systems. Indeed, the role of religions varies from State to State depending, notably, on whether it is a secular State or if it has a State religion. In view of the framework established by the applicant guidebook for limited public interest objections, the IO limits his review of the application to its compliance to fundamental principles of international law and rules of international law aimed at protecting common values of the international society, such as prohibition of genocide, slavery, torture or sexual exploitation of children.
2. It should be noted that the understanding of international morality is not uniform within the international society. It is difficult to list such principles since those value judgments, even when fundamental, also change over time. When reviewing applications, the IO makes his assessment in the light of those value judgments that have been transcribed in international norms, and not with regard to specific religious or national moral values. However, it does not mean that the IO cannot examine and discuss issues relating to religion.

3. In fact, the IO notes with interest for the present review that international law is concerned with issues related to religion. The fundamental notion of equal sovereignty, today enshrined in article 2 of the United Nations Charter, stemmed from the right of each State to choose its religion without any foreign intervention (Treaty of Westphalia (1648)).

4. International law still addresses issues related to religion, notably since it prevents international relations from conflicts to promote international peace and security and when protecting religious diversity. Thus, the freedom of religion or belief is one of the fundamental principles protected by international law.

5. The principle is enshrined in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that “1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching. 2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. 3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. 4. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions”.

6. Protection of religious diversity is also, inter alia, enshrined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which defines genocide in its article 2 as certain “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group” or in article 8 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe, which states that “The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to manifest his
or her religion or belief and to establish religious institutions, organisations and associations”.

7. The same right is incorporated in article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”.

8. Other non-binding international instruments also set important benchmarks for the freedom of religion. This is the case in particular for the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which affirms in its article 3 that “Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations”.

9. In its resolution on “Combating Intolerance, Negative Stereotyping and Stigmatization of, and Discrimination, Incitement to Violence, and Violence Against Persons Based on Religion or Belief”, the Human Right Council also called for “strengthened international efforts to foster a global dialogue for the promotion of a culture of tolerance and peace at all levels, based on respect for human rights and diversity of religions and beliefs”.

10. Similar safeguards are also provided at the regional level and particularly by article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights which stipulates that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance”. Article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights also underlines that “Everyone has the right to freedom of conscience and of religion. This right includes freedom to maintain or to change one's religion or beliefs, and freedom to profess or disseminate one's religion or beliefs, either individually or together with others, in public or in private”. Similarly, Article 8 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights states that “Freedom of conscience, the profession and free practice of religion shall be guaranteed.
No one may, subject to law and order, be submitted to measures restricting the exercise of these freedoms”.

11. The issue of religion is finally approached from the perspective of the principle of non-discrimination. This principle is notably enshrined in various key international instruments:

- Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that “everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”.

- The United Nations Charter and its Article 1(3), which defines one of the purposes of the United Nations as being the promotion and encouragement for the “respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”.

- According to Article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, States parties agree to “undertake to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

- Similarly, Article 2 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child says that “States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status”.

- Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights also requires States parties to “guarantee that the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”. 
FIRST AND FINAL ASSESSMENT: For all these reasons, the IO is of the opinion that an objection to the launch of the new gTLD “.Islam” on the limited public interest ground is not warranted. Quite the contrary, the gTLD could encourage the promotion of the freedom of religion, a fundamental right under public international law, by creating and developing a new space for religious expression that could benefit the Muslim community.

**Community Objection**

For the IO to consider filing a community objection, there must be a substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a representative portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Therefore, the community named by the IO must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection.

When assessing whether a community objection is warranted, the IO bases his review on four preliminary tests.

1. As for the first test, *(the IO determines if the community invoked is a clearly delineated community)*, the IO notes that the notion of “community” is wide and broad, and is not precisely defined by ICANN’s guidebook for the new gTLD program. It can include a community of interests, as well as a particular ethnical, religious, linguistic or similar community. Moreover, communities can also be classified in sub-communities (i.e. the Jewish community in New York or the Italian community on Facebook). However, beyond the diversity of communities, there are common definitional elements.

For the IO, a community is a group of individuals who have something in common (which can include their place of residence – i.e. the French, South-East Asian or Brazilian community – or a common characteristic – i.e. the disability community), or share common values, interests or goals (i.e. the health, legal, internet or ICANN community). For the purpose of the IO evaluation, it is clear that what matters is that the community invoked can be clearly delineated, enjoys a certain level of public recognition and encompasses a certain number of people and/or entities.

In this case, the IO acknowledges that public comments made on the community ground tend to prove the existence of such a community, being the global Muslim community, and
generally express an opinion in the name of the designated community. Muslims are adherent of Islam and share common religious values and interests. The community is composed of individuals, whether they are religious officials or ordinary Muslims, as well as non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organization such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). According to some comments, the latter would represent the majority of the community since it “has membership of 57 states spread over four continents”. “The Organization is the collective voice of the Muslim world and ensuring to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony among various people of the world”.

2. As for the second and third tests, (The IO verifies if there is a substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted), the IO pays a particular attention to the representative nature of entities or persons expressing opposition as well as well as the level of recognized stature or weight among sources expressing opposition.

In this regard, the IO particularly notes that the GAC representatives of the governments of India and the United Arab Emirates have issued two early warnings. The United Arab Emirates give three reasons for the issuance of their early warning. First, they argue that “Religious terms and subjects are very sensitive areas. The applicant is a commercial entity. Strict boundaries, measures and policies must be set to ensure that applicant business activities do not conflict with the religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. They also underline that there is a “lack of community involvement and support” and that “the application lacks any sort of protection to ensure that the use of the domain names registered under the applied for new gTLD are in line with Islam principles, pillars, views believes and law”. As to the Indian government, they argue that “the applicant intends to run the “.islam” gTLD on an exclusive basis, without any regard to the diverse and wide-ranging needs of India’s 120 million plus Muslims”.

The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates has also expressed its concern about the application on the public comments webpage of ICANN. “The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (TRA) of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has been established according to the UAE Federal Law by Decree No. 3 of 2003 – Telecom Law. TRA is responsible for the management of every aspect of the telecommunications and information technology industries in the UAE. TRA, and as determined by its mandate, is entrusted with a wide range of responsibilities related to the
Telecommunications and Information Technology Sector, both within and outside the UAE”.

Finally, the Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia also expressed concerns on the application. It is “the information and communications technology sector (ICT) regulator in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Telecommunications Act (enacted in June 2001) and its Bylaws (issued in July 2002) provide the basis for regulatory framework of the sector. The Act includes a number of objectives, including: provision of advanced, sufficient and affordable communications services; creating the proper climate to encourage fair competition; utilizing frequencies efficiently, transferring telecommunications technology and keeping breast with its developments, and realizing clarity and transparency in processes procedures, in addition to achieving the principles of equality and non-discrimination and protecting the public interest as well as the interests of users and investors. The Commission enjoys the juridical personality and financial independence to achieve its objectives stipulated in the Telecommunications Act, its Bylaw and the Ordinance of the Communications and Information Technology Commission”.

Furthermore, regarding the question as to whether the gTLDs implicitly or explicitly target the invoked community, the link in the present case is to say the least obvious and explicit. Indeed, the applicant itself specifies that “There are hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, practicing their faith in a huge variety of different ways. They are a disparate group, yet they are united through their core beliefs. Hitherto, however, there has been no way to easily unify them and their common appreciation of Islam. The .ISLAM gTLD will change this”.

3. Finally and as for the fourth test (the IO conduct when assessing whether an objection is warranted or not, the application for the Top-Level Domain name must create a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted), the IO holds that comments against the application have been made by major representatives of the “Muslim world”. They notably state that the applicant lacks support from the Muslim community, which it did not consult prior to its decision to operate the gTLD. In fact, comments against the application suggest that a more representative entity should operate such a gTLD. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation would have greater legitimacy according to them. They also underline that a “.Islam” gTLD should not be operated by a commercial entity, which furthermore does not offer sufficient safeguard for preventing “conflict with the
religion objectives, principles, beliefs and laws”. Also, considering that actors that are among the most important of the community have made comments, it is reasonable to believe that the application could interfere with the legitimate interests of, at least, the above-mentioned stakeholders.

FIRST ASSESSMENT: Therefore, as for his possibility to object on the community ground, the IO was of the opinion that an objection against the application for the new gTLD “.Islam” could have been warranted. However, the IO clarified that he would certainly hesitate to object in case a representative community objector would be in position to object, as it clearly seems to be the case in the present case.

FINAL ASSESSMENT: As a result of the initial notice procedure, the IO now considers that applicant appropriately addresses his first concerns.

In their response, Asia Green IT System (AGIT) notably emphasized that they “agree with most of the Public Comments on ‘sensitivity’ of .Islam and try to create a Governance Platform with cooperation of OIC to address such concerns. AGIT does not want to position itself as the ‘judge’ of ‘choosing suitable candidates for using .Islam gTLD’ without the Muslim community leaders' involvement. As a private Company with Technical and Managerial capabilities, [they] would like to be mostly involved in operational side of [their] .Islam gTLD application.” They assured that they “will do [their] outmost to include OIC into governance of .İslam gTLD. [Their] proposal to OIC is establishing OIC ICT organization as the Sponsor of .İslam gTLD and in charge of the governance entity”.

They added that an “alternate Governance approach would be formation of "dot-ISLAM Advisory Council", consisting of prominent Islamic leaders like former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Muhammad, personalities and NGOs that acceptable to all Muslim faithful.”.

AGIT also attached to their response numerous letters of support and assured that they had “a plan to increase the level of support [they] can receive from Islamic communities around the world”. However, the IO noted that unfortunately, none of those letters emanated from current officials of governments concerned by this gTLD or from International Organizations such as the OIC.
Following this first exchange, the IO contacted again AGIT in order to clarify certain remaining issues. Indeed, the IO main concern was about the legitimacy of AGIT to represent the Islamic community and operate a gTLD in its sole interests. In order to dispel his doubts as to this issue, the IO sought clarification with regards to what did AGIT exactly meant when they proposed to share the governance of the gTLD and to what extent the OIC could be involved. The IO also wished to have a more precise idea of the entities AGIT could include in the “Dot Islam Advisory Council” in case the OIC does not intend to get involved in the management of the gTLD and what will be the exact role of the “Dot Islam Advisory Council”.

In a second response, AGIT attached a draft proposal on the governance of the gTLD “.Islam”, which was also shared with governments’ representatives for their feedbacks, including those who issued an early warning against their application. They stated that “the main core of [their] proposed .ISLAM governance is “.ISLAM Policy Advisory Council (PAC)” which will have great powers in different aspects of operation of a TLD, including Registration Policy Making, Dispute Resolutions, Content Monitoring Policies and activities etc…”. They have proposed “the PAC to include 3 main groups: a) The Governments’ representatives, b) Religious leaders, c) Civil society. And on the head (as PAC Chairperson) [they] would like to benefit from the representative of an international Islamic Organization (like OIC or ICCI)”. They assured that “PAC will be a non-for-profit board elected from interested members, and will have designed enough dynamicity to include representatives of different stakeholder time to time, through its rotating system”.

As an alternative to a representative of an International Organization, like the OIC, appointed as the PAC chairperson, they had contact with the “Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (ICRIC) affiliated to the Islamic Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI) which is under the umbrella of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC)”, which gave its support to this initiative.

They also mentioned a fruitful consultation with the GAC representative of the United Arab Emirates as well as several “organizations and associations which can be considered as representatives of specific groups of Muslims”.

The IO considers that guarantees presented by the applicant properly address his initial concerns. Therefore and for all these reasons, the IO is finally of the opinion that an objection on community ground is not warranted.
Moreover, it is the public policy of the IO not to make an objection when an established institution representing and associated with the community having an interest in an objection can lodge such an objection directly. This does not exclude that the IO deems it nevertheless appropriate to file a community objection in particular circumstances, e.g., if the established institution representing and associated with the community has compelling reasons not to do so, if the community has no representative established institutions entitled to file a community objection, or when several communities are in the same interest and an application could raise issues of priority or in respect to the modalities of the objection.

