This is the Print View Page

".Pol", a ".Com" for Political Candidates

May 01, 2009 9:37 AM PDT | Comments: 22 | Views: 2,054

By **Matthew T. Sanderson**

In the coming months, ICANN will ambitiously expand the number of top-level domains (TLDs). ICANN could add ".movie" and ".paris", among others, to the existing ranks of ".com", ".org", ".gov", and ".edu". Here's another they should consider: a new ".pol" TLD that is reserved exclusively for political candidates and entities.

A ".pol" TLD is needed to alleviate problems linked to a now-common phenomenon called political cybersquatting. Without any legitimate affiliation, people around the world regularly nab rights to web domains that evoke politicians' names.

Political cybersquatting is now commonplace because candidates make easy targets. Candidacies often launch well after the press and public anticipate, giving cybersquatters a head start. For instance, Hillary2008.com was acquired in 1999 and RudyForPresident.com was snatched just eight days after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Also, candidates operate in a time-sensitive environment and must secure a domain quickly to use it during the short campaign season. Cybersquatters regularly exploit this urgency to fetch a premium price.

Even with Internet users turning to powerful search engines to locate online content, cybersquatting significantly disrupts campaigns at all levels of American politics. Web domains are valuable to candidates and voters because they ensure better search-result placement for official sites, serve as a mnemonic for voters, facilitate voter-to-voter "buzz" about a site, and guard against attempts to manipulate search-engine results like "Google bombing." A candidate's ability to fundraise, communicate, and organize is impaired when a cybersquatter diverts traffic away from the candidate's site by appropriating an official-sounding web domain. And cybersquatting robs voters of assurance that the online location where they read, volunteer, and donate is an authorized campaign site.

Some cybersquatters simply hope to freeload on a candidate's real-world notoriety by hocking college term papers, debt consolidation services, and other wares to those searching for candidate-related information. But others' motives are more menacing. Former Congressman Henry Bonilla's campaign registered a dozen domains that included an opponent's name and then posted statements that misled visitors to believe the opponent lacked a campaign website. During last year's presidential election, a cybersquatter produced a contribution webpage at "JohnMcain.com" that was almost indistinguishable from that that found on John McCain's official campaign site, "JohnMcCain.com." It is still unknown whether any McCain supporters were swindled, but the danger of fraud was certainly present. And counterfeit contribution pages will only become more common as other cybersquatters imitate the JohnMcain.com scheme. Perhaps most alarming, though, some cybersquatters register domain names as a way to extract favors from, or gain access to, candidates. As one cybersquatter bragged, "Don't I kind of destroy the myth of one man, one vote? ... I hold a little more power than the average person."

Despite the myriad problems that political cybersquatting can bring, existing preventive and remedial measures are ill-suited to solve this important problem. A candidate cannot buy in advance all possible domain-name variations. Negotiation gives cybersquatters exactly what they want—a chance to receive an exorbitant sum. Jurisdictional limits hamper the Federal Election Commission's ability to assist. And remedies offered through the Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act and

other laws are too expensive, slow, and geographically limited to aid candidates who are often cash-strapped, short on time, and attempting to reach foreign-based cybersquatters. Even ICANN's arbitration process, which was established to address cybersquatting, leaves many candidates helpless because it protects only commercial trademarks, not rights obtained through political activities.

A new ".pol" TLD would not completely stop political cybersquatting. But it would reduce cybersquatters' economic incentive to purchase candidates' domains under ".com", ".net", ".org", and other non-".pol" TLDs. Candidates' easy access to ".pol" domains would undermine the price for which cybersquatters can ransom non-".pol" domains to candidates. Decreased traffic to non-".pol" candidate domains would also reduce non-".pol" sites' value to political cybersquatters wanting to draw away Internet users. In addition, a TLD reserved solely for candidates and voters to fundraise, organize, and communicate would lessen the damage done by political cybersquatting. Candidates would be able to timely and dependably access and control at least one domain from which to reach voters. Internet users would be able to easily locate candidate domains because ".pol" would provide a reliable shortcut for finding and identifying official websites. So even if, as was the case in 2008, a cybersquatter builds an imitation contribution page on a ".com" site, informed Internet donors could visit a ".pol" site for assurance that their money goes to the intended recipient. ".pol" would therefore significantly reduce the extortion, confusion, fraud, and reputation exploitation associated with political cybersquatting.

