GAC Advice Response Form for Applicants



The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) has issued further advice to the ICANN Board of Directors regarding New gTLD applications. Please see Section IV of the <u>GAC Los Angeles</u> <u>Communiqué</u> for the full list of advice.

Respondents should use this form to ensure their responses are appropriately tracked and routed to the ICANN Board for its consideration. Please complete this form and submit it as an attachment to the ICANN Customer Service Center via your <u>CSC Portal</u> with the Subject, "[Application ID] Response to Los Angeles GAC Advice" (for example "1-111-11111 Response to Los Angeles GAC Advice"). All GAC Advice Responses to the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué must be received no later than 23:59:59 UTC on 17 November 2014.

Please note: This form will be publicly posted. Please do not include in this form any information that you do not want posted.

Respondent:

Applicant Name	Hotel Top-Level-Domain S.à.r.l.
Application ID	1-1032-95136
Applied for TLD (string)	hotel

Response:

HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.à.r.l. is the community-based registry operator for the .hotel TLD and is being supported by the global hotel community. We would like to comment to the GAC Los Angeles communiqué as follows:

We encourage ICANN to provide the GAC with specific responses to the concerns listed in the GAC Los Angeles communiqué.

We have pointed out before that it is against competitive rules to allow applicants to amend their applications in order to comply with the GAC requirements. We are confident that for instance a change from an open to a closed application or vice versa constitutes a court-proof Material Change, especially in comparison what ICANN has mandated to be a Material Change in the guidebook.

We also echo the GACs concerns about the operation of generic terms as closed gTLDs.

HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.à.r.l. also again urges ICANN to ensure that any Public Interest Commitments or changes to applications and gTLD operations based on Safeguards filed by applicants in Contention Sets are being bindingly implemented and monitored after being approved as Change Request.

We agree with the GAC Beijing (and following) advice that allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings could lead to consumer harm and ask ICANN to provide applicants with an Appeal Mechanism that allows the reconsideration of the inconsistent results of the String Similarity Objections.

The GAC raised vital consumer protection issues in the Beijing, Singapore, and, most recently, London Communiqués, which help establish an environment of trust for these new domains as they are delegated.