In the present case, the IO is of the opinion that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is an established institution representing and associated with a significant part of the targeted community. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is already fully aware of the controversial issues and is better placed than the IO to file an objection, if it deems it appropriate. That is also for this reason that the IO, who is primarily acting as a “safety net”, does not in principle intend to file an objection on the community ground.
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

إنتباه: هيئة تقييم الطلبات الجديدة (New GTLD)

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة .HALAL و .ISLAM

بموجب هذه الرسالة نحن قناة الساحات الفضائية نؤكد على تأييدنا الكامل لنتيجة المقدمة إلى ICANN في برنامج GTLD الجديد.

وبصفتي الممثلية لوك.مدير عام لها، أؤكد أن لدي السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لكم.

نحن نؤمن أنه في المجال المتاح والمرحب به من قبل ICANN لعدد من النطاقات TLDs والمختلف المجتمعات (من ضمنها النطاقات TLDs التي تتعارض مع القيم الإسلامية)، يحتاج المجتمع المسلم أيضاً لطاقاته، حيث أن النطاقات .HALAL و .ISLAM تستطيع أن تلعب دوراً كبيراً في تعزيز القيم في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالإنجاز على مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاحتراز المتبادل للأديان.

شكركم الفرصة المتاحة لنا لتلبيتنا لهذه النطاقات .TLDs

بكل إخلاص

الاسم: ريدان المقدم

التاريخ:
موضوع: حمایت از دامنه های .HALAL و .ISLAM

مدیریت محتوی موسسه آیکن با سلام

سازمان کانال اون دوارت (14) به دین و سیله حمایت کامل خود از ثبت دامنه .HALAL های سطح بالای جدید اینترنتی .ISLAM و .HALAL مورد بررسی است. ابراز می‌دارند.

این ادغام موشی آیدین به عنوان مهندس سازمان فوق اعلام می‌دارم که حق امضای رسمی استاد سازمان فوق را دارا هستم.

این سازمان ضمن تهیه از اقدام آیکن در فرآیند نمودن قرار است. حضور جوامع و اقوام مختلف در فضای اینترنت که اقدامی گسترده در اقدامی از پیامدهای دارد.

فرهنگ عمومی است. به عنوان عضوی از جامعه مسلمانان جهان، ثبت مسندهای خاص مسلمانان را اقدامی مثبت و فرصتی ارزشمند برای مسلمانان برای انتخاب اقدامات حقوق و مالی خود به جهان‌های میدان. می‌توانم این سازمان اعتقاد دارد که در فضای کنونی که تمامی اقوام و مسلمانان علی‌العید حضور در فضای اینترنت را در قابلیت نامه‌ای داخلی سطح بالا به دست آورده‌اند. مسلمانان نیز به عنوان بخشی از شرکت‌های جهانی با استفاده از این امکان بتوانند در دسترس گردد.

با سپاس
موشی آیدین
رئیس هیئت مدیره

MEDYAM 14 RADYO
TELEVİZYON YAYINCIĞI A.Ş.
Mahmutbey Mah.Küçük Halkali Caddeći
Baran Plaza No:16 Kat:10 Beşiktaş / IST.
Telefon: V: 613 070 2289
Fatih-İSTANBUL
Tlf: 0212 659 63 12
Fax: 0212 659 50 48

Sayın: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Dikkat: Yeni gTLD Değerlendirme Süreci

Konu: Yeni .ISLAM ve .HALAL için destek mektubu.

Bu mektup KÜDÜS MEDYA A.Ş’in ICANN’in yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde yapılan .ISLAM ve .HALAL başvurularına tam destek verdiğini ifade etmek için yazılmıştır.

Kurum’un Yönetim Kurulu Başkanı olarak, bu mektupta yazdığınız şeyler yetkimi olduğunu onaylıyorum.

Bizler, ICANN’in farklı toplulukların (İslami değerlerle uyuşmayan TDL’ler dahil) TDL’lerini barındığı alanları olumlu karşıladığına inanıyoruz ve aynı şekilde Müslüman toplulukların da bu alanlarda kendi TDL’erinin olması gerektiğini düşünüyoruz. Ayrıca, ISLAM ve HALAL başka dinlere saygı, temel insan hakları ifade ve inanç özgürlüğine dayalı olarak, siber alanda İslami değerleri desteklemesi noktasında önemli rol oynayabilirler.

Bu TDL’leri destekleme fırsatı verdiğiiz için teşekkürler.

Saygılarımızla

ALİ YAZICI
Kudüs Medya A.Ş
Yönetim Krl. Bşk.
İnternet Tahsisli Sayılar ve İsimler Kurumu / ICANN Müdürlüğüne

Bizler Kevser Basın Yayıncılık olarak internette .halal, .islam uzantılarının kaydedilmesi ve kullanımların olacak sağlanması başvurusunda bulunan, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Şirketinin bu talebini desteklemektediyiz.


Müdür
Çetin AKYÜZ

Contact Information Redacted
To: ICANN  

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs  

This letter is to confirm that I, Faysal Alashmar as the representative of Research Services Group, website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Name: Faysal Alashmar

Position in Organization: editor in chief
بعنوان:

المجلس الإسلامي الشيعي الأعلى

الموضوع: رسالة تأديب تسجيل نطاقات ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نود تأكيدنا تسجيل النطاق ISLAM في مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للسمي HALA - ISLAM المشتركة.

العقد من شركتنا "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نتمنى أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف أنواعهم المذهبية، فقرب أيهما وتفتخر من حدة تطرفهم الذين، من خلال انتشار ساحة التواصل المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما واقفاً بناءً موثرًا في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الأقواسية والأممية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

مسؤول المكتب الإعلامي

محمد رزق

بيروت في: 2013/4/3
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Mahmoud Raya as the representative of INBAA website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Name: Mahmoud Raya

Position in Organization: editor in chief
الإلا: ICANN

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد تسجيل نطاقات .HALAL — .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا تسجيل النطاقات في مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى المقدم من شركة .HALAL — .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"

الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنشاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكارا بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

مدير المكتب الإعلامي
علي شرف
כותب

جنب السادة:
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

(ＮewgTld)

العنوان: تقييم الطلبات الجديدة (HALA-ISLAM)

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لوزم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة

بموجب هذه الرسالة نحن في معهد الدعوة الجامعي للدراسات الإسلامية نؤكد على تأييدنا الكامل لـ TLDs البديلة تقدمها ICANN HALAL و ISLAM في برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وبصفتي الناشط المعني في برنامج ICANN نؤكد أن لدى السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لم يتم تأكيده من قبل مختلف TLDs ICANN في العديد من النطاقات التي تعارض مع القيم الإسلامية. يجب أن تلتقي الأمم في المجتمع الإسلامي عن تضمن النطاقات TLDs بين الفينين الإسلامي واللبناني، وذلك الإرتكاز على مبدأ حريات الإنسان في حريات التعبير والإيمان، ومع المحفز على مبدأ الاحترام المتبادل للأديان.

شكرا لكم الفرصة للناقش لنا في تصور عن تأييدنا للنطاقات TLDs ونفضل بقبول فائق التقدير والاحترام.

رئيس المعهد

التوقيع

التوقيع

بيروت - بنك حسن - بجانب السفارة الكويت - هاتف: 8540680 /854072 - 01/1 854072/8540680
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد;

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في شركة HALAL و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرر بينهم وتحفز من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة التواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: حليمة الياس
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD الجديد.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج ICANN.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفيف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع: 

الاسم:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزووم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأول على الإنترنت للمسي "HALAL و ISLAM" المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتها المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفحص من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إحداث ساحة التواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمى HALAL و ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti
لإلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتعزف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التقليد:
 الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لنموذج تسلسل ISLAM و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي ISLAM و HALAL.

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti"
gTLD إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنتنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتجاهاتهم المذهبية، فترى بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤشرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

التوقيع:

[Signature]

الإسم:

[Name]

جمعية تجمع العلماء المسلمين
علم وخدمة وندب
رئيس الجمعية

[Signature]

01/12/0
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للزم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونذكر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأيدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى .HALAL و .ISLAM

来访信函

分红绿信息技术有限公司

الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN

gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبيه، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنبذاعة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكارًا بناء متورثة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: اسم مكتوب

التوقيع: توقيع مكتوب

الدبلوماسي
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسي "HALAL و .ISLAM" المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماهم المذهبي، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنبعاثاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التوقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسؤولة المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti" إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً" وأفكاراً بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجاباتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: [الاسم]
التقـيـع: [التقـيـع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسية .HALAL و .ISLAM

المقدمة من شركة:

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنجازاتهم المذهبة، فتتولى بينهم وتحفف من حدة تطرفهم الدينية، من خلال إتساق ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إنعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعربية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:
التوقع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل \textit{HALAL} و \textit{ISLAM}.

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسيحيّين: \textit{HALAL} و \textit{ISLAM}

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

gTLD الدولي ضمن برنامج ICANN الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتفتح من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤرّة في مجتمعاتهم تكون لها إعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: 

التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في: .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti. إلى برنامج ICANN الدولي ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

ولكننا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتماماتهم المذهبية، فتقوي بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإسلامية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ: 

[توقيع]
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل HALAL و ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساوح HTML و ISLAM المقدمة من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

الإضافة إلى برنامج ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا قلنا أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إمتيازاتهم المذهبية، فتحب بينهم وتخفف من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتاحة ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيمة" وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إبعاداتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم:
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل **HALAL** و **ISLAM**

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسى **HALAL** و **ISLAM** المقدمة من شركة "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتهاطاتهم المذهبية، فتقرب بينهم وتحفة من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إتساع ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما و أفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم: 
التاريخ:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل ISLAM و HALAL

تحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة المشتركة في:\n
"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti\n
إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكليا نثق أن هذا التسجيل من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إتنواماتها المذهبية، فتقوم بينهم وتخفق من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إسعال سلسلة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتم لاحقاً فيما وأفكاراً بناءً مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الاسم:

توقيع:
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدها على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الانترنت للمست悲剧ية: .HALAL و .ISLAM

"Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكمنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إدماجاتهم المذهبية، فقرب بينهم وتفعيل من حدة تطرفهم الديني، من خلال إمداد ساحة القواسم المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً "قيماً وأفكاراً" بناءة مؤثرة في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها إعجازاتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نشكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.

الإسم: [اسم]
التوقيع: [توقيع]
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM, .SHIA, .HALAL gTLDs

This letter is to confirm that World Assembly for Proximity of Islamic Sects fully supports the application for .ISLAM and .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the new gTLD Program.

As the Secretary General of World Assembly for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought I confirm that I have the authority of the Islamic communities to be writing to you on this matter. By bringing the perspective of the World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought means: Convergence between the followers of Islamic schools in order to know some of them over others by achieving harmony and religious brotherhood on the basis of Islamic principles common fixed and firm. Islamic unity is: Cooperation between the followers of Islamic schools on the basis of Islamic principles common fixed and firm and take a unified stand in order to achieve the goals and interests of the Muslim and its enemies to the common position with respect for the obligations of every Muslim to his doctrine of faith and deed.

The gTLD will be used to Principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on the general principles. Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be a satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

This application is being submitted as a community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the application. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.
Yours sincerely

Thanks and best regards
Secretary General The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought
Mohammad – Ali Taskhiry
Forum for proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought is the only and most welcomed Forum among Muslim Community in both Shia’a and Sunni’s.

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought was established in response to the thoughts of Islamic Unity, a revolution which is not only related to all Muslims but also all the oppressed masses of the world.

The Members of the Supreme Council comprise of eminent thinkers of different Islamic Schools of Thought from various Islamic countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, America, Pakistan, Oman and Iran.

The Forum’s activities are aimed toward bringing Proximity and Unity among Muslims, whatever group they belong to. That had made the Forum popular among Muslim leaders all around the world.