Some may object to a ".pol" TLD. For example, cybersquatters would undoubtedly complain that ".pol" prevents them from exercising commercial and free-speech rights. This would be true to some extent, but the countervailing interest of preventing political cybersquatting's harms demands some reform measure. Blocking political cybersquatters from only one TLD is a relatively non-invasive way of solving this considerable problem, especially since ".pol" is not currently available anyway. Cybersquatters would lose nothing but the opportunity to take advantage of bona fide candidates in an entirely new area of the Internet.

ICANN should accept this new TLD during its upcoming open application process in order to mitigate political cybersquatting's harms and to preserve the Internet as a useful medium for real-world democracy.

Mr. Sanderson is a political law attorney at Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered in Washington, D.C. His full ".pol" proposal appears in the February 2009 issue of [The Election Law Journal](#).

Written by [Matthew T. Sanderson](#), Attorney

Related topics: [Cybersquatting](#), [Domain Names](#), [Domain Registries](#), [Internet Governance](#), [Law](#), [Top-Level Domains](#)

RSS FEED B Y! ... / **Get our weekly report:** [email address] [Sign Up]

🔊 **Master Feed** (more feeds)   🇪 **Twitter**   📱 **Mobile**

➕ **Bookmark / Email This Post**

MOBILE OPTIMIZED ✓ .mobi

Comments

www.barackobama.com was plucked from the drop pool
John Berard – May 01, 2009 11:32 AM PDT

An anecdote that suggests that if something can be done, it should be done comes from the experience U.S. President Barack Obama had in "getting his name back" just months after being elected to the U.S. Senate.

A political opponent had registered the URL www.barackobama.com but, without notice of Obama or his team, let it fall out of registration. Pool.com secured the address along with a host of others that day that suggested value based on traffic figures. But rather than put it up for auction, the folks at Pool.com thought it best to return it to then-U.S. Senator Obama.

So, in early March 2005, Pool.com chairman Rob Hall and then-Pool.com President Tony Farrow made the trip to Washington, D.C. to meet Mr. Obama and give him back his name. A name, we now know, that became the

centerpiece of the most Internet-based election campaigns in history.

What/Who are "Political Candidates"?* Does a candidate
Thomas Uxiou – May 02, 2009 1:59 AM PDT

What/Who are "Political Candidates"?
* Does a candidate for a tribal council qualify?
* Do political parties qualify?

What about after the election, are the domains deleted or ... ?

Who determents the criteria?

How are those criteria going to be enforced?
* For example how are potential town mayors in Afghanistan and pretenders identified
A TLD of this kind is going to provide trust to all its registered domain thus any kind of abuse has potentially far more damaging effects.

Basically the same concept was implemented as .PRO for "professionals", has a low recognition rate even among frequent internet users and the criteria/enforcement was subverted from the get-go.

> Blocking political cybersquatters from only one TLD is a relatively non-invasive way of solving this considerable problem, especially since ".pol" is not currently available anyway.

Yes, cybersquatters of any kind can be a problem. There is however a far more straight forward approach: .POL.US (1). Legal enforcement is trivial as only one country's jurisdictions are to be considered and thus the enforcement can be comparatively swift. In addition it can be introduced right now as it doesn't require any involvement of ICANN's decision making process. The success of .KIDS.US might however be an indicator for the potential success of .POL.US.

Seriously, the idea - as presented - is fundamentally flawed.

Response to Mr. Uxiou
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 02, 2009 6:19 AM PDT

"Seriously, the idea – as presented – is fundamentally [sic] flawed."

Before making such a sweeping conclusion, you would have done well to consider that the entire idea was not presented (nor could it be presented) in an 800-word blog post. As noted in my post, the full proposal was published in the Election Law Journal earlier this year and can be accessed athttp://www.liebertonline.com/...

