

New gTLD Program
Initial Evaluation Report
 Report Date: 30 August 2013

Application ID:	1-1771-82835
Applied-for String:	UNICORN
Priority Number:	1130
Applicant Name:	Unicorn a.s.

Overall Initial Evaluation Summary

Initial Evaluation Result	Eligible for Extended Evaluation
<p>Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application and the responses to Clarification Question(s), the Evaluation Panel(s) determined that there was not sufficient information to award a passing score. Your application is eligible for Extended Evaluation as defined in Section 2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.</p>	

Background Screening Summary

Background Screening	Eligible
<p>Based on review performed to-date, the application is eligible to proceed to the next step in the Program. ICANN reserves the right to perform additional background screening and research, to seek additional information from the applicant, and to reassess and change eligibility up until the execution of the Registry Agreement.</p>	

Panel Summary

String Similarity	Pass - Contention														
<p>The String Similarity Panel has determined that your applied-for string is visually similar to another applied-for gTLD string, creating a probability of user confusion. Based on this finding and per Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, your application was placed in a string contention set.</p>															
DNS Stability	Pass														
<p>The DNS Stability Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Section 2.2.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook.</p>															
Geographic Names	Not a Geographic Name - Pass														
<p>The Geographic Names Panel has determined that your application does not fall within the criteria for a geographic name contained in the Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.</p>															
Registry Services	Pass														
<p>The Registry Services Panel has determined that the proposed registry services do not require further review.</p>															
Technical & Operational Capability	Eligible for Extended Evaluation														
<p>The Technical & Operational Capability Panel determined that:</p> <p>There was not sufficient information provided in the application or in the responses to Clarifying Question(s) in order to award a passing score. The application received a score of zero (0) on one or more questions, and did not receive the minimum required score of twenty-two (22) in the Technical/Operational Capability section for the application to pass. Please review the summary below for more information.</p> <p>Based on Section 2.3.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, the application is eligible for Extended Evaluation.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Question</th> <th style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24: SRS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25: EPP</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26: Whois</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Question	Score	24: SRS	0	25: EPP	1	26: Whois	1	27: Registration Life Cycle	1	28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation	0	29: Rights Protection Mechanism	0
Question	Score														
24: SRS	0														
25: EPP	1														
26: Whois	1														
27: Registration Life Cycle	1														
28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation	0														
29: Rights Protection Mechanism	0														

30: Security Policy	0
31: Technical Overview of Registry	0
32: Architecture	0
33: Database Capabilities	0
34: Geographic Diversity	0
35: DNS Service	0
36: IPv6 Reachability	0
37: Data Backup Policies & Procedures	0
38: Data Escrow	1
39: Registry Continuity	0
40: Registry Transition	0
41: Failover Testing	0
42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation	0
43: DNSSEC	1
44: IDNs (Optional)	0
<hr/>	
Total	5
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass*	22

**No zero score allowed except on optional Q44*

Question 24 Summary:

The following Clarifying Question was issued for Question 24 regarding Shared Registration System (SRS) Performance:

"Question 24 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states scoring criteria required in order to score 1 point with respect to Question 24.

Your application included some, but not sufficient, information that could be evaluated against the AGB scoring criteria with respect to Question 24.

Please provide a response that satisfies the scoring criteria with respect to Question 24."

The response to this Clarifying Question provided a description of SRS and compliance with the requisite RFCs. However, the response did not describe how the proposed registry will comply with Specification 10.

As this information was not provided, the response was not sufficient to meet the requirements for a minimum score on Question 24.

Question 26 Summary:

The following Clarifying Question was issued for Question 26 regarding Whois:

"Question 26 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states scoring criteria required in order to score either 1 or 2 points with respect to Question 26.

Your application included some, but not sufficient, information that could be evaluated against the AGB scoring criteria with respect to Question 26.

Please provide a response that satisfies the scoring criteria with respect to Question 26."

The response to this Clarifying Question provided a description of a Whois service that is publically available, and searchable Whois capabilities including precautions to avoid abuse. However, the response did not describe the potential forms of abuse of searchable Whois, or address how the searchable Whois service would comply with any applicable privacy laws and policies.

As this information was not provided, the response was not sufficient to meet the requirements for a maximum score on Question 26.

Question 28 Summary:

The following Clarifying Question was issued for Question 28 regarding Abuse Prevention and Mitigation:

"Question 28 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states scoring criteria required in order to score either 1 or 2 points with respect to Question 28.

Your application included some, but not sufficient, information that could be evaluated against the AGB scoring criteria with respect to Question 28.

Please provide a response that satisfies the scoring criteria with respect to Question 28."

The response to this Clarifying Question provided a single abuse point of contact, description of the proposed registry's anti-

abuse policy, and an abuse team resourcing plan. However, the response did not address the proposed registry's policies for handling complaints regarding abuse, describe proposed measures for the removal of orphan glue records and to promote Whois accuracy, provide policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, capture metrics and service levels for responding to law enforcement requests, or describe adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions.

As this information was not provided, the response was not sufficient to meet the requirements for a minimum or maximum score on Question 28.

Question 29 Summary:

The following Clarifying Question was issued for Question 29 regarding Rights Protection Mechanisms:

"Question 29 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states scoring criteria required in order to score either 1 or 2 points with respect to Question 29.

Your application included some, but not sufficient, information that could be evaluated against the AGB scoring criteria with respect to Question 29.

Please provide a response that satisfies the scoring criteria with respect to Question 29."

The response to this Clarifying Question described support of the Trademark Claims process, compliance with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system, and provided a brief description of a "short sunrise period."

However, there was not sufficient detailed information provided to demonstrate that the proposed registry will satisfy the Sunrise process and implement Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Policy (PDDRP) to comply with Specification 7. In addition, the response did not identify rights protection as a core objective, and did not describe "additional measures specific to rights protection, such as abusive use policies, takedown procedures, registrant pre-verification, or authentication procedures, or other covenants."

As this information was not provided, the response was not sufficient to meet the requirements for a minimum or maximum score on Question 29.

Financial Capability

Pass

The Financial Capability Panel determined that:

Your application meets the Financial Capability criteria specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

Question	Score
45: Financial Statements	1
46: Projections Template	1
47: Costs and Capital Expenditures	2
48: Funding and Revenue	2
49: Contingency Planning	2
50: Funding Critical Registry Functions	1
Total	9
Minimum Required Total Score to Pass**	8

***No zero score allowed on any question*

Disclaimer: Please note that these Initial Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. All applications are subjected to due diligence at contracting time, which may include an additional review of the Continued Operations Instrument for conformance to Specification 8 of the Registry Agreement with ICANN. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.