FORUM’S ACTIVITIES

The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought’s activities is mostly directed to education, clarification and explanation of the Proximity Thoughts to Muslims.

Such activities consist of:

1. The annual International Islamic Unity Conference:

   The 25th International Islamic Unity Conference was recently held. Muslim world scholars from 57 countries of the world attended this annual conference held by the World Forum for Proximity of Proximity of the Islamic Countries headed by Secretary General Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Taskhiri.

2. Publications: The World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought publishes books, journals and internet content in different languages for all Muslims in the world.

   The Forum’s website “www.taqrib.info” is published in 16 different languages the majority of Muslims speak.

   More than 250 books and journals are published by the Forum till today.

DEFINITION OF PROXIMITY AND MUSLIM UNITY

From the viewpoint of The World Forum of the Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought, proximity of Islamic schools of thought entails closeness of the followers of Islamic sects with the aim of getting acquainted with one another in order to attain
religious brotherhood according to the principles and common goals of religion. Muslim Unity entails co-operation among the followers of schools of thought while adopting joint approaches to reach the desired goals for the interests of the Muslim Ummah and confronting enemies of Islam.

**BASICS OF PROXIMITY**

The movement of proximity of Islamic schools of thought is based on firm general principles, the most important one being:

1) The Holy Qur’an and Prophetic traditions, which are the basic sources of Islamic Law. All Islamic schools of thought share commonalities in these two elements and rely on them as their main and reliable reference points.

2) Belief in the principles and pillars being the criterion of a Muslim
   a) Belief: Oneness of God the Almighty.
   b) Belief in the Prophethood and the Holy Prophet (SAW) as the seal of Prophets including belief in the traditions of the Messenger as one of the mains sources of religion.
   c) Belief in the Holy Qur’an and its concepts.
   d) Belief in the Day of Judgment.
   e) Not denying the necessaries of religion and submitting to the pillars of Islam such as prayers, Zakat, Fasting, Hajj, Jihad...

3) Legitimacy of Jihad and freedom of debate and officially acknowledging differences of opinion within the framework of basic Islamic sources.

4) To be bound to Islamic unity according to the mentioned definition.

5) The principle of brotherhood and Islamic morals in relations among Muslims.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE FORUM**

1. Assistance towards reviving and spreading Islamic culture and teachings and defending the sanctity of the Qur’an and traditions of the Holy Prophet (SAW).

2. Making efforts towards creating acquaintance and more understanding among scholars, thinkers and religious leaders of the Islamic world in the fields of beliefs, Fiqh including on social and political fronts.

3. Spreading proximity ideas and thoughts among scholars of the Islamic world and transferring that to Muslim masses while informing them of plots aimed at creating divisions by enemies of Islam.

4. Solving pessimism and arguments among followers of Islamic schools.

5. Making efforts to strengthen and propagate the principle of Ijtihad and deduction in religion.
6. Endeavor to co-ordinate and establish a joint front to confront the propaganda plots and cultural onslaught of enemies of Islam.

PRINCIPLES AND VALUES OF THE FORUM

1. The necessity of co-operations in all spheres to enable Muslims obtain consensus and agree among themselves.

2. The need for joint concerted efforts and co-operation in confronting enemies of Islam.

3. Abstaining from libeling one another as infidel and innovator.

4. Dealing respectfully on points of difference.

5. Freedom to select school of thought.

6. Being bound by the culture of healthy dialogue and observing its rules and manners.

7. Endeavor to encourage Muslims to implement proximity in all its dimensions and ensure crystallization of its values in all aspects of life.

IMPORTANT ORGANS OF THE FORUM

1) Supreme Council.
   The Members of this council comprise of eminent thinkers of different Islamic Schools of Thought from various Islamic countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, America, Pakistan, Oman and Iran. They are mandated with setting the path and activities of the forum and oversee it.

2) General Assembly.
   More than 100 thinkers and Ulamaa from different Islamic schools of thought are members of this assembly and are charged with the important duty of studying the general issues and problems of the Islamic world and presenting solutions and programs of actions to the forum including management of such programs.

3) Secretary General.
   The secretary general is the highest-ranking executive position of the forum and its holder is responsible for following up and implementing decisions and decrees of the Supreme Council, General Assembly and the management of all departments of the forum.

4) Departments.

5) The University of Islamic Schools of Thought.
   This university, which is a fruitful outcome of action taken by this forum, was established in the year 1995 in Tehran. Students from different Islamic countries in this university are engaged in studying Islamic Sciences in the field such as,
Jurisprudence of Islamic Schools of thought, Qur’an and Hadith Sciences, Islamic History, philosophy and Islamic speech. While practically learning the culture of proximity and peaceful co-existence in Islamic communities coupled with Islamic brotherhood, they will be the cream of experts in Islamic seminaries and suitable propagators of the culture proximity in Islamic communities.

Its scientific board members are professors, scholars and thinkers coming from various Islamic Schools of thought. Meanwhile the University of Islamic Schools of thought has up to now conducted four courses and will soon have complete study programs. The graduates of this University have excelled scientifically and have obtained high marks in various scientific Olympiads.
Mohammad Ali Taskhiri, Ayatollah is a well-known and highly respected intellectual figure among Muslims, both Shia’s and Sunni’s.

He was born in 1944 in the holy city of Najaf, Iraq. He acquired his primary and middle-level education from Najaf while for the acquisition of highest educational level of the Islamic Seminary (Hawzah) i.e. "Dars-e-Kharej" which contains advanced religious courses. He gained extensively from the renowned Ulama of Najaf Ashraf.

Taskhiri attained the university-level education on Arabic literature, Islamic law & Jurisprudence from the Fiqh College of Najaf Ashraf. Along with the acquisition of education, during his stay in the Islamic Seminary of Najaf Ashraf, he was also engaged in the teaching of the Islamic subjects. As regards the Arabic poetry and literature, he benefited from the distinguished mentors like Ayatollah Sheikh Muhammad Reza Muzzafar, Sheikh Abol Mehdi Matar and Sheikh Muhammad Amin Zain-ud-Din. Being fond of the Arabic poetry and literature at a tender age, he versified many Arabic odes and on diverse occasions delivered literary lectures at different forums of poetry and literature.

In the political arena, he played a dynamic role against the Bathist party of Iraq and for the same reason he was jailed and also given death sentence. But with the grace of Almighty Allah he was released later.

In 1971 he proceeded to the Qom Islamic Seminary in Iran and for ten years attended the lectures delivered by the leading Ulama like Ayatollah Golpayengani, Ayatollah Wahid Khurasani, and Ayatollah Mirza Hashem Amuli.

In the aftermath of the victory of the glorious Islamic Revolution in Iran, he fully got engaged in the cultural activities and the preaching of Islam, in Iran and elsewhere in the world. During this period, Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Taskhiri held different cultural, propagation and administrative positions and undertook various responsibilities.

Some of his responsibilities in political arena include: Representative Gilan province in the Assembly of Experts, Supreme leader’s advisor in Islamic World’s cultural affairs, Head of the Islamic Culture and Relations Organization from its establishment until 2001, International affairs director at the Islamic Ideology
Propagation Organization, Member of Islamic Ideology Propagation Organization's Board of Trustees, Culture and Islamic Guidance Minister's advisor on international affairs, Secretary General of the Ahl-ul-Bayt (AS) World Assembly. Following appointment by the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution he is now serving as the secretary general of the World Forum for Proximity of Islamic Schools of Thought.

Ayatollah Taskhiri has authored over 50 books on various Islamic topics including Islamic ideology, Fiqh (jurisprudence), Islamic economy and Islamic history. He has also penned some 350 articles on Islamic issues including unity. Many of his works have been translated into English, Urdu and other world languages.
Madame, Monsieur,

Je soussigné/née.Manuelle Lélong, déclare apporter mon soutien total et entier à la demande de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM pour l'activation d'un nom de domaine générique de premier niveau appelé couramment TOP LEVEL DOMAIN (TLD) : « .islam » remise à la société ICANN aux États-Unis d’Amérique.

Je tiens également à confirmer que la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM vise à mettre en place une communication plus étroite entre les pratiquants et adeptes des différentes confessions et religions à travers le monde et valoriser ainsi la circulation des informations entre ces derniers et œuvrer pour le rapprochement des religions monothéistes.

Favoriser l'activité de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM, permettrait en réalité d'établir un canal de communication entre les responsables et les adeptes de toutes les confessions en vue de promouvoir la culture du dialogue et d'échanges interculturels.

Dans l'attente de votre réponse que j'espère favorable, je vous prie d'agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Fait à Paris, le 9 août 2016

[Signature]

Tél. 06.08.57.18.35
Né à Angers, le 25 février 1925. Licencié ès-lettres (Licence d'arabe). Docteur ès-lettres.
Thèse principale : "Le patrimoine musulman dans l'enseignement tunisien".
Thèse complémentaire : "Les relations entre l'Eglise catholique et l'islam en Tunisie, de 1930 à 1968".
Cofondateur du Groupe d'Amitié Islamo-Chrétienne (GAIC).
Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur.
Officier de l'Ordre National du Mérite.

**Principales publications :**

- Pour un dialogue avec les athées (Le Cerf, 1965)
- J'ai rencontré l'Islam (Le Cerf, 1976)
- Le don qu'il vous a fait (Le Centurion, 1977)
- Deux fidélité, une espérance (Le Cerf, 1979)
- La tradition islamique (en collaboration avec Sahar Moharram) (Club du Livre et du Disque, 1979)
- L'Islam et l'Ocident (Albin Michel, 1982)
- Guerre ou Paix à Jérusalem ? (Albin Michel, 1983)
- L'Eglise nous parle de l'Islam : du Concile de Jean-Paul II (Le Chalet, 1984)
- Si Dieu l'avait voulu (Tougui, 1984)
- De la prière du Christ au message du Coran (Tougui, 1991)
- L'Eglise catholique et l'Islam (Maisonneuve et Larose, 1993)
- La vérité rend libre (François-Xavier de Guibert, 1999)
- Jean-Paul II et l'Islam (François-Xavier de Guibert, 2003)
- Le choix de Cécile (roman) (François-Xavier de Guibert, 2005)
- Prêtre de Jésus Christ parmi les Musulmans (François Xavier de Guibert, 2007)
- Chrétiens et Musulmans, adversaires ou partenaires ? (L'Harmattan, 2007)
- Les Papes et l'Islam (Koutoubia, Editions Alphée 2009)
- Le retour des religions, péril ou espoir ? (François Xavier de Guibert, 2009)
- Le message de la croix (Encre d'Orient, 2011)
- Pour la nécessaire réconciliation (Nouvelles Editions Latines, 2011)
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

In the name of God

Dear Sirs

This letter is to confirm that I.R. of Iran Halal Supreme Council fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the President, I confirm that I have the authority of the I.R. of Iran Halal Supreme Council to be writing to you on this matter.

The gTLDs will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Mohammad Nahavandian

[Signature]

President
16th April 2012

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad fully support the application for .ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles. This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and non – radical followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad
DR. MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD

16th April 2012

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I, Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad fully support the application for .ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles. This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and non – radical followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad

Contact Information Redacted
Tun Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad

QUICK FACTS

NAME: Datuk Seri Mahathir bin Mohamad
OCCUPATION: Prime Minister
BIRTH DATE: December 20, 1925 (Age: 86)
EDUCATION: Sultan Abdul Hamid College, University of Malaya
PLACE OF BIRTH: Alor Setar, Malaysia

BEST KNOWN FOR

Mahathir bin Mohamad served as prime minister of Malaysia from 1981 to 2003, overseeing his country's transition to an industrialized nation.

Profile

Mahathir bin Mohamad was reelected to the Supreme Council of the United Malays National Organization (UMNO) in 1972 and to parliament in 1974. Later in 1974 he was appointed minister of education. In 1976 he became deputy prime minister and in 1981 was elected president of UMNO. He became prime minister in July of that year, the first commoner to hold that office, holding it for the next 22 years.