In answer to your specific questions…

Yes, .pol would be available to non-candidate political entities like PACs and parties.

The .pol registry would determine eligibility criteria after hearing from various communities of interest. I think the registry organization
should, in the first instance, try to use a public election organization to determine who is/is not a political candidate or committee. For example, it might require a registration statement from a state or national government entity. It would *also* need to provide an alternative means for registering domains for opposition candidates in developing countries if the public election organization won't recognize them as candidates.

You are right that eligibility gets harder to determine in the developing world context. But luckily, Internet use often tracks institutional development, meaning that in places where campaigns/voters heavily use the Internet for political activities there will nearly always be a public election authority to recognize the candidate before the .pol registry. And .pol would improve today's situation if it frees up valuable space for *any* significant segment of political candidates and committees across the world.

This is not a new .pro. I realize that among some in the
internet community, there's skepticism about new gTLDs because of
.aero, .jobs, .pro, and other TLDs that really haven't taken hold. However, I
think ".pol" would be much more comparable to .gov, and .edu--TLDs that
arguably work well--rather than, for example, .aero. And here's why: airlines are a just a type of for-profit
corporation, so they fit in both the .com conceptual "box" AND the .aero "box". You could say that .aero captures
only a sub-category of what we think of as properly fitting under .com.
Since internet users are more accustomed to the general category of
.com, they look to that rather than .aero.

This is not the case with .gov and .edu. They do NOT capture only a
sub-category of what we think of as properly fitting under .com. In
fact, government entities and educational institutions, to most people,
are fundamentally different from for-profit corporations and therefore
fit only in the .gov and .edu conceptual "boxes", not the .com "box".
Thus, moderately experienced Internet users will recognize that FEC.gov is the Federal Election Commission's
official site, not FEC.com. I think .pol
would be comparable to .gov and .edu because .pol coverage would also
not really overlap with another TLD. If you think about it, political
campaigns don't really fit in any of the conceptual "boxes" you might
put them in--they are different from the for-profits that inhabit .com,
the educational institutions that inhabit .edu, and the
charities/non-profits that inhabit .org. These real-world differences
would make it easier for people to delineate on the Internet.

I do not believe that a .pol SLD under the .us ccTLD would be successful. As you noted, .kids.us has not done well.
Any logistical headaches caused by recognizing non-US political entities will be well worth it for making .pol a TLD,
not an SLD.

One other thing, I'd like to mention. This isn't only about protecting
candidates. Campaign websites are no longer just computerized pamphlets
where we all read a candidate's policy positions. We visit campaign
websites to donate money, submit contact information, and build
grassroots political movements. Because sites are much more interactive,
and we want to build on these existing trends, more needs to be done to
ensure that cybersquatting is curbed. This is as much about protecting
candidates' supporters as it is about protecting candidates.

It would *also* need to provide an
Thomas Uxiou – May 02, 2009 2:01 PM PDT

> It would *also* need to provide an alternative means for
> registering domains for opposition candidates in developing countries if
> the public election organization won't recognize them as candidates.

Whatever registry is going to do that will have to weather a constant storm of diplomatic issues. This is basically
the same problem as defining what is an independent country and what are it's borders - a non-trivial task that
for example the UN and ITU face once in a while. The registry would have to face it on a weekly base as
elections aren't synchronized the world over.

> Any logistical headaches caused by recognizing non-US political entities will be well worth it for making .pol a
> TLD, not an SLD.

I think your seriously underestimate the task. Logistics are but one element. Organizing the verified translations
alone is going to be major headache. Another is reliable identifications people (e.g.: John Smith, New York,

Democrat, ...)

By convention domain names contain three parts.While

Thomas Uxiou – May 02, 2009 2:03 PM PDT

> By convention domain names contain three parts.

While many advertisers in the US use that format for web servers - a small part of all active domain names - that is at best a cultural and country-dependent convention if even that.

