

nameshop

June 10, 2026

Subject: Urgent Follow-up on .Internet Delegation and Response to Correspondence dated 9 June 2026 on the delegation of .Internet

Dear Theresa Swinehart, Board Chair Tripti Sinha, and CEO Kurtis Lindqvist,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 9 June 2026. As this message reaches you while the ICANN community is actively gathered for the Policy Forum in Sevilla, Spain, please allow me to first wish you all a highly productive and successful meeting.

I am writing today to address the assertions in your recent letter, and to politely but emphatically challenge the decision to move the Nameshop application to a "terminated" status.

1. Emphatic Objection to "Terminated" Status and the "No Further Avenues" Rationale

Your letter states that ICANN will now proceed to move the application to "terminated" status because there are "simply no further avenues [as part of the 2012 Round] to delegation for Nameshop to pursue at this time."

I must respectfully, but firmly, object to this classification. The application cannot be legitimately "terminated" when it has neither been withdrawn by the applicant nor failed on its substantive merits. The assertion that there are "no further avenues" is not a substantive evaluation of the .Internet TLD; it is an artificial procedural bottleneck. It is a reflection of a corporate inability to correct past evaluation gaps, rather than a reflection of the application's validity. **Terminating a fully revealed, uncontested, 12-year-active application merely because ICANN's internal processes currently lack a predefined "avenue" to gracefully resolve this anomaly is a denial of due process and fundamental fairness.**

2. Reiteration of the Request for Immediate Delegation I respectfully ask the Board and the Executive, particularly while convened in Sevilla, to look beyond these self-imposed

procedural limitations. The .Internet string remains an uncontested application from the 2012 round, fortified by profound, legally binding public interest commitments.

As emphasized in our May 2026 correspondence, we cannot accept the suggestion to apply in the 2026 round. Forcing this 12-year-delayed application into a subsequent round will inevitably trigger **Artificial Contention**, unjustly exposing an application that has operated in good faith to opportunistic actors who have monitored the string's value over the past decade. The fair and equitable avenue is for the Board to exercise its authority to resolve this procedural anomaly and delegate .Internet ahead of the 2026 round.

3. Request for Transparency and Publication of the Record Finally, in the interest of fairness and maintaining an accurate public record, I kindly remind ICANN of my formal request to publish my previous response sent on 13 May 2026, along with its attachments (specifically our 25 April 2019 and 23 June 2019 letters), on the ICANN Correspondence page. Nameshop provided its express consent for this publication to ensure the community has access to the full, factual context of our application's history, rather than a selectively curated record. I look forward to seeing it published without further delay.

We remain fully prepared to provide any further information to facilitate the timely delegation of .Internet.

Thank you for your time, your continued service to the multistakeholder model, and your fair consideration of this request.

Respectfully,
Sivasubramanian M
Nameshop, India

Whitefield, 389-1 Perundurai Road, Erode 638011 India.
<https://nameshop.in>
Internet@nameshop.in