Tun Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad (born 10 July 1925) is a Malaysian politician who was the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia. He held the post for 22 years from 1981 to 2003, making him Malaysia's longest serving Prime Minister. His political career spanned almost 40 years.

Born and raised in Alor Setar, Kedah, Mahathir excelled at school and became a medical doctor. He became active in the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO), Malaysia's largest political party, before entering parliament in 1964. He served one term before losing his seat, before falling out with the then Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman and being expelled from UMNO. When Abdul Rahman resigned, Mahathir re-entered UMNO and parliament, and was promoted to the Cabinet. By 1976, he had risen to Deputy Prime Minister, and in 1981 was sworn in as Prime Minister after the resignation of his predecessor, Hussein Onn.

During Mahathir's tenure as Prime Minister, Malaysia experienced rapid modernization and economic growth, and his government initiated a series of bold infrastructure projects. He was a dominant political figure, winning five consecutive general elections and seeing off all of his rivals for the leadership of UMNO. However, his accumulation of power came at the expense of the independence of the judiciary and the traditional powers and privileges of Malaysia's royalty. He also deployed the controversial Internal Security Act to detain activists, non-mainstream religious figures, and political opponents including his sacked deputy, Anwar Ibrahim. Mahathir's record of curbing civil liberties and his antagonism to western diplomatic interests and economic policy made his relationships with the likes of the US, Britain and Australia difficult. As Prime Minister, he was an advocate of third-world development and a prominent international activist for causes such as the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and the interests of Bosnians in the 1990s Balkans conflict.

He remains an active political figure in his retirement, having become a strident critic of his handpicked successor, Abdullah Badawi, and actively supporting Abdullah's replacement by Najib Razak.
To: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Iran's Halal Supreme Council fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

Iran's Halal Supreme Council is an authorized Certification Body for Halal products and service based on the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Halal food standard.

I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely
Dr.M.Nahavandian
Presiden
No. 14-2012
Date: Apr 24, 2012

To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Halal Export Consortium fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the General Secretary of the Halal Export Consortium, I confirm that I have the authority of this Consortium to be writing to you on this matter.

The target of establishing Consortium is to become workable the activists in the field of Halal in HalalWorld member countries and benefiting from a group activity for export capacity building of all producers and exporter of Halal products.

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Kamyar Montaser
Secretary for Founding Staff
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  

Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL  

This letter is to confirm that the Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.  

As the President of the Association of Development, Promotion, Production and Trade of Halal Products, I confirm that I have the authority of the Association to be writing to you on this matter.  

This association is formed by the support of Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center to act as a facilitator of the Halal Trade among Islamic countries.  

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.  

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.  

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.  

Yours sincerely  
Dr. Amir Esmaeil Saghaflinia  
President
To: ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292  
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process  
Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the HalalWorld Center fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the General Secretary of the HalalWorld Center, I confirm that I have the authority of this center to be writing to you on this matter.

Islamic Chamber research & Information Center (ICRIC), affiliated to Islamic Chamber of Commerce & Industry (ICCI) and a member of the family of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) has embarked to study and research on the subject to meet the need in Muslim World, and as a result embarked to adopt a monitoring system in "Halal Product" including "Halal Food" and proceeded to research, development, information and support in this ground, under the supervision of the HalalWorld Center.

As a member of the HALAL Industry Service Providers Community, I declare that we believe that .HALAL gTLD will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions, and development of Halal standards.

This application is being submitted as community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Abd-ul-Hussain Fakhari
General Secretary
In the name of God

To: ICANN
Suite ۳۳۳, ۴۷۷۷ Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA ۴۷۷۷

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .HALAL

Dear Sirs,

This letter is to confirm that the Ministry of Industry, Mine and Trade of Islamic Republic of Iran fully supports the application for .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program. As the Minister of Industry, Mine and Trade of I.R. Iran, I confirm that I have the authority of the Government of I.R. Iran to be writing to you on this matter.

The gTLDs will be used to promote the concept of Halal productions and development of Halal standards.

The Government of I.R. Iran supports this application, and in doing so, understands that in the event that the application is successful, Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti will be required to enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN. In doing so, they will be required to pay fees to ICANN and comply with consensus policies developed through the ICANN multi-stakeholder policy processes.

Yours sincerely,

Mehdi Ghazanfari
Dear Sir/ Madam

This letter is to confirm that, I, Majid Tafreshi, as a British-Iranian Historian and researcher and the manager of MTS production (Media, Thought, Studies), fully support the application for .ISLAM, .SHIA and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

I am an active researcher and writer in this field for about 25 years and I am aware of the importance of the requested matter.

The gTLDs will be used to Principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic communities on the general principles. Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be a satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

These applications are being submitted as community-based applications, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the applications. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

I think it is very important for many members and believers of the Muslim communities around the world to have these names available for obtaining a domain name attached to them.

If you need further information about this letter, please do not hesitate to contact m via email and/ or phone:

Yours sincerely

Majid Tafreshi

12-04-12
In the name of God

2007/87

29 May, 2012

To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way

Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL

This letter is to confirm that the Iran Tajikistan Friendship Association (ITFA) fully supports the application for .ISLAM and .HALAL submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

As the Chairman of the Board of Directors, I confirm that I have the authorization from ITFA to write to you on this matter.

ITFA is a non-political, non-profit NGO established in September 2007 in order to promote sustainable friendly relations between two Persian speaking nations of Tajikistan and Iran.

ITFA believes that these gTLDs will be used to strengthen the religious connections of the Iranian and Tajik Muslim Communities.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ashraf Mojtabah Shabestari,
Chairman of the Board of Directors,
Iran-Tajikistan Friendship Association
ICANN
Suite 330 - 467 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey - CA. 90292
USA
Attention : New gTLD Evaluation Process

Objet : la mise en place de l’extension générique : « .islam »

Madame, Monsieur,

Je soussigné, président de l’association ALGHADIR, déclare apporter mon soutien total et entier à la demande de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM pour l’activation d’un nom de domaine générique de premier niveau appelé couramment TOP LEVEL DOMAIN (LTD) : « .islam » remise à la société ICANN aux États-Unis d’Amérique.

Je tiens également à confirmer que la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM vise à mettre en place une communication plus étroite entre les pratiquants et adeptes des différentes confessions et religions à travers le monde et valoriser ainsi la circulation des informations entre ces derniers et œuvrer pour le rapprochement des religions monothéistes.

Favoriser l’activité de la société ASIA GREEN IT SYSTEM, permettrait en réalité d’établir un canal de communication entre les responsables et les adeptes de toutes les confessions en vue de promouvoir la culture du dialogue et d’échanges interculturels.

Dans l’attente de votre réponse que j’espère favorable, je vous prie d’agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l’assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Fait à Paris, le 01/10/2012

[Signature]
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci. .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, [İsim ve telefon]
, bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti'nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya desteğim tam olduunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: [İsim ve soyisim]
Meslek: [Meslek]
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim:
.ISLAM.
.ITALY.
.INDIA.
.INDIA.
.DE.
.AT.

Saygılarımla,

Tel:
Cep:
Email:
Adres:
İsim ve İmza: [İsim ve İmza]
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili
Ben, Fatih KAYA ........................................ bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti’nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya desteğiim tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: ......................................................
Meslek: ...........................................................
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim;
 Alan Adları Her Kesime hitap edip, Müslüman
 ve dini değerler alan bu kimlik içinde Müslüman bir
 yapılı bir ortamı istemekteyim

..............................................................

..............................................................

..............................................................

Saygılarımla,

Tel: 0543 499 5858
Cep: 
Email: 
Adres: Fahri Kaya
İsim ve İmza.
Ref: __________

ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,  
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Date: __________

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I ABDUL QAYUM fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

Dated: 2012-08-04
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,  
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

3Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I M GONDAL fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

M GONDAL

Dated: 2012-08-04
Ref No. ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I Mansoor Hashmi fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Mansoor Hashmi

Dated: 2012-08-04
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

3Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I MALIK ABDUL QAYUM KHAN fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Malik Abdul Qayum Khan

Dated: 2012-08-04
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM**

This letter is to confirm that I Rasheed Ahmad Chuughtai fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

President of IUC

Dated: 2012-08-04
Ref: IUC/ICANN
ICANN  
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,  
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

3Dear Sir/Madam:

**Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM**

This letter is to confirm that I IMAM ALI SHAH fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

IMAM ALI SHAH

Dated: 2012-08-04
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter of Support for .ISLAM

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter is to confirm that I – Fathi El-Abed, Chairman of the Danish Palestinian Friendship Association, fully support the application for .ISLAM internet Top Level Domain, submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program.

The gTLD will be used for Principles of Rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities and followers of all religions.

Fathi El-Abed
Chairman – The Danish Palestinian Friendship Association

Copenhagen the 5th of August, 2012
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I Rana Ansar Bhatti fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Rana Ansar Bhatti
Central Secretary General
Peoples Youth Organization

Dated: 2012-08-05
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way,
Marina del Ray, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Letter of Support for ISLAM

This letter is to confirm that I Rasheed Ahmad Chughtai fully support the applications for ISLAM internet Top Level Domain submitted to ICANN by Asis Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd Sti in the New gTLD program. The gTLD will be used for principles of rounding i.e. the march of rapprochement between Islamic sects on general principles.

This will therefore provide the opportunity to expand religious beliefs through a guided line which could result in satisfactory achievement for both authorities of followers of all religions.

Yours Sincerely

Rasheed Ahmad Chughtai
Chief Editor

Ref: The page/Icann, Dated: 06-08-2012
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, [Adres], bu mektubla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti'nin .ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya destekimi tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: [Adres]
Meslek: [Adres]
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim;

[Adres]

Saygılarımla,

Contact Information Redacted
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, [Ad] KARA, bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti’nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya desteği tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.

İsim Soyisim: [Ad] KARA
Meslek: [Ad] Müller
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim:
Bu anlaşmalar müslüman kadınlar tarafından kontrol edilmesi gerekli, komşularım.

Saygılarımla,

Contact Information Redacted

[İsim ve İmza]

[Ad] KARA
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Kona: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci. .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, [Ad Soyad] ........................................, bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde
Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti’nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level
Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yaptığı olduğu başvuruya desteğiimin tam
olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: [Ad Soyad] ........................................
Meslek: ...................................................................
Bu alan adlarına destekleme nedenlerim:

[Durum Açıklaması]

Saygılarımla.

Tel: [Tel No]

Contact Information Redacted

İsim ve İmza.
[İmza]
16 Ağustos 2012

ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci. .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, .Halal

,... bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti'nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuru da desteğim tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirinizi;

İsim Soyisim: Necati... Halal
Meslek: Mühendislik Müdür Yardımcısı (Ödemen)
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim;

.. İslam, Halal, Kavramları, Nüfusun, Yönlendirme, ve

Kontrolüne... Örnek.. Dışarıyardımı..

Saygılarımıyla,

Tel:

Contact Information Redacted

Adres:

İsim ve İmza.
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330,4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci. .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben, ..Muhammed Yaşın Sakallı, bu mektubu, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde
Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti’nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level
Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya desteğimin tam
olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: ..Muhammed Yaşın Sakallı
Meslek: ..Zahtıra

Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim:
..İslam ve .halal domain adlarına .com benzeri .com domain adlarını kabul edilmiş. Bu domain adlarını
..kullanım için belirtmek önemlidir. Bu nedenle bu .com domain adlarına özel olarak sorumlu
..olunmalıdır.

Saygılıarak,

Contact Information Redacted

Isim ve Imza
16 Ağustos 2012
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayan Yetkisi

Ben, ...Muhammed Yaşışım ..., bu mektupla, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Şti'nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya desteğiim tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
İsim Soyisim: ...Muhammed Yaşışım ...Sakallıh
Meslek: ...Zorba...
Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim:
...ISLAM ve .HALAL...domain...isimlerine...baş...yapın...yaşışım...Dek...Bismişım...
...baş...yapın...kabul...edilmiş...OL começ...Basm...müallim...
...100...Sunca...eyle...Mondak...el...olmuş...gör...kafile...aid...