> Registrants of ".edu" domains, for example, must be"post-secondary institutions that are institutionally accredited.

As David A. Ulevitch pointed out above: this is - apart from very few exceptions - only true for US based organizations.

> http://net.educause.edu/edudomain/show_faq.asp?code=EDUELIGIBILITY
> *Eligibility for a .edu domain name is limited to U.S. postsecondary institutions that are institutionally accredited,*

> A domain name and an IP address matched in a registry's depository that is recognized by the
> root will propagate throughout the Internet so users may access the machine at the IP address.

I don't have numbers right at hand but I strongly suspect that this is - ignoring the infrastructure .ARPA TLD - a tiny minority of cases. In the overwhelming number of cases the domain name and then name of the responsible DNS server and potentially the DNS' IP address are propagated not the domain name and it's IP address.

> ICANN also conditions domain-name registration upon the registrant paying a fee, submitting to ICANN
> arbitration in the event of a domain dispute, and disclosing accurate contact information.

Just a clarification as the text is a bit ambiguous: This is only valid for generic and sponsored TLDs not for the large amount of ccTLDs.

> First, campaign organizations are typically short-term enterprises that operate in a time-sensitive environment.
> Campaigns must obtain their domain names quickly. Candidate-related domain names therefore provide an
> inviting mark for cybersquatters hoping to convert candidates'urgency into a premium domain-name price.

There is sharp distinction between candidate-related domains (e.g. Candidate2010.TLD) and campaign/slogan related domains (e.g. OneWidgetForEveryone.TLD). Only the later operate in a time sensitive environment the former can be organized years in advance. On the political level the paper uses for examples I highly doubt that potential politicians failed to seriously plan presidential candidateship two years in advance.

> Most corporations also have an early advantage over cybersquatters in registering domain
> names because they rarely invite press coverage before they start up.

It is a failure on part of the candidates to neglect adequate preparations.

> Many politicians decide to run for office only shortly before election seasons begin.

The paper is well source in other parts but I'd really like to seem some data backing this assertion.

> Negotiation, though, obviously gives many cybersquatters exactly what they want — a chance to receive an
> exorbitant sum in exchange for a domain.

Do you have any data for the "exorbitant" claim?

> ACPA is not ideal for solving po
> litical-cybersquatting problems because: (1) liti

gation is too costly and slow for most candi
dates; [...]

The ACPA and other laws on impersonation have been on the books for years and are in my view adequate to handle that kind of issue already. If you think that the issues aren't resolved in a timely or costeffective matter maybe it might be best to have a look at the process so that everyone can profit instead of creating a special case for candidates. (2)

> [...] (2) non-commercial cybersquatters may
> not have the requisite "bad faith intent to profit;"[...]

Criticizing and parody usually fall under the Fair Use doctrine in the US thus calling it cybersquatting blurs the very definition of cybersquatting.

> [...] and (3) jurisdictional issues may prevent American courts from reaching foreign cybersquatters.

Simple solution: use .US domains and American courts are going to have no such problems.

> Third, candidates cannot rely on standard preventive and remedial measures like UDRP to
> avoid and solve their cybersquatting problems. Because political cybersquatting is a distinct problem, it
> demands a distinct solution.

Frankly, I'm not convinced that political cybersuatting is a distinct problem. All of the time related issues are for example experienced when companies merge, a daily occurrence. The cost issue is not unknown to small business and non-profit organizations.

> [...] and suggests the creation of ".pol," a new special-use TLD, as a measure to mitigate
> harms that result from political cybersquatting.

What you completely fail to address is the potential harm .POL could cause. Consider .POL is supposed to be a TLD reserved for political organizations and candidates: What happens when - not "if" but "when" - a .POL website is defaced, a .POL domain is hijacked or registered by a fake candidate? The potential PR disaster would affect all the other .POL domains as .POL - unlike .COM or .ORG is seen as a "special" and "authoritative" TLD.

> Following ICANN's existing model for special-use TLDs, a designated private international organization285
> that represents political candidates and entities would communicate with potential stakeholders to
> formulate ".pol" policies and registration requirements.

