

Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

### **Proposed Service**

Name of Proposed Service:

RSEP .INSURANCE

Technical description of Proposed Service:

During the onboarding process for fTLD Registry Services, LLC ("fTLD") approved registrars, fTLD received a request about whether a Registry Lock Service (the "Service") is available to help protect against accidental or inadvertent modifications to or deletions of domain name registration data that would affect their customer's most high profile or valuable domain names. This is a service that ICANN has approved for other gTLDs, notably .BIZ, .COM, .ORG, .NAME & .NET.

fTLD would like to offer this Service to its registrars for the .BANK and .INSURANCE gTLDs. Providing the Service will enable registrars to offer their registrants, especially those registrants concerned with identity theft and other malicious activities, a new service to protect their domain name and/or host.

The Extensible Provisioning Protocol ("EPP") specifies both client (registrar) and server (registry) status codes that are consistent with the intent to prevent registry changes (i.e., a Delete, Transfer and/or Update) that were not intended by the registrant. Many registrars currently use the client status codes and have requested the ability to add server status codes as an additional layer of protection.

The EPP server status codes that would be applicable for domain names include (i) serverUpdateProhibited, (ii) serverDeleteProhibited, and (iii) serverTransferProhibited. These statuses may be applied individually or in combination.

The EPP also enables setting Host (name server) status codes to prevent deleting or renaming a host or modifying its IP addresses. Setting Host status codes at the registry would reduce the risk of inadvertent disruption of the DNS resolution for domain names associated with locked name servers.

#### Consultation

Please describe with specificity your consultations with the community, experts and or others. What were the quantity, nature and content of the consultations?:

Please see responses provided in a. through f. below.



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

a. If the registry is a sponsored TLD, what were the nature and content of these consultations with the sponsored TLD community?:

While neither .BANK nor .INSURANCE is a sponsored TLD, each is a Community TLD. While fTLD identified no contractual obligation to consult with its community for this RSEP, given the inherent benefits it would provide to registrants, it did provide a copy of the RSEP to its Advisory Council, comprised of stakeholders from the global banking and insurance communities.

b. Were consultations with gTLD registrars or the registrar constituency appropriate? Which registrars were consulted? What were the nature and content of the consultation?:

fTLD chose to file this RSEP based upon an initial inquiry from a Registrar. Given the trusted, verified and more secure nature of the .BANK and .INSURANCE gTLDs, any additional services that protect registrants and their respective customers are viewed as positive developments for the gTLDs. In advance of filing the RSEP with ICANN, fTLD provided a courtesy copy of the request to all Registrars that have executed fTLD's Registry Registrar Agreement for .BANK and/or .INSURANCE.

c. Were consultations with other constituency groups appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

Not applicable.

d. Were consultations with end users appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

fTLD did not deem end-user consultation necessary given its interaction with its Advisory Council which includes end users from the banking and insurance communities.

e. Who would endorse the introduction of this service? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

Registrars and their registrants with domain names that are concerned with identity theft and other malicious activities would endorse the introduction of the Service. See response to b. above.

f. Who would object the introduction of this service? What were(or would be) the nature and content of these consultations?:



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

To date, fTLD is unaware of anyone that has objected to the introduction of the Service in any of the other gTLDs. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that any objections would be raised since this Service is already being offered to all registrars as an optional, value-added service in those other gTLDs.

#### **Timeline**

Please describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed new registry service:

Following approval by the ICANN Board, fTLD intends to implement the Service within three (3) months, after consulting with Verisign, its registry backend provider, who has already successfully implemented this service in several other gTLDs as noted above.

### **Business Description**

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

The Extensible Provisioning Protocol ("EPP") specifies both client (registrar) and server (registry) status codes that are consistent with the intent to prevent registry changes (i.e., a Delete, Transfer and/or Update) that were not intended by the registrant. This means that today, a registrar may place a series of EPP client status codes on the domain name record for various purposes such as restricting access to making updates, transfers and deletes.

As previously described, the Service will allow registrars to offer server-level protection to the domain name and/or Name Server records for their registrants. The Service is designed to be a low volume/high value service that will be used in conjunction with a Registrar's proprietary security measures to bring a greater level of security to registrants' domain names and help mitigate the potential for domain name hijacking, inadvertent or unintended deletions, transfers and/or updates.

#### Fees:

The charge to registrars, to be invoiced directly by Verisign as the provider of the Service, is based on the market value of the Service. A tiered pricing model is expected with each tier having an annual fee based on per domain/host and the number of domain names to be placed on server status code(s).