Sagılarım...

Contact Information Redacted

İsim ve Imza

Aşır
16 Ağustos 2012

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Konu: Yeni Üst Seviye Alan Adları Süreci .ISLAM ve .HALAL Alan Adlarına Destek.

Sayın Yetkili

Ben,...[İsim]...[Ad], bu mektuba, yeni gTLD programı çerçevesinde Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti.'nin ISLAM ve .HALAL adlı Top Level Domain Names (Üst Seviye Alan Adları) için yapmış olduğu başvuruya destekimim tam olduğunu belirtmek isterim.

Herhangi bir durumda aşağıdaki iletişim adreslerinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.

İsim Soyisim: [İsim]...[Ad]
Meslek: [Meslek]

Bu alan adlarını destekleme nedenlerim;

[Asya Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti.]

Saygılarımla,

Contact Information Redacted

[İsim ve İmza]
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALA TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, mostafa khazem as the representative of Albilad magazine fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALA internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Name: mostafa khazem
Position in Organization: editor in chief
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد تسجيل نطاقات — ISLAM — HALA

تحية طيبة وبعد،

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا تسجيل النطاقات في مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمسمي ISLAM — HALA.

المقدم من شركة: "Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti".

إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وكلنا ثقة أن هذا التسجيل يمثل العديد من الإجابات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إثنيةاتهم الديني، من خلال إنشاء ساحة التواصي المشتركة التي تنتج لاحقاً فيما أفكراً بناء مؤثرة في مجتمعهم يكون لها تأثيراتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

شكركم وننال جهودكم لنا في مصلحة الجميع.
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Sheikh Mohammad Amro as the representative of http://www.wahdaislamyia.org/ website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Sheikh Mohammad Amro

Position in Organization: General Manager
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Sheik Mohammad Amro as the representative of Islamic Unity Center for Studies and Documentation website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domains submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Sheik Mohammad Amro

Position in Organization: General Manager
To: ICANN

Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process
Subject: Letter for support for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs

This letter is to confirm that I, Sheik Mohammad Amro as the representative of http://www.wahdaislamyia.org/ website fully support the applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL internet Top Level Domians submitted to ICANN by Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic.Ltd. Sti in the New gTLD Program.

The gTLDs will bring the opportunity for the Muslims community to present their activities, beliefs and culture to told the world through internet; and can act as the voice of the Muslim community, to represent their message of peace to the world.

Therefore providing the opportunity to expand religious believes through a guided line could be satisfactory achievements for both authorities and non-radical religion followers.

Yours sincerely

Name: Sheik Mohammad Amro

Position in Organization: General Manager
إلى: ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

(New gTLD) إنتباه: هيئة تقييم الطلبات الجديدة
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لزوم تسجيل النطاقات الجديدة .HALAL و .ISLAM

بموجب هذه الرسالة نحن قناتنا آسيا الإخبارية نؤكد على تأيييدنا الكامل لنطاقات .HALAL و .ISLAM، المقدمة إلى ICANN في برنامج gTLD الجديد.

وبصفتي التمثيلية كمدير لقناتنا آسيا الإخبارية لها، أؤكد أن لدي السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لكم.

رهن نؤمن أنه في المجال المتاح والمربح به من قبل ICANN ومع مختلف المجتمعات (من ضمنها النطاقات TLDs التي تتعارض مع القيم الإسلامية)، يحتاج المجتمع المسلم أيضا لنطاقاته، حيث أن النطاقات .HALAL و .ISLAM، تلعب دوراً كبيراً في تعزيز القيم في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالإرتكاز على مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاحترام المتبادل للأديان.

نشكر لكم الفرصة المتاحة لنا للتعبير عن تأييدها لهذه النطاقات TLDs

بكل إخلاص

الإسم: انفاض كمال قنبر

التوقيع

قناة آسيا الفضائية
مدير القناة
إنتماء: هيئة تقييم الطلبات الجديدة

الموضوع: رسالة تأييد للاستفادة من تطبيقات النطاقات الجديدة

.HALAL و .ISLAM

بموجب هذه الرسالة نحن قلنا تلفزيون فلسطين اليوم نؤكد على تأييدنا الكامل لنطاقات .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة إلى ICANN في برنامج .gTLD الجديد.

ويعتبر التشريعة كمدير تنفيذي لها، أكد أن لدي السلطة لإصدار مثل هذا الكتاب لـ TLDs. نحن نؤمن أنه في المجال المتاح والمرحب به من قبل ICANN والمختلف المجتمعات (من ضمنها النطاقات TLDs التي تتعارض مع القيم الإسلامية)، يحتاج المجتمع المسلم أيضا لنطاقاته، حيث أن النطاقات .HALAL و .ISLAM تستطيع أن تلعب دوراً كبيراً في تعزيز القيم في المجتمع الإسلامي عبر الفضاء الإلكتروني، وذلك بالالتزام على مبدأ حقوق الإنسان في حرية التعبير والإيمان، ومع الحفاظ على مبدأ الاحترام المتبادل للأديان.

نشكر لكم الفرصة المتاحة لنا للتعبير عن تأييدنا لهذه النطاقات TLDs.

بكل إخلاص

الإسم: ناذا أبو حسنة
التوقيع:

Contact Information (Redacted)
الموضوع: رسالة تأييد لzőم تسجيل .HALAL و .ISLAM

نحية طيبة وبعد,

بالإشارة إلى الموضوع أعلاه، نؤكد تأييدنا على تسجيل مجال المستوى الأعلى على الإنترنت للمساهمة في .HALAL و .ISLAM المقدمة من شركة Asia Green IT System Bilgisayar San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Sti إلى منظمة ICANN الدولية ضمن برامج الجدید.

وكلنا نثق أن هذا التسجيل يمتلك العديد من الإيجابيات التي سوف تفتح المجال الواسع في عملية التواصل بين سائر الأفراد والمجتمعات الإسلامية على مختلف إنتقاءاتهم المذهبية، فتقترب بينهم وتخفى من حدة تطرفهم الذين، من خلال إتساع ساحة القوام المشتركيرة التي تنتج لاحقاً. فيما وأفكاراً بناء مؤثر في مجتمعاتهم يكون لها انعكاساتها الإيجابية الإقليمية والعالمية.

نكركم ونقدر جهودكم لما فيه مصلحة الجميع.
Dated: August 9th, 2013

To: Mr. Cherine Chalaby, Chairman of the new gTLD Program Committee
    ICANN Board Members,
Subject: I.R.Iran’s position regarding new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL

Dear New gTLD Program Committee member, Dear ICANN Board Member

I am writing to you further to the meeting held on July 18th, 2013 in Durban between some of the ICANN board members and members of new gTLD Program Committee, with GAC representatives of the Islamic Countries, relating to follow up actions to be taken with respect to new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL.

First of all, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Board’s and Committee’s Members attending that meeting for their kind attention and the time that was made available to me and my colleagues to further pursue the subject matter.

Secondly I wish to describe the position of our government regarding new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL as following:

The Islamic Republic of Iran as an Islamic Country believes that TLDs like .ISLAM and .HALAL will naturally bring valuable opportunities for the Muslim community to be presented on the Internet using the New gTLD Program, however there are important points about the management and governance of these TLDs, which we expect ICANN consider them in its evaluation process.

We strongly believe that both TLDs should be managed and operated by the Muslim community through a neutral body that represents the different sections and segments of the Muslim community including Governments, NGOs and IGOs, Private Sector, Academia, as different stakeholders of internet in this community.

We believe that the inclusion of all these stakeholders not only complies with the objectives and purposes of the internet as an inclusive, democratic, transparent approach in a multi-stakeholder
model, but also guaranties the management of these sensitive TLDs to function in a non-political environment without any direct or indirect influence of any government or group of countries on the proper and healthy functioning of the matter, so as the entire Muslim community (Ummah) in a nondiscriminatory approach could benefit from its very objectives fully, consider the matter and take into account the full impartiality, neutrality, inclusiveness, transparent and democratic approach to be taken in the management of these new gTLDs in order to prevent any potential imposition of any view by a single organization or entity, in particular having any political motivation contradicting the very purpose and objectives of ICANN.

I again thank you for the opportunity provided to us to express our views.

Yours sincerely,

Saeed Mahdioun

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in GAC, ICANN
Date: 04 September, 2013

To: Ms. Cherine Chalaby, Chairman of the New gTLD Program Committee,
ICANN New gTLD Program Committee
ICANN Board Members,

Subject: Position of Lebanon Regarding New gTLD Applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL

Dear Ms. Chalaby,
Dear New gTLD Program Committee Members,
Dear ICANN Board Members,

Reference is made to inform you the Lebanese position regarding new gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL as follows:

We strongly believe that, in general, the ICANN should stay away from making decisions related to religious domain names based on other than purely technical criteria, principals, requirements, and inputs.

Having stated our overarching position, Lebanon believes that TLDs like .ISLAM and .HALAL like many other new TLDs sought using the new gTLD program, will benefit the general public and will help the Muslim community in getting better presentation, and it will also help the community integrate and engage better on the Internet.

We also understand and point out that TLDs of this nature will also bring with it few additional management challenges that we believe that the ICANN board and committees must take into account as part of the evaluation of these two TLDs and of other similar TLDs.

We must reiterate our strong belief that the evaluation process must be a purely technical conducted through a technical committee based on purely technical criteria. However, in case inputs other than technical inputs must be taken into account, we also strongly believe that, the management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral non-governmental
multi-stakeholder group representing, at least, the larger Muslim community, and representing its different sections and segments including Governments, NGOs and IGOs, Private Sector, Academia, as well as other stakeholders of the Internet for the Muslim community.

It is extremely important to guarantee a growth-oriented developmental management process of these, and of other similar, very sensitive TLDs, where the management is conducted in a non-governmental, non-political multi-stakeholder manner. It is also important to avoid any dominance or major influence by any specific organization, country or group of countries, governments, governmental organizations in an effort to help conduct a proper and healthy multi-stakeholder management with the objective of making sure that the Internet (and the society as a whole) follows a more inclusive, democratic, peace-seeking, transparent approach, consistent with the purposes of the ICANN and the larger Internet community.

This approach could help engage the entire Larger Muslim Community in a nondiscriminatory process that could benefit from its very objectives to fully consider the matter and take into account the highest level of non-alignment, impartiality, neutrality, inclusiveness, transparency and democratic process.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Imad Y. Hoballah
Lebanon's Representative to the ICANN-GAC
Chairman and CEO, TRA, Lebanon

Contact Information Redacted
Page 248/279
In the name of God

Dated: November 20, 2013

To: Mr. Fadi Chehadé, the President & CEO of ICANN
To: Mr. Steve Crocker, Chairman
To: Mr. Cherine Chalaby chairman and other members of the New gTLD Program Committee
CC: Mrs. Heather Dryden, Chair of Governmental Advisory Committee, for information only

Subject: New gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL

Dear Mr. Fadi Chehadé, Dear All,

I would like to inform you that I have noted with surprise a copy of the letter referenced OIC/SG-01/2013, 005954 dated 04 November 2013 signed by Mr. Ekmeleddin Ihsanouglu, Secretary General of Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), forwarded to you on by Mr. Wajdi H. Al-Quliti regarding New gTLD applications for .ISLAM and .HALAL.

First of all, it is worth to mention that the follow up actions on these two applications is now under the responsibility of the Chairman of the New gTLD Program Committee and other members of that Committee. Based on the available information, the relevant procedure contained in chapter 3 of Applicant Guide Book has been successfully applied. Consequently, from the procedural point of view, the matter is no longer under the GAC responsibilities due to the fact that CAG has forwarded its position and conclusion to ICANN after its 46 Meeting in Beijing/People’s Republic of China (GAC Communiqué, Beijing, dated 11 April 2013)

Secondly, for your kind attention of Mr. Steve Crocker, Chairman and Mr. Fadi Chehadé, the President & CEO of ICANN and other distinguished ICANN Board members and that of the distinguished chairman and respectful members of New gTLD Program Committee, we are on
the opinion that relevant stakeholder (individuals, personalities, entities, governments) including but not limited, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Economic Cooperation Organization should be consulted within a button-up, inclusive multi-stakeholder model /approach, with a view that appropriate mechanism/modality be developed to properly address the concerns raised above

Thirdly, as I wish to reiterate that the Islamic Republic of Iran as an Islamic Country believes that TLDs like .ISLAM and .HALAL will naturally bring valuable opportunities for the Muslim community to be presented on the Internet using the New gTLD Program, however there are important points about the management and governance of these TLDs, which we expect ICANN and New gTLD Program Committee carefully consider them in their evaluation process.