Reply 2
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 02, 2009 7:11 PM PDT

First, let me say thank you for reading the paper. I realize that probably took some time. . .

The longer academic paper was written mostly for political law attorneys, many of whom do not familiar with how the Internet works. I fully realize that I may have oversimplified some technical descriptions.

I actually gave several examples of instances where press/cybersquatters anticipated a candidacy earlier than the candidate himself/herself. RudyForPresident.com was registered only days after Sept 11th attacks. Mayor Giuliani wasn't thinking about running for president or securing a domain. Another instance is Hillary2008.com--it was registered in 1999. The most recent is Meg Whitman, a candidate for California Governor. Several domains were registered a full year before she even started an exploratory committee, while she was still campaigning on behalf of Mitt Romney and later John McCain. None of these situations was, as you put it, a "failure on part of the candidates to neglect adequate preparations." It's unrealistic to expect a candidate to buy-up domains 9 years in advance of their run.

Political cybersquatting is a distinct problem. You may be able to point to some situations, like recently

merged corporations, that are comparable in some respects. But remember, the real problem is that political candidates can't really use existing remedies like corporations can. There are scores of UDRP proceedings that have denied candidates' claims. Using your hypothetical merger, that merged corporation would be able to get the domain back through UDRP. A political candidate can rarely do that.

You wrongly assume that there's nothing the registry and a specialized .pol dispute resolution process could do to quickly remedy the "hijacking" . . .

[second part]Following ICANN's existing model for special-use
Thomas Uxiou – May 02, 2009 2:05 PM PDT

[second part]

> Following ICANN's existing model for special-use TLDs, a designated private international organization285 that represents political candidates and entities would communicate with potential stakeholders to formulate ".pol" policies and registration requirements.

> Unlike formally altering UDRP to protect political names, arbitration panels could develop a coherent and consistent policy that protects political names in the limited ".pol" context, without causing confusion over trademark law's application in non-political UDRP cases or running roughshod over other interests.

And this is why your paper isn't a serious proposal for .POL: the little matter of *policies and registration requirements* are the core of any TLD. While you show that you certainly perceive a need for .POL you fail to show that .POL could actually address the raised issues.

> But even if a small minority of politicians is left out, ".pol" makes domain names accessible to a vast number of candidates and entities; [...]

I don't know about the US but in the EU that could cause a considerable amount of successful lawsuits.

All your raised arguments fail to explain why it should be .POL instead of .POL.US. In fact the legal issues would strongly favor a .US based approach.

Reply 3
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 02, 2009 7:41 PM PDT

As I've said, a government registration should be relied upon in the first instance for determining whether an individual is a candidate. That would open access to .pol domains for the vast majority of candidates out there. I acknowledge that there are other situations, such as political opposition candidate in developing countries that would need a separate "track" to register .pol.

All I am saying in the quoted text above is that I don't presume to have all of the answers. Because these are politically sensitive decisions, it is important to get input from relevant communities of interest before formulating exact criteria for this separate "track" of individuals who can't register via government certification.

Again, .pol as an SLD, rather than a gTLD, would fail. First, this is a worldwide problem, not just a US problem so you wouldn't want to make this solution available only to US candidates/entities. (I realize that I've given only US examples in this Post--that is solely because US politics is my area of expertise.) Second, and most importantly, .POL can only solve the cybersquatting issue if it can become an easy "shorthand" for official campaign sites. As you've noted with .KIDS.US, it is difficult for a .us SLD to achieve recognized status.

It looks to me that this is

Jeroen Massar – May 02, 2009 6:52 AM PDT

It looks to me that this is an American (USA that is) problem, as such: *.pol.us
Problem solved, and doesn't need to bother the rest of the world. Next!

A US problem belongs solved under .US

David A. Ulevitch – May 02, 2009 10:14 AM PDT

It's too late to fix the stupidity of having .mil and .gov only apply to US organizations. Let's not continue the stupidity by creating a .pol for politicians.

If you really want it, lobby for it to exist under .us, where it belongs.

