

**The Global Name Registry, Limited**  
**Report due May 17, 2004 pursuant to**  
**Appendix U to the .name TLD Registry Agreement**

This report presents the information required by Appendix U to the .name TLD Registry Agreement (the “Agreement”) between the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) and The Global Name Registry, Limited (“Global Name Registry”). The information set forth below is required on each anniversary of 120 days after the Commencement of Service Date (15 January 2002).

This report sets out the following information:

- The Agreement reference, concept and description of required information.
- Response from Global Name Registry.

With the exception of 10.2.12 and 10.2.13, please note that this information is supplemental to that provided in the report on 15 May 2002; information previously provided is not reiterated.

**§10. *Concept: Registrations Restrictions Can be Implemented by a Registry Operator in a Cost Effective and Timely Manner***

10.2.1 *A statement of the total number of Eligibility Requirements Dispute Resolution Policy (“ERDRP”) Challenges filed.*

One.

10.2.2 *A tabulation of the number of names subject to multiple ERDRP challenges (i.e. x names were subject to exactly two challenges, y names were subject to exactly three challenges, etc.)*

No names have been subject to multiple ERDRP challenges.

10.2.3 *A statement of how many names sponsored by each Registrar were subject to at least one ERDRP challenge.*

One. (mini.name)

10.2.4 *A breakdown by country of the registration offered by the domain-name holder of the number of successful and unsuccessful ERDRP challenges.*

mini.name:

10.2.5 *A statement, broken down by sponsoring Registrar, of the number of names involved in ERDRP challenges where the holder fails to submit any materials after notification of challenge.*

Key-Systems GmbH: mini.name.

10.2.6 *A statement, broken down by the region of the holder's address as described below, of the number of names subject to successful ERDRP challenges:*

10.2.6.1 Africa: None.

10.2.6.2 Asia Pacific: None.

10.2.6.3 Europe: One.

10.2.6.4 Latin America/Caribbean: None.

10.2.6.5 North America: None.

10.2.7 *A statement, broken down by the region of the successful challenger's address as described below, of the number of names subject to successful ERDRP challenges:*

10.2.7.1 Africa: None.

10.2.7.2 Asia Pacific: None.

10.2.7.3 Europe: One.

10.2.7.4 Latin America/Caribbean: None.

10.2.7.4 North America: None

10.2.8 *A statement of the number of successful ERDRP challengers that did not register the challenged name, broken down by priority of the challenger (i.e. x first-priority challengers chose not to register the challenged name; y second priority challengers were offered the opportunity to, but did not, register the challenged name, etc.)*

One.

10.2.9 *A statement, broken down by sponsoring Registrar, of the number of names forfeited on the basis that the name was registered solely for the purposes of (1) selling, trading or leasing the domain name for compensation, or (2) the unsolicited offering to sell, trade or lease the domain name for compensation.*

The domain name "mini.name" appeared to be held by a cyber-squatter (based on the Whois details entered), however it is not possible to state this conclusively.

10.2.10 *A summary of complaints received from Registrars concerning the ERDRP.*

We are not aware of any complaints from Registrars concerning the ERDRP.

10.2.11 *A description of significant technical difficulties in connection with the*

*ERDRP.*

We are not aware of any significant technical difficulties that have been encountered in connection with the ERDRP.

10.2.12 *A written evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the ERDRP adopted for the Registry TLD.*

There continue to be very few challenges under the ERDRP, reflecting the relatively small namespace of .name. However, the ERDRP process has been successfully used to challenge what we suspect to have been a cybersquatter in the "mini.name" ERDRP decision. As the .name namespace grows, we shall gain a better idea of the effectiveness of the ERDRP process in deterring abusive registration practices.

10.2.13 *A written evaluation of the overall effectiveness of each dispute resolution policy adopted by the Registry TLD described below:*

10.2.13.1 ERDRP: please see 10.2.12.

10.2.13.2 UDRP: At this point, since there have been no UDRP challenges filed, it is difficult to state to what extent the UDRP has been effective for .name.