We strongly believe that both TLDs should be managed and operated by the Muslim community through a neutral body that represents the different sections and segments of the Muslim community, including Governments, NGOs and IGOs, Private Sector, Academia as different stakeholders of internet in the this community.

We also believe that the inclusion of all these stakeholders not only complies with the objectives and purposes of the Internet as an inclusive, democratic, transparent approach in a multi-stakeholder model under which the ICANN is functioning and expected to function in future, but also guaranties the management of these sensitive TLDs to operate in a strictly non-political environment without any direct or indirect influence of any government or group of countries on the proper and healthy functioning of the matter, so as the entire Muslim community (Ummah) in a nondiscriminatory approach could fully benefit from its very objectives

I there wish to affirm and reiterate the position of my country which certainly would be shared by other Muslim countries familiar with the functioning and management of ICANN and request the ICANN and its constituent to carefully consider the matter in order to prevent any potential imposition of any view by a single organization or entity, in particular having any political motivation contradicting the very purpose and objectives of ICANN.

Finally I would like to recall that at this very moment that the functioning and management of ICANN/Internet is under the full scrutiny of the whole world it is imperative and fundamental that ICANN and its constituent entities/ Committees/ organs to be conscious of any action that may compromise the full fairness, impartiality, neutrality, inclusiveness, transparent and democratic approach that need to be taken in the management of these new gTLDs
I again thank you for the opportunity provided to us to express our views.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Saeed Mahdioun

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in GAC, ICANN
Mr. Cherine Chalaby  
Chairman of New gTLD Program Committee  
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers  
Cherine.Chalaby@icann.org

Our Ref.: B-140/002/BJ/04.04/12/2013  
Subject: Indonesia’s Position regarding New gTLD Applications for .islam and .halal

Dear Sir,

With reference to recommendations arising from Islamic states regarding the management and implementation of new gTLD applications for .islam, and .halal by a private company/institution, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MCIT) on behalf of the government of Indonesia would like to convey its official views on the aforementioned matter, as follows:

1. Indonesia highly appreciates and supports ICANN’s policies regarding new gTLD programs which we believe that it will bring about positive impacts for the global development of domain names, particularly its potential in escalating competition and innovation in the business sphere. However, it is inevitable to view that all newly proposed gTLDs will not receive approval from multi-stakeholders, specifically those that concern a certain religion. Thus, Indonesia is of the view that ICANN should be impartial, inclusive, neutral, and has multi stakeholder approach.

2. Besides, Indonesia is a multi-cultural, multi-racial, and multi-religious country, with its population predominantly Muslim (of the Islamic faith). Based on this fact, we indeed realize that domain name issues concerning a certain religion may be of sensitive nature and potentially provoke future conflicts.

3. Taking into consideration the aforementioned grounds, Indonesia’s position on the new gTLD application of .islam are as follows:
   a. Any domain name that uses a name of a particular religion may be the root cause of potential sensitive friction and future conflicts.
   b. The entity/person who proposed new gTLD application does not represent the larger global muslim community.
   c. Within Islam, there exists several different schools of thoughts that may have entirely different opinions and arguments which may cause conflicts.
   d. Indonesia opposes any domain name that uses a name of any particular religion; and strongly objects the proposal of the domain name of .islam.

4. Indonesia’s position on the new gTLD application of .halal:
   a. In principle, Indonesia approves the proposal and use of domain name .halal, provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.
b. Entities that register for the domain name .halal should be obliged to submit a halal certification for proof of halal products and/or services from a local government authority of the originating country.

c. Ideally, the domain name .halal should be managed by an entity which resides in a country that represents the majority of muslim community.

Thank you for your kind attention, and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Basuki Yusuf Iskandar
Secretary General
Ministry of Communication and Information Technology
Republic of Indonesia

CC:
H.E. Minister of Communication and Information Technology, Republic of Indonesia; Director General of ICT Applications.
The Requester Asia Green IT System Ltd. seeks reconsideration of the NGPC’s\(^1\) February 2014 resolution deferring the contracting process for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings until certain noted conflicts have been resolved. The Requester also seeks reconsideration of an alleged staff action implementing the NGPC’s resolution; namely, the 7 February 2014 letter from Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board, to Requester.

I. Brief Summary.

The Requester applied for .ISLAM and .HALAL. The applications were the subject of two GAC\(^2\) Early Warning notices, an evaluation by the Independent Objector, an objection filed with the ICC,\(^3\) three issuances of related GAC Advice, and significant objections from a number of other entities and governments. Ultimately, the NGPC resolved to take no further action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL applications until and unless the Requester resolves the conflicts between its applications and the objections raised by the organizations and governments identified by the NGPC. The Requester claims that the NGPC failed to consider material information in taking its action and also claims that ICANN staff violated an established policy or procedure by failing to inform the Requester how it should resolve the noted conflicts.

With respect to these claims, there is no indication that the NGPC failed to consider material information in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. Rather, the record

---

\(^1\) New gTLD Program Committee.
\(^2\) Governmental Advisory Committee.
\(^3\) International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.
demonstrates that the NGPC was well aware of the information Requester claims was material to
the 5 February 2014 Resolution. In addition, the Requester has not identified an ICANN staff
action that violated an established ICANN policy or procedure. Instead, the action challenged by
the Requester was that of the Board, not staff, and, in any event, the Requester has failed to
identify any ICANN policy or procedure violated by that action. Given this, the BGC
recommends that Request 14-7 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Relevant Background Facts.

The Requester Asia Green IT System Ltd. (“Requester”) applied for .ISLAM
and .HALAL (“Requester’s Applications”).

On 20 November 2012, the Requester’s Applications received GAC Early Warning
notices from two GAC members: (i) the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”)
(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-AE-23450.pdf;
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-AE-60793.pdf); and (ii) India
(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Islam-IN-23459.pdf;
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27131927/Halal-IN-60793.pdf.) Both
members expressed serious concerns regarding the Requester’s Applications, including a
perceived lack of community involvement in, and support for, the Requester’s Applications.

In December 2012, the Independent Objector (“IO”) issued a preliminary assessment on

---

4 Concurrent with the public comment period, the GAC may issue GAC Early Warning notices
concerning particular applications. The notices provide the applicant with an indication that the
application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more governments. (Applicant
Guidebook (“Guidebook”), Section 1.1.2.4.)

5 The Independent Objector, Professor Alain Pellet, was appointed by ICANN to serve for the duration of
the New gTLD Program and lodge objections to highly objectionable gTLD applications on limited
public interest and community grounds. (Guidebook, Section 3.2.5.)
the Requester’s application for .ISLAM, noting that the application received numerous public comments expressing opposition to a private entity, namely the Requester, having control over a gTLD that relates to religion (“IO’s Assessment on .ISLAM”). (http://www.independent-objector-newgtlds.org/home/the-independent-objector-s-comments-on-controversial-applications/islam-general-comment.) The Requester submitted responses to the IO’s initial concerns, and the IO ultimately concluded that neither an objection on public interest grounds nor community grounds to the application for .ISLAM string was warranted. (See IO’s Assessment on .ISLAM.)

On 13 March 2013, the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE filed community objections with the ICC to the Requester’s Applications (“Community Objections”).6

On 11 April 2013, the GAC issued its Beijing Communiqué, which included advice to ICANN regarding the Requester’s Applications, among others.7 Specifically, the GAC advised the Board that, pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), some GAC members:

[H]ave noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.8


---

6 UAE’s Community Objections asserted that there is “substantial opposition to [each] gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.” (Guidebook, Section 3.2.1; New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”), Art. 2(e).)
7 The New gTLD Program includes a procedure pursuant to which the GAC may provide Advice to ICANN concerning a specific application for a new gTLD. The procedures are set out in Module 3 of the Guidebook. (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/objection-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf).
8 GAC Advice regarding a new gTLD application may include advice: “[T]hat there are concerns about a particular application []. The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns.” (Guidebook, Section 3.1.)
On 18 April 2013, ICANN published the GAC Advice thereby notifying the Requester and triggering the 21-day applicant response period.9 Requester submitted to the Board timely responses to the GAC Advice, which included, among other things, a summary of the support received for the Requester’s Applications and a draft of the proposed governance model for the .ISLAM string (“Requester’s Responses to GAC Advice”).

(See also Summary and Analysis of Applicant Responses to GAC Advice, Briefing Materials 3 (“NGPC Briefing Material”) available at https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-3-04jun13-en.pdf.)

On 4 June 2013, the NGPC adopted the NGPC Scorecard (“4 June 2013 Resolution”) setting forth the NGPC’s response to the GAC Advice found in the Beijing Communiqué (“NGPC Scorecard”). (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-04jun13-en.htm#1.a.; http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-04jun13-en.pdf.) With respect to the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings, the NGPC Scorecard stated in pertinent part:

> The NGPC accepts [the GAC] advice.…. Pursuant to Section 3.1ii of the [Guidebook], the NGPC stands ready to enter into dialogue with the GAC on this matter. We look forward to liaising with the GAC as to how such dialogue should be conducted.

(NGPC Scorecard, Pg. 3.) The NGPC Scorecard further noted the Community Objections filed against the Requester’s Applications and indicated that “these applications cannot move to the

---

9 Where GAC Advice is received by the Board concerning an application, ICANN is required to: “[P]ublish the advice and endeavor to notify the relevant applicant(s) promptly. The applicant will have a period of 21 calendar days from the publication date in which to submit a response to the ICANN Board.” (Guidebook, Section 3.1.)
contracting phase until the objections are resolved.” (Id.)

On 18 July 2013, pursuant to Section 3.1.II of the Guidebook, members of the NGPC entered into a dialogue with the governments concerned about the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings to understand the scope of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Advice in the Beijing Communiqué.

On 25 July 2013, the Ministry of Communications for the State of Kuwait sent a letter to ICANN expressing its support for UAE’s Community Objections and identifying concerns that the Requester did not receive the support of the community, the Requester’s Applications are not in the best interest of the Islamic community, and the strings “should be managed and operated by the community itself through a neutral body that truly represents the Islamic community such as the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/al-qattan-to-icann-icc-25jul13-en.pdf)

On 4 September 2013, in a letter to the NGPC Chairman, the Republic of Lebanon expressed general support for the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings, but stated that it strongly believes “the management and operation of these TLDs must be conducted by a neutral non-governmental multi-stakeholder group representing, at least, the larger Muslim community.” (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/hoballah-to-chalaby-et-al-04sep13-en.pdf.)

On 24 October 2013, the expert panel (“Panel”) appointed by the ICC to consider UAE’s Community Objections rendered two separate Expert Determinations (“Determinations”) in favor of the Requester.10 Based on the submissions and evidence provided by the parties, the

Panel determined that UAE failed to demonstrate substantial opposition from the community to the Requester’s Applications or that the Applications created a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the relevant community. (.ISLAM Determination, ¶ 157; .HALAL Determination, ¶ 164.) The Panel dismissed the Community Objections and deemed the Requester the prevailing party. (.ISLAM Determination, ¶ 158; .HALAL Determination, ¶ 165.)

On 4 November 2013, the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (“OIC”) submitted a letter to the GAC Chair, stating that, as the “second largest intergovernmental organization with 57 Member States spread across four continents” and the “sole official representative of 1.6 million Muslims,” the Member States of the OIC officially opposed the use of the .ISLAM and .HALAL strings “by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people” (“4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair”.)(http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-11nov13-en.pdf.)