Of all the GTLD ideas, this might be the worst.

Reading the other comments, and also realizing

Jeroen Massar – May 02, 2009 2:06 PM PDT

Reading the other comments, and also realizing that it actually only pertains to a 'website', and not actually for doing communications of any kind (eg they are not going to do email/SIP/FTP/whatever other protocol), just create a "MySpace for Politicians" and the problem is solved, ah yes, they are already on MySpace/LinkedIn/Facebook etc thus why are we having this thread here?

To start with it's not ICANN that

Michele Neylon – May 05, 2009 5:36 AM PDT

To start with it's not ICANN that creates the TLD. It would be up to a 3rd party to put forward an application to run a .pol TLD and then ICANN may or may not allow it to go ahead.

Does any real need exist for a .pol TLD?

While there may have been "issues" in the past with candidates not being able to get access to domain names, is that the ICANN community's fault or the candidate's (and their staff)?
If, as you argue, domain names and the internet are so important, surely the onus would be on the candidate to register their domain name as soon as they decided to run for office?

As has also been pointed out, if it's more of a US problem than anything else, then maybe a second level domain off .us would solve the perceived issue

Michele

Response to Mr. Neylon

Matthew T. Sanderson – May 05, 2009 6:06 AM PDT

Thank you for your comment. I'm happy to answer your questions…

I'm aware that ICANN will not create the TLD. Hence the phrase "ICANN should accept this new TLD during its upcoming open application process" rather than ICANN should "create" .pol.

My point, in a nutshell, is that political candidates are uniquely vulnerable to cybersquatting because (1) political campaigns start much later than the press anticipates their beginning, giving cybersquatters a head start; (2) campaigns are short-term affairs, which up the urgency to get a domain and make ACPA litigation and other options impractical; (3) campaigns are divisive and open up candidates to a wider pool of non-commercial cybersquatters; and (4) existing remedial measures are ill-suited to help a candidate get a domain once it's been cybersqatted. On this last point, for example, UDRP is geared toward protecting trademark rights and rarely helps political candidates

trying to wrest a domain from a cybersquatter.

I understand the impulse to blame the candidates--they should prepare whenever possible. But I think it's unrealistic to expect Hillary Clinton to register Hillary2008.com 10 years before she starts running. It's unrealistic to expect Meg Whitman to register WhitmanForGovernor.com while she's stumping for Romney and McCain in the heat of a presidential race a full 13 months before she even forms an exploratory committee. And it's unrealistic to expect Rudy Giuliani to register RudyForPresident.com 8 days after the September 11th attacks. These are all very recent examples, from the 2008 election so this is a current problem, not merely one that existed in the past. As a commenter pointed out above, even a tech-savvy politician like Barack Obama may've missed out on obtaining BarackObama.com if the Pool.com folks hadn't offered it to him.

Finally, as I discussed with Mr. Uxiou above, .pol as an SLD, rather than a gTLD, would fail for two reasons. First, this is a worldwide problem, not just a US problem so you wouldn't want to make this solution available only to US candidates/entities. (I realize that I've given only US examples in this Post--that is solely because US politics is my area of expertise.) Second, and most importantly, .POL can only solve the cybersquatting issue if it can become an easy "shorthand" for official campaign sites. As we've seen with .KIDS.US, it is difficult for a .us SLD to achieve recognized status.

Again .. ICANN have to receive an
Michele Neylon – May 05, 2009 6:16 AM PDT

Again .. ICANN have to receive an application from someone in order for it to be considered.

Now if you want to get some backers to put together a proposal for a .pol tld then "go for it", however I still don't see how it would solve anything.

I also don't see why politicians should be given any special treatment when it comes to domain names.

Setting up SLDs on a large and successful ccTLD might be a good way to give this idea of yours some traction, but I fail to see any real demand for it.

Kids.us is overly restrictive, which is why it hasn't worked. If it wasn't as restrictive it might work. One could also argue that .us as a ccTLD hasn't been much of a success.

