

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

Application ID:	1-2139-55785
Applied-for String:	SMART
Priority Number:	1839
Applicant Name:	Smart Communications, Inc. (SMART)

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 - No Contention																
<p>The String Similarity Panel has determined that your application is consistent with the requirements in Sections 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and your applied-for string is not in contention with any other applied-for strings.</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;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27: Registration Life Cycle</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29: Rights Protection Mechanism</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30: Security Policy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Question	Score	24: SRS	0	25: EPP	1	26: Whois	0	27: Registration Life Cycle	0	28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation	1	29: Rights Protection Mechanism	2	30: Security Policy	0
Question	Score																
24: SRS	0																
25: EPP	1																
26: Whois	0																
27: Registration Life Cycle	0																
28: Abuse Prevention and Mitigation	1																
29: Rights Protection Mechanism	2																
30: Security Policy	0																

31: Technical Overview of Registry	0
32: Architecture	0
33: Database Capabilities	1
34: Geographic Diversity	1
35: DNS Service	0
36: IPv6 Reachability	1
37: Data Backup Policies & Procedures	0
38: Data Escrow	1
39: Registry Continuity	1
40: Registry Transition	1
41: Failover Testing	1
42: Monitoring and Fault Escalation	1
43: DNSSEC	1
44: IDNs (Optional)	0
Total	13
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 that "a complete answer should include, but is not limited to...a high-level SRS system description, representative network diagram(s), number of servers, description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, frequency of synchronization between servers, and synchronization scheme (e.g., hot standby, cold standby)."

Your application response provides a high-level SRS system description, and it also includes a network diagram. It also describes the synchronization scheme with the secondary data center. However, it does not describe the number of servers, description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, or the frequency of synchronization between servers.

Question 24 of the AGB also states that SRS plans must be "sufficient to result in compliance with Specification 6 and Specification 10 to the Registry Agreement."

Your application response described compliance with EPP RFCs as required by Specification 6. Your application response, however, did not describe how the proposed registry will comply with Specification 10.

Question 24 also asks applicants to describe "the plan for operation of a robust and reliable SRS."

Your application response states "the company had tested the Domain Name Registry System (DNRS) Version 5.09, the open source version of the New Zealand Shared Registry System (NZ-SRS) deployed by the .NZ ccTLD. The company would use this system, with minor modifications, as its Shared Registration System." However, your response does not describe the modifications, nor does it describe any plans for testing the SRS system, such as testing of protocol compatibility and testing of scalability.

Please clarify the response by describing the number of servers, description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, and the frequency of synchronization between servers. Please also describe how the proposed registry will comply with Specification 10. Finally, please describe "the plan for operation of a robust and reliable SRS" by describing the modifications to the SRS system you intend to implement, and also please describe testing that will be performed around these modifications, such as testing of protocol compatibility and testing of scalability."

The response to this Clarifying Question did not include a description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, a description of how the proposed registry will comply with Specification 10, or a description of any modifications to the SRS system, including plans for testing the SRS system.

ICANN performed outreach to request this missing information on 19 July 2013. A response to the outreach was provided. The response described deployment of the SRS to two data centers as well as other information related to network distribution and bandwidth. However, the response did not describe how these features would enable the proposed registry to comply with the requirements of Specification 10. Additionally, the response still did not describe interconnectivity with other registry systems or plans for testing the SRS system.

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 AGB Question 26 regarding Whois:

"Question 26 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) asks applicants to provide "evidence of compliance with Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement." Question 26 also asks applicants to describe "how the Applicant's Whois service will comply with

RFC 3912."

Your application response states "Smart will setup a publicly accessible look-up/Whois service which will provide a reliable, stable, standards-compliant platform for supporting the .SMART registry." The response also states, "the Whois service will accommodate queries regarding the data sets listed in the following table." The referenced table, however, is missing, and the response does not demonstrate how the proposed registry will comply with Specification 4, Specification 10, and RFC 3912, as required by the AGB.

Question 26 of the AGB also asks applicants to provide "a high-level Whois system description, Relevant network diagram(s), IT and infrastructure resources (e.g., servers, switches, routers and other components), Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, and Frequency of synchronization between servers."

Your application response provided a high-level Whois system description and a diagram showing Whois servers. It also described the IT and infrastructure resources in the response to question 32. It did not, however, include a description of interconnectivity with other registry systems, nor did it describe frequency of synchronization between servers, as required by the AGB.

Please clarify the response by describing how the proposed registry will comply with RFC 3912 and Specifications 4 and 10 of the Registry Agreement. Please also describe interconnectivity with other registry systems and frequency of synchronization between servers.

Question 26 of the AGB also states that, to score a 2, applicants should include a "provision for Searchable Whois capabilities" and "a description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions."

Your application response did not describe implementation of Searchable Whois capabilities, nor did it describe potential forms of abuse.

To meet the 2 point scoring requirements, please clarify the response by describing a "provision for Searchable Whois capabilities" and "a description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions.""

The response to the Clarifying Question included the Whois response format as described in section 1.4.2 of Specification 4. However, it did not describe compliance with the other sections of Specification 4, including registrar data, nameserver data, zone file access, co-operation with ICANN, and bulk registration data access. The response also did not describe compliance with RFC 3912, Specification 10, or interconnectivity with other registry systems.

ICANN performed outreach to request this missing information on 19 July 2013. A response to the outreach was provided that described internet connectivity for the Whois server, including bandwidth. However, the response still did not describe compliance with the other sections of Specification 4 (including registrar data, nameserver data, zone file access, co-operation with ICANN, and bulk registration data access), and it did not describe interconnectivity with other registry systems or how the registry will comply with RFC 3912 and Specification 10.

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

Question 27 Summary:

The following Clarifying Question was issued for AGB Question 27 regarding Registration Life Cycle:

"Question 27 of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states, "provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD." The Supplemental Note to Question 27 (Knowledge Base Article 30027, "Evaluation question #27: Registration Lifecycle") states, "Applicants must describe all domain name statuses. If any or some domain name EPP statuses (see RFCs 3915, 5730-5734, and 5910) are not used, applicants must provide explanations."

Your application response to question 25 stated that you intend to comply with RFCs 5730-5734, however it did not describe "all domain name statuses," as required by the Supplemental Note.

Please clarify the response by describing "all domain name statuses" per the Supplemental Note to Question 27 (Knowledge Base Article 30027, "Evaluation question #27: Registration Lifecycle")."

The response to this Clarifying Question described states in the Registration Life Cycle. However, the response did not describe "all domain name statuses" in accordance with the Supplemental Note to Question 27 (ICANN Knowledge Base Article 30027 - Evaluation question #27: Registration Lifecycle).

ICANN performed outreach to request this missing information on 19 July 2013. A response to the outreach was provided that described states in the Registration Life Cycle. The response did not describe the domain name statuses to support the described states, including the standard EPP statuses as required by RFCs 5730-5734.

As this information was not provided, the response was not sufficient to meet the requirements for a minimum score on Question 27.

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	1
48: Funding and Revenue	2
49: Contingency Planning	2
50: Funding Critical Registry Functions	3
Total	10
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>.