On 11 November 2013, having received a copy of the OIC’s 4 November 2013 letter, the ICANN Board Chairman sent a letter to the GAC Chair, noting that the NGPC has not taken any final action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL applications while they were subject to formal objections. The letter further stated that since the objection proceedings have concluded, the NGPC will wait for any additional GAC input regarding the strings and stands ready to discuss the applications if additional dialog would be helpful. (Cover Letter to 4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair.)

On 21 November 2013, the GAC issued its Buenos Aires Communiqué, which stated the following with respect to the Requester’s Applications:

GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided
advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded
its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC
correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in
early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair’s
correspondence in similar terms.

(Buenos Aires Communiqué, Pg. 4, available at
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/FINAL_Buenos_Aires_GAC_Comm
unique_20131120.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1385055905332&api=v2.)

On 29 November 2013, the GAC Chair responded to the ICANN Board Chairman’s 11
November 2013 correspondence, confirming that the GAC has concluded its discussion on the
Requester’s Applications and stating that “no further GAC input on this matter can be expected.”

On 4 December 2013, the Requester submitted a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman
requesting contracts for .ISLAM and .HALAL “as soon as possible.”

On 19 December 2013, the Secretary General of the OIC sent a letter to the ICANN
Board Chairman, stating that the Foreign Ministers of the 57 Muslim Member States of the OIC
have unanimously approved and adopted a resolution officially objecting to the .ISLAM
and .HALAL strings and indicating that the resolution “underlines the need for constructive
engagement between the ICANN and OIC as well as between ICANN and OIC Member States.”

On 24 December 2013, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology on
behalf of the government of Indonesia sent a letter to the NGPC Chairman, stating that Indonesia
“strongly objects” to the .ISLAM string and, in principle, “approves” the .HALAL string
“provided that it is managed properly and responsibly.”


On 30 December 2013, the Requester submitted a letter to the ICANN Board Chairman challenging the nature and extent of the OIC’s opposition to the Requester’s Applications, reiterating its proposed policies and procedures for governance of .ISLAM and .HALAL, and requesting to proceed to the contracting phase.


With respect to the Requester’s Applications, the NGPC’s Actions and Updates Scorecard stated in pertinent part:

> The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community.

(Action and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) In addition, the NGPC directed the transmission of a letter from the NGPC, via the Chairman of the Board, to the Requester (“7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester”). (http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf.) The 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester acknowledges the Requester’s stated commitment to a multi-stakeholder governance model, but states:

> Despite these commitments, a substantial body of opposition urges ICANN not to delegate the strings .HALAL and .ISLAM....
There seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in your letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC will not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.

(7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester, at Pg. 2.)

On 26 February 2014, the Requester filed Request 14-7.

B. Requester’s Claims.

The Requester claims that the NGPC failed to consider material information when it approved the 5 February 2014 Resolution. Specifically, the Requester contends that the NGPC ignored, or was not otherwise made aware of, material information including:

1. The ICC’s Determinations dismissing the Community Objections;
2. The Requester’s proposed multi-stakeholder governance model; and
3. The differences between the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications.

(Request, Section 8, Pgs. 6-9, 12-14.)

In addition, the Requester claims that the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violates the policies set forth in the Guidebook and underlying the gTLD program because it fails to provide the Requester with guidance on how to resolve the conflicts identified in the letter. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 1; Section 8, Pgs. 9-12.)

C. Relief Requested.

The Requester asks that its Applications be immediately approved for contracting, or alternatively, at least the application for .HALAL be immediately approved for contracting.

(Request, Section 9, Pg. 14.)
If the Requester’s Applications are not immediately approved for contracting, the Requester asks that ICANN explain why the purported “conflicts” referenced in the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester have not been resolved, and “provide clear criteria for the [the Requester] to ‘resolve’ those purported conflicts.” (Request, Section 9, Pg. 14.)

III. Issues.

In view of the claims set forth in Request 14-7, the issue for reconsideration appears to be whether the NGPC failed to consider material information in approving the 5 February 2014 Resolution, which deferred the contracting process for the Requester’s Application until the identified conflicts have been resolved. Specifically, the issue is whether the NGPC ignored, or was not otherwise made aware of, the information identified in Section II.B, above. An additional issue for reconsideration is whether the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violated ICANN policies because it failed to provide clear criteria for the Requester to resolve conflicts with the objecting entities and countries.

IV. The Relevant Standards for Evaluating Reconsideration Requests.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with the criteria specified in Article IV, Section 2.2 of the Bylaws.11 (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.) Requester is purportedly challenging a Board action or inaction and a staff action.

---

11 Article IV, Section 2.2 of ICANN’s Bylaws states in relevant part that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction to the extent that it has been adversely affected by:
(a) one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies); or
(b) one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board’s consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or
(c) one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that are taken as a result of the Board’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.
Dismissal of a request for reconsideration is appropriate if the BGC\textsuperscript{12} recommends, and in this case the NGPC agrees, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the criteria set forth in the Bylaws for challenges of a Board action or inaction as well as a staff action. (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.9.)

V. Analysis and Rationale.

A. The Requester Has Not Demonstrated That The NGPC Failed To Consider Material Information When It Approved The 5 February 2014 Resolution.

A challenge of a Board action or inaction must be based upon the Board acting or failing to act without consideration of material information or as a result of the Board’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.\textsuperscript{13} (Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 2.2.) A proper request for reconsideration claiming that the Board acted without consideration of material information must:

1. identify the information that the Board had available to it but did not consider; and
2. identify that the information would be material to that decision. (Id.) If the Board did not have the information, the Requester must explain why it did not provide that information to the Board in advance of the decision that is being challenged.

Based upon the Request, the Requester has not sufficiently stated a request for reconsideration of the 5 February 2014 Resolution. The Requester has identified some information that the NGPC had available to it and purportedly should have considered before approving the 5 February 2014 Resolution. But the Requester has failed to demonstrate that the NGPC did not consider this information or that the information was material and would have changed the NGPC’s decision to defer the contracting process for the Requester’s Applications.

\textsuperscript{12} Board Governance Committee.

\textsuperscript{13} The Requester is not claiming that the 5 February 2013 Resolution was the result of the NGPC’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.
until certain conflicts have been resolved, as set forth below.

1. **The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider the Determinations dismissing the Community Objections, or that the Determinations were material to the NGPC’s Resolution.**

   The Requester contends that ICANN “has no right to second-guess” the ICC’s dismissal of the Community Objections. (Request, Section 8.I.a., Pg. 7.) The Requester, relying on Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, further claims that the Guidebook specifically indicates that the ICANN Board “should consider the advice of experts in making determinations about new gTLD applications which raise sensitive government issues.” ([I]d. at Pg. 8.) The Requester concludes that because the ICC, an appointed expert, has not advised ICANN to reject the Requester’s Applications, it “seems clear that the NGPC did not consider this material information” in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. ([I]d.) But the Requester’s conclusions are not supported.

   There is no evidence that the NGPC did not consider the ICC’s Determinations on the Community Objections in adopting the challenged Resolution. To the contrary, in the NGPC’s Actions and Updates Scorecard that was adopted by the NGPC as part of its 5 February 2014 Resolution, the NGPC specifically referenced the ICC’s Determination on the Community Objections:

   On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE.

   ([A]ctions and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) Moreover, in communications with the GAC, ICANN noted that it did not take any final action on the Requester’s Applications while the applications were subject to formal objections, but that the “objection proceedings have concluded.” ([C]over Letter to 4 November 2013 OIC Letter to GAC Chair.)
The Requester has also failed to demonstrate that the ICC’s Determinations were material to the NGPC’s Resolution or otherwise identify how the Determinations would have changed the actions taken by the NGPC. With respect to the Requester’s Applications, the ICC only evaluated UAE’s Community Objections, and the fact that the Panel determined that UAE failed to demonstrate substantial opposition from the community to the Requester’s Applications does not change the fact that the NGPC was made aware of opposition by many other entities and governments, such as the OIC, after the ICC rendered its Determination. In other words, the ICC’s Determination would not affect the conflict identified by the NGPC between the Requester’s commitment to a multi-stakeholder model and the concerns raised by other entities/governments outside the ICC’s proceedings. The NGPC is not second-guessing the ICC’s determination, as argued by the Requester, but is instead addressing a separate and distinct issue of concern.

2. The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider the Requester’s proposed multi-stakeholder governance model, or that the model was material to the NGPC’s Resolution.

The Requester asserts that the NGPC failed to consider the Requester’s proposed “multi-stakeholder governance model” in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Request, Section 8, Pg. 8-9.) But this assertion is also unsupported, for a couple of reasons.

First, the Requester’s purported multi-stakeholder governance model was a subject of the Beijing Communiqué, the Requester’s response to the Beijing Communiqué and the ICC’s Determinations. The NGPC’s 5 February 2014 Resolution makes clear that the NGPC considered the Beijing Communiqué, the NGPC Briefing Material summarized the Requester’s response to the Beijing Communiqué, and, as set forth above, the NGPC was well aware of the ICC’s Determinations. Thus, there is no support for the claim that the NGPC did not consider
the Requester’s purported multi-stakeholder governance model in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. Second, as the Requester concedes (Request, Section 8, Pg. 9, FN 11.), the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester identifies (and applauds) a 4 December 2013 letter and a 30 December 2013 letter from the Requester to ICANN relating to its proposed multi-stakeholder governance model. And finally, the Requester does not identify any other materials relating to the Requester’s proposed governance model that should have, or could have, been considered by the NGPC before reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution.

In addition, the Requester makes no effort to demonstrate that the Requester’s proposed governance model was material to the NGPC’s resolution or otherwise identify how the proposed model would have changed the action taken by the NGPC. Rather, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester shows that the NGPC was concerned with conflicts between the Requester’s purported model and the claims made about that model in the letters urging ICANN not to proceed with .ISLAM and .HALAL.

3. The Requester has not demonstrated that the NGPC failed to consider differences between the .ISLAM and the .HALAL Applications, or that such differences were material to the NGPC’s Resolution.

The Requestor claims that there are differences between the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications and that the NGPC failed to consider these differences in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Request, Section 8, Pg. 12-13.) The Requester’s only support for this claim is a letter from Indonesia objecting to .ISLAM, but “endors[ing]” .HALAL, and a letter from the Islamic Chamber Research and Information Center (“ICRIC”) expressing support for .HALAL. (Id.) But the record indicates that the NGPC reviewed both of these letters before taking its action. The 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester specifically identifies the letter from
Indonesia and that Indonesia was objecting to .ISLAM only and the NGPC Briefing Material specifically identifies the ICRIC’s letter of support for .HALAL.

In addition, the Requester has not explained how consideration of these two letters is material to the NGPC’s Resolution or otherwise identify how the letters would have changed the action taken by the NGPC. There were significant concerns expressed to ICANN with respect to both applications. Moreover, every submission made by the Requester treated both Applications the same.

B. The Requester Has Not Demonstrated That The ICANN Staff Took An Action Inconsistent With An Established ICANN Policy Or Process.

The Requester’s final ground for seeking reconsideration appears to be a claim that the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was a staff action that violates the policies set forth in the Guidebook and underlying the New gTLD Program because it fails to provide the Requester with guidance on how it should resolve the conflicts associated with the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications. (See Request, Section 3, Pg. 1; Section 8, Pgs. 9-12.) This is not a proper basis for seeking reconsideration.

To challenge a staff action, the Requester would need to demonstrate that it was adversely affected by a staff action that violated an established ICANN policy or process. (Bylaws, Art. IV., Section 2.2.) Here, however, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester was not a staff action, it was a Board (or NGPC) action. The letter was sent to the Requester under the signature of the Chair of the ICANN Board, Stephen D. Crocker. More importantly, the NGPC, delegated with all legal and decision making authority of the Board relating to the New gTLD Program, (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-10apr12-en.htm), directed transmission of the letter to explain its reasoning for the 5 February 2014 Resolution. (Actions
and Updates Scorecard, Pg. 8.) As such, the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester is a Board (or NGPC) action and cannot be challenged as a staff action.

