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Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 17 March 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID:</th>
<th>1-1025-18840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for String:</td>
<td>TAXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Taxi Pay GmbH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priority Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Did Not Prevail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application did not prevail in Community Priority Evaluation.

Your application may still resolve string contention through the other methods as described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Panel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Scoring</th>
<th>6 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Community Establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Registration Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Community Endorsement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Required Total Score to Pass 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #1: Community Establishment</th>
<th>0/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A Delineation</td>
<td>0/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the community demonstrates insufficient delineation, organization and pre-existence. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.

Delineation
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.
The community defined in the application (“taxi”) is:

The global taxi community, including its four main community groups: Firstly, the core taxi industry with taxi drivers, taxi offices, and individual taxi entrepreneurs, all of which can be clearly identified based on their taxi licenses, as well as a certificate of registration, i.e. a trade register excerpt. Secondly, the taxi community includes the members of the immediate surrounding industry, such as hardware and software suppliers, recruiting and training companies, auto shops, automotive suppliers, insurances and pertinent press all with a very strong if not exclusive focus on the just described core taxi industry. This particular community group is identified through trade register excerpts. Thirdly, the community includes superordinate organizations, such as governmental organizations, public authorities and institutions and committees with the purpose of establishing relevant policies for the core taxi industry, as well as non-governmental organizations with the purpose of advocating taxi-related issues towards the public sector, the general public and relevant taxi industry representatives on a municipal, regional, national and international level. This group verifies its affiliation to the taxi community through a written, official and verified statement by its superordinate authority or a certificate of a verified register of associations. Fourthly, the taxi community includes affiliated businesses, such as owners of trademarks with a special interest in the products and services of the core taxi industry, such as major places of public interest (i.e. hospitals) or major events of public interest (i.e. Oscar Academy Awards).

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership. While broad, the community is clearly delineated, as membership is dependent on having appropriate documentation (licenses, certificate of registration, etc.).

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the many affiliated businesses and sectors would have only a tangential relationship with the core taxi community, and therefore would not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for delineation.

Organization
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community. Additionally, existing entities do not represent a majority of the community as defined by the applicant. According to the application:

The taxi community currently lacks a single and overarching international umbrella organization. Even though there are a handful of organizations with a global claim, none of those comes close to even covering the majority of all community organizations….. It is the strong interest of TaxiPay GmbH to establish long term and sustainable relationships with stakeholders, thus creating a network based on all four major constituent parts of the taxi community.

The community as defined in the application does not have documented evidence of community activities. As there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the .Taxi application, there is no documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.
To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was not active prior to September 2007. The community as defined by the applicant is a construed community and therefore could not have been active prior to the above date (although its constituent parts were active).

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not fulfill the requirements for pre-existence.

1-B Extension

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application did not meet the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not demonstrate considerable size or longevity for the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

Size
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .Taxi as defined in the application is large both in terms of geographical reach and number of members.

However, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the many affiliated businesses and sectors would have only a tangential relationship with the core taxi community, and therefore would not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application only satisfies one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for size.

Longevity
Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application does not demonstrate longevity. The pursuits of the .Taxi community are not of a lasting, non-transient nature as the community as defined by the applicant is a construed community.

Additionally, the community as defined in the application does not have awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the many affiliated businesses and sectors would have only a tangential relationship with the core taxi community, and therefore would not associate themselves with being part of the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

2-A Nexus

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook.
The string does not identify or match the name of the community, nor is it a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community. The application received a score of 0 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must match the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must identify the community.

The applied-for string (.Taxi) does not match or identify the name of the community. The application for .Taxi defines a core community of taxi companies and drivers, as well as peripheral industries and entities. According to the application documentation:

The word “taxi” describes the center of the taxi community, which is the taxi service and vehicle itself – the very object that all community groups, namely entrepreneurs and companies of the core taxi industry, members of the immediate surrounding industry (i.e. suppliers), superordinate organizations and affiliated businesses, as well as its beneficiaries, namely current and potential taxi customers, have in common.

While the string identifies the name of the core community members (i.e. taxis), it does not match or identify the peripheral industries and entities that are included in the definition of the community as described in Criterion 1-A. Therefore, there is a misalignment between the proposed string and community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not match or identify the name of the community as defined in the application, nor is it a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community. It therefore does not meet the requirements for nexus.

2-B Uniqueness

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the string has other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application. The string as defined in the application does not demonstrate uniqueness as the string does not score a 2 or a 3 on Nexus and is therefore ineligible for a score of 1 for Uniqueness. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string does not satisfy the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

Criterion #3: Registration Policies

3-A Eligibility

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as eligibility is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.

To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by requiring proof of affiliation through licenses, certificates of registration, official statements from superordinate authorities, or owners of trademarks, etc. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the
condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.

3-B Name Selection

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.

To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by outlining a comprehensive list of name selection rules, such as requirements that second level domain names should not violate others’ trademarks, that they should fulfill technical and lexical requirements, and also demonstrate a connection to the name or occupation of the registrant, amongst other requirements. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.

3-C Content and Use

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.

To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by noting four relevant rules for content and use, which include restricting content to taxi-related issues or indicating a strong connection to it, amongst other rules. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.

3-D Enforcement

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application did not meet the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as the application provided specific enforcement measures but did not include appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a score of 0 out of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. The applicant will commission a Registry Service Provider to validate a registrant’s eligibility for a domain and to act upon requests/complaints on the basis of its registration policies. The applicant will also provide an in-house validation agent in order to respond to cases of abuse and/or arising disputes. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). However, the application did not outline an appeals process. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies only one of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement</th>
<th>3/4 Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-A Support</td>
<td>1/2 Point(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook as there was documented support from at least one group with relevance. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.

To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s) / member organization(s), nor did it have documented authority to represent the community, or documented support from the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from at least one group with relevance and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. While the applicant had support from several groups with relevance, these groups do not constitute the recognized institutions to represent the community, as they are limited in geographic scope and do not represent the global community as defined by the applicant. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant partially satisfies the requirements for Support.

| 4-B Opposition                                                        | 2/2 Point(s) |

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not receive any relevant opposition. The application received the maximum score of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.

To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.

The application received letters of opposition, which were determined to not be relevant, as they were either from groups/individuals of negligible size, or were not from communities which were not mentioned in the application but which have an association to the applied for string. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant satisfies the requirements for Opposition.

**Disclaimer:** Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. 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>.