Yes, I understand that. I plan to
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 05, 2009 6:43 AM PDT

Yes, I understand that. I plan to submit a proposal to ICANN. Thank you for the suggestion on the SLD.

I don't see this as offering politicians "special treatment." It is affording them equal treatment. They "fall through the cracks" of the existing system, so to speak. ".pol" would help give them access to domains and to remedial measures on par with corporations under the current regime. And as I've said before, this isn't only about protecting candidates. Campaign websites are no longer just computerized pamphlets where we all read a candidate's policy positions. We visit campaign websites to donate money, submit contact information, and build grassroots political movements. Because sites are much more interactive, and we want to build on these existing trends, more needs to be done to ensure that cybersquatting is curbed. This is as much about protecting candidates' supporters as it is about protecting candidates.

I honestly don't see how you can
Michele Neylon – May 05, 2009 4:52 PM PDT

I honestly don't see how you can contend that they "fall through the cracks".
Private individuals can register domain names without any issue, so why can't politicians?

As for "remedial measures" - I think you're contradicting yourself. Didn't you already express

dissatisfaction with the existing systems due to timelines etc? Now if that isn't treating politicians differntly, I don't know what is.

In this instance, candidates aren't like other
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 06, 2009 4:32 AM PDT

In this instance, candidates aren't like other private individuals. They "fall through the cracks" because unlike an regular people, they have a potentially large group of individuals who will cybersquat them; unlike celebrities like Julia Roberts, Dan Marino, etc. they cannot use UDRP to get their domains back because they haven't used their name in commerce. In sum, it is harder for them to register a domain in advance and nearly impossible for them to wrest a domain away from a cybersquatter once it's gone.

By referring to "remedial measures" I'm not contradicting myself in the least. .Pol, like some other special-use gTLDs would have a specialized dispute resolution process. As I've said, they don't have access to the remedial measures that similarly situated non-candidates do.

I wouldn't call it a a ".Com" for Political Candidates...
Daniel R. Tobias – May 05, 2009 4:33 PM PDT

Political candidates have *never* really been proper for **.com**, unless their candidacy is a commercial entity. Call it a **.org** for political candidates to be more proper.

Maybe in some countries politicians might not
Michele Neylon – May 05, 2009 4:54 PM PDT

Maybe in some countries politicians might not be "for profit", but in Ireland at least they earn way more than most people

That is one of the reasons .pol
Matthew T. Sanderson – May 06, 2009 4:40 AM PDT

That is one of the reasons .pol would be a good development. Candidates and political entities really don't fit under any of the other conceptual "boxes" that exist under the current gTLDs. As you note, they aren't corporations so they don't exactly fit under the .com gTLDS (yet many candidate DO house websites on .com domains). And they aren't really like the non-profits and charities that dominate .org either…

BTW--don't worry about the title. It was just attention-grabbing. Another way of saying a gTLD for candidates.

I am !!!SPECIAL!!!, as such I need
Jeroen Massar – May 06, 2009 5:00 AM PDT

I am !!!SPECIAL!!!, as such I need my own TLD. See that that can't work?!

Just keep these problems under your own .us domain please. Thank you! Next!

Same with IDN for that matter, if there is a need for an IDN TLD, that TLD most likely fits perfectly fine in the country or region specific TLD already, no need to create TLDs for that.

JeroenI'm not sure the advocates of IDN
Michele Neylon – May 06, 2009 2:31 PM PDT

Jeroen

I'm not sure the advocates of IDN TLDs would agree with you.

Personally I don't have an issue with there being hundreds of new TLDs as long as they are sustainable.

If a large enough community want a TLD of their own to serve whatever purpose they may decide on then I don't see any reason why they shouldn't have it.

However I do take issue with people inventing reasons for TLDs that aren't firmly grounded in facts.

A lot of the TLDs that are being developed at present are aimed at serving communities that would not fit comfortably into an existing ccTLD or an existing gTLD for one reason or another.

Obviously some of the proposals have sound backing and could be a success, whereas others are probably less likely to succeed should they get past the hurdles of the application process.

Michele