Even if this were to be considered a staff action, which it is not, there is no established ICANN policy or procedure that requires the ICANN Board or the NGPC to provide gTLD applicants with individualized explanations or direction on what the applicants should do next. To the contrary, and as set forth in the Guidebook, after receiving GAC Advice, the NGPC is required to publish the advice, notify all relevant applicants, give the applicants an opportunity to respond to the GAC Advice, take action on, or respond to, the GAC Advice and then publicly post its decision along with a rationale for that decision. (See Guidebook, Section 3.1.)

This is precisely what the NGPC did with respect to the Requester’s Applications. Based on the GAC Advice, and subsequent concerns raised by a number of entities and governments, the NGPC decided that it will take no further action on the .ISLAM and .HALAL Applications until and unless the noted conflicts have been resolved, one way or another, as the NGPC explained in the Actions and Updates Scorecard and the 7 February 2013 NGPC Letter to the Requester. Nothing more is required of the NGPC at this time.

VI. Decision.

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore recommends that the Request be denied without further consideration. There is no indication that the NGPC failed to consider material information in reaching its 5 February 2014 Resolution. In addition, the Requester has not identified an ICANN staff action that violated an established ICANN policy or procedure.
This report is intended to provide a preliminary summary of public comments received to date concerning the framework principles of the proposed review mechanism to address perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations on String Confusion Objections, which was posted for public comment on 11 February 2014. A complete summary and analysis of the public comments will be prepared at the conclusion of the public comment reply period scheduled for 3 April 2014.

1. **Mike Gailer**
   - Notes that the .CAM gTLD will be confusing with the existing .COM gTLD.
   - Requests that ICANN refuse the application for .CAM.

2. **Hotel Top-Level-Domain**
   - Notes serious concerns about the entire handling of the String Confusion Objections, including: (1) that a case decision entirely relied on a single expert’s decision, (2) that the case decisions lack consistency in the statement of grounds and even untrue and far-fetched grounds have been accepted as valid, and (3) that there are no effective appeal or reconsideration mechanisms.
   - Highlights that there are a number of new gTLDs that are very likely to cause user confusion although there have been no String Confusion Objections for these strings.
   - Calls for ICANN and the ICDR to review all decisions and define clear rules under which parties may file for an appeal.
   - Presents a set of rules for an appeal, which are based on visual similarity determined by the SWORD tool. For example, strings that have less than 70% visual similarity are generally not similar, except for extraordinary circumstances (e.g. predominant aural similarity).
3. **Radix**
   - Requests the NGPC expand the scope of the review mechanism and agree to take up the issue of inconsistencies in Community and Limited Public Interest objections.
   - Call for the NGPC to send it clear signal as to whether it intends to take up the cases in objections other than the String Confusion Objections.

4. **Rudi Fras**
   - Questions the authority of the NGPC to be involved in this issue in this way.
   - Suggests that the NGPC is “treading on hallowed ground of policy change.”

5. **No Reply**
   - Questions the validity of a limited review, which allows relief to only randomly-selected members of the ICANN community. Notes that the Guidebook did not provide for a review process, we should all have a right of redress, or none at all.
   - Suggests that if there is a review, there must be clear guidelines on what standards of evidence and burden of proof apply. This task should be entrusted to an independently convened panel of academics who understand the rules of evidence and how they should be applied in a global context.

6. **Jean Guillon**
   - Argues that the original rules were “full of holes,” but changing them at this point is patently unfair.
   - Recommends that any review must be all, or nothing.

7. **Domain Venture Partners (dot Agency Limited’s .CAM application)**
   - Comments that amending the New gTLD Program rules post event to allow an appeal is a breach of process under ICANN’s own guidelines, and also legally.
   - States that the proposed appeal review materially prejudices its investment and notes that they are obtaining formal legal advice on this matter.
• Argues that the arbitrary nature in which the NGPC has subjectively isolated two objections sets compounds the unfairness caused by changing the process at all.

8. **Valideus**

• Highlights the need for a formal appeals process for future new gTLD application rounds, and makes recommendations for certain changes in the process.

• Notes that in many ways, the objections process worked exactly as intended because it removed ICANN from potentially controversial decisions about applied-for TLDs. Suggests that ICANN should stick closely to its core technical mandate, and not stray into politicized debates over particular applications.

9. **Famous Four (Applicant for .CAM)**

• Argues that any ICANN action to create a review mechanism would be a fundamental breach of contract. A right of appeal is a fundamental change to the Procedure - which the Board simply did not have the due competence and authority to make

• Notes that it has allocated resources for auction, and has begun or is intending to begin negotiations and/or enter the auction process with just one other bidder. To allow United TLD back into the contention set now, would seriously jeopardize the simple resolution of the contention set.

• Suggests that creating a Panel of Last Resort would open ICANN to liability because it is not included in the exclusion of liability in Article 22 of the New gTLD Domain Dispute Resolution Procedure in AGB, Module 3)

• Indicates that it fully intends to make a Request for an Independent Review Panel under the Bylaws, should the Framework Review be adopted.

• Suggests that some results in Community and Limited Public Interest objections are inconsistent. By focusing solely on the decisions mentioned in the Framework Review, the NGPC appears de facto to be making its own determination of the relative merits of the cases, a situation which it has hitherto sought to avoid.
- Argues that it is against a fundamental principle of natural justice that an affected party have input into the process. It, and the other prevailing .CAM applicant, would have no input.

10. **Google (applicant for .CAR)**

- States that there is a need for an entirely new review process intended solely to re-litigate two specific instances in which an objection proceeding resulted in a dubious ruling, when other inconsistencies (e.g., with the community objection proceedings) have not merited similar treatment.
- Suggests that the AGB already has guidance for dealing with inconsistent string contention scenarios. Namely, a reasonable solution for the .CAR/CARS and .CAM/COM strings would be to simply move all of the relevant applications into a single contention set for the purposes of the auction procedure, whether through direct or indirect contention.
- Urges ICANN to consider its suggested modifications, relating to scope, the standard of review, basis for consolidation, and standing to object, if ICANN considers adopting a new procedure. Among other modifications, the commenter suggests that a more appropriate standard of review is the “clearly erroneous” standard.

11. **DERCars LLC (applicant for .CARS)**

- Indicates general support for the review mechanism, but believes the NGPC should make a few clarifications.
- Suggests that the standard of review is too narrow, and proposes a revised standard as follows: “Was there substantial and reasonable cause, when considering the standard set forth in the AGB, the procedural rules, and the other Expert Determinations issued in the set, for the Expert panel to reach a determination on the underlying SCO that is inconsistent with the other Expert Determinations issued in the set?”
• Recommends that the Expert Determination in the losing applicant’s SCO should only be permitted to stand if the Panel of Last Resort unanimously concludes that it is consistent with the standard of review.

12. **Universal Postal Union (UPU)**

• Express support for the comments submitted by Radix Registry and others, particularly as related to the extension of proposed review mechanisms to other categories of disputes, such as the Community Objections.

13. **United TLD (applicant for .CAM)**

• Asserts that review of inconsistent SCO Expert Determinations should be confined to those involving the EXACT SAME string. Notes that ICANN has correctly identified these two circumstances as the only two truly inconsistent Expert Determinations.

• Propose a slight modification to the standard of review: Could the Expert Panel have reasonably come to the decision reached on the underlying SCO through an appropriate application of the standard of review as set forth in the Applicant Guidebook and procedural rules *and not unfairly prejudice any applicant by being inconsistent with other SCO determinations for the exact same string*?

• Disagrees with ICANN’s view of the only potential outcomes, and suggests that the potential outcomes, so as to avoid prejudicing any one applicant, should be: 1) that the Panel determines that the strings at issue are confusingly similar in all three applications or, 2) the strings are not similar, for all three applications.

• Requests that if the review mechanism is adopted, the Panel should look at all of the decisions rendered related to .CAM and .CARS and that United TLD and DERCars, LLC be permitted to submit a brief, not to exceed five pages, highlighting the errors in the expert’s application of the standards for considering evidence of visual and aural similarity.

14. **At-Large Advisory Committee**
• Supports the details of the process described, but recommends that it be widened to include cases such as the various .shop objections where the objected-to strings were not identical, but the results were just as inconsistent.

15. Chris Penn
• Requests that ICANN cease these community discussions, which serve only as a point of distraction.
• Suggests that ICANN adhere to the guidelines discussed to exhaustion in the planning period, and do what it initially promised, which is to evaluate all TLDs for visual, audial, and meaning similarity as established by the adopted policies and guidelines.

16. s s (Note: provided seven separate inputs into the public comment forum)
• Posts several letters previously submitted by other community members, including:
  o Letter from Chuck Gomes to Cyrus Namazi dated 18 October 2013 re: GNSO Discussion with ICANN CEO
  o Letter from the Business Constituency to the NGPC re: concerns about ICANN’s intention to delegate both singular and plural versions of the same string
  o Letter from Marilyn Cade, on behalf of the Business Constituency dated 5 September 2013 re: concerns about what appears to be a staff proposed change in the new gTLD Guidebook
  o Letter from eCommerce World Retailers, Inc. dated 20 November 2013 re: failure to properly review for string similarity in the process.
  o Letter from Jonathan Robinson to Steve Crocker and Cherine Chalaby dated 18 September 2013 re: GNSO Council policy concerns relating to string similarity in new gTLD applications
  o Circileid.com post by Statton Hammock dated 20 August 2013 re: .cam/.com String Confusion Objection Expert Determinations
17. **Uniregistry, Corp. (applicant for .CARS)**

- Highlights that the Applicant Guidebook did not provide a mechanism for appeals, and all parties applied for their top-level domains under the express promise by ICANN, and the reasonable contractual expectation of the applicants, that decisions by the dispute resolution providers would be final.
- If the NGPC decides to add an appeal mechanism, recommends that the adoption of the principle that makes the appeal available only to the “applicant for the application that was objected to in the underlying SCO and lost” should be subject to appropriate opportunity for comment, and not decided as a “process detail.”

18. **Commercial Connect, LLC**

- Urges ICANN not to adopt the proposed review mechanism.
- Asserts that the core problem is that ICANN failed to provide sufficient written procedures in the AGB to allow the string similarity objection process to be conducted in a fair and equitable manner, resulting in inconsistent SCO determinations.
- Argues that the only equitable solution is to amend the AGB to set forth the legal principles that are to be applied including, (a) trademark principles, (b) domain name dispute principles, (c) cases of singular/plural forms of the same root, and (d) English and foreign equivalents of the same root.

19. **Donuts**

- Notes general support of a limited review process to address inconsistent string confusion objection outcomes and not just inconsistent determinations.
- Also supports view that only the “losing” applicant should have the ability to seek redress under the limited review process.
- Recommends that review should be extended to include .shop/.shopping objection. Not aware of other instances of inconsistent outcomes from the SCOs.
• Suggests that the standard of review should include whether it is reasonable to have inconsistent outcomes in the same contention set.
  o If any one .CAM applicant is permitted to proceed, both .CAM and .COM will be active TLDs. Hence, any confusion on the part of the public between .CAM and .COM will exist. As such, the review should look at the reasonableness of the outcome in light of the other outcomes and the end result. If there will be a .CAM and resulting consumer confusion, is it reasonable to permit two of the .CAM applicants to proceed and not a third? Obviously not.

• Urges ICANN to undergo a similar review mechanism in cases of inconsistent outcomes with the Limited Public Interest and Community objections.

20. MarkMonitor
• Applauds decisions that mitigate confusion and deception within the expanded Internet namespace.
• In future rounds, supports a widely applicable and reliable SCO appeals mechanism.

21. Intellectual Property Constituency
• Recommends that should any review mechanism be convened: (1) both the losing applicants and losing objectors have standing to initiate the review; (2) panels of last resort apply due deference via the clearly erroneous standard of review; and (3) only panelists with demonstrated experience with the new gTLD program be appointed.