Here is an example of potential pricing tiers:

Tier Number of Domain Names and/or Hosts Fee per Domain placed on Registry Lock per Month Name/Host per Month



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

- 1 1-49 domain names and/or hosts \$10.00
- 2 50-99 domain names and/or hosts \$7.00
- 3 100-499 domain names and/or hosts \$5.00
- 4 500-2,499 domain names and/or hosts \$4.00
- 5 >2,500 domain names and/or hosts To be negotiated

The Service is made up of two components both of which will be administered by Verisign in its capacity as fTLD's backend registry provider:

- 1. A registrar must provide Verisign with a list of the domain names to be placed on any/all of the server status codes. During the term of the service agreement, a Registrar may add domain names to be placed on any/all of the server status codes and/or remove domain names currently placed on any/all of the server status codes. Verisign will then authenticate that the registrar submitting the list of domain names to be placed on any/all of the server status codes is the registrar-of-record for such domain names.
- 2. If changes (including updates, deletes, transfers) are required on a domain name(s) placed on a server status code(s), Verisign will follow a secure, authenticated process which includes, among other things, a request from an authorized individual at the registrar (or Registry Operator) for Verisign to remove the specific registry status code(s), validation of the authorized individual by Verisign, removal of the specified server status code(s), completion by registrar (or Verisign, if Registry Operator requested) of the desired change(s), and a request from the authorized individual at the registrar (or Registry Operator) to reinstate the server status code(s) on the domain name(s). This process is designed to complement the automated transaction processing through the Shared Registration System using independent authentication by trusted registry experts.

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:

Verisign has demonstrated the ability to deliver scalable and reliable registry services. The lessons learned from the beta and commercial service for .COM, .NET and .NAME are being applied to the testing/scalability requirements for the commercial offering for .BANK and .INSURANCE, including the processes described above.

Please list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.:

Subsequent to the initial registration process, the provisioning protocols currently implemented will apply. RFC 4931

Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) Domain Name Mapping and RFC 4932 - Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) Host



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

**Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC** 

gTLD: .bank

Status: ICANN Review

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

Mapping will describe the EPP Statuses utilized in the Service. All RFC's that apply include:

RFC 4930 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)

RFC 4931 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) Domain Name Mapping

RFC 4932 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) Host Mapping

RFC 4934 Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) Transport over TCP

#### **Contractual Provisions**

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

No substantive contractual provisions will be impacted, other than the addition of the Service to Exhibits A of the .BANK and .INSURANCE Registry Agreements.

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the reporting of data to ICANN:

None.

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the Whois?:

None.

#### **Contract Amendments**

Please describe or provide the necessary contractual amendments for the proposed service:

The Service will be added to Exhibit A of the .BANK and .INSURANCE Registry Agreements.

### **Benefits of Service**

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

The Service is intended to meet the needs of registrars and their registrants who would like to receive the highest level of domain name and host record protection.

### Competition

Do you believe your proposed new Registry Service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.:

The Service would have no negative effects on competition. To the contrary, fTLD believes that this service will enhance the protection services currently offered in the market place, allow registrars to market a new services related to domain name and host protection, better enable registrars to differentiate their services and compete more effectively and give their clients or potential clients more choices.

How would you define the markets in which your proposed Registry Service would compete?:

The market is all current and future fTLD-approved registrars and registrants.

What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to your proposed Registry Service?:

The Registry Lock Service will complement existing protection services currently offered by registrars, which are described above, and will enable these registrars to enhance their service offerings.

Other gTLD's currently offer this service to their customers.

In view of your status as a registry operator, would the introduction of your proposed Registry Service potentially impair the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?:

No. Registrars may continue to develop their own protection services and may continue to offer such services with or without the proposed Registry Lock Service. The Registry Lock Service is intended to complement registrars' protection services.

Do you propose to work with a vendor or contractor to provide the proposed Registry Service? If so, what is the name of the vendor/contractor, and describe the nature of the services the vendor/contractor would provide.:



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

**Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC** 

gTLD: .bank

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

Verisign, as fTLD's backend registry provider, will provide this Service directly to fTLD's registrars and will be uniquely positioned to leverage their experience in providing this same service in the .COM, .NET, and .NAME gTLDs.

Have you communicated with any of the entities whose products or services might be affected by the introduction of your proposed Registry Service? If so, please describe the communications.:

fTLD has communicated with registrar that inquired about the Service and as described in (b) above. Once approved by ICANN, fTLD will alert its approved registrars to the availability of the Service.

Do you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of your proposed Registry Service? If so, please submit them with your application. (ICANN will keep the documents confidential).:

We have no documents to submit.

### Security and Stability

Does the proposed service alter the storage and input of Registry Data?:

No.

Please explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of reponses to Internet servers or end systems:

The Service will have no impact on throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of the responses to Internet servers or end systems.

Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service, and if so, how do you intend to address those concerns?:

No.

#### Other Issues

Are there any Intellectual Property considerations raised by the Proposed Service:



Ticket ID: V9A0Y-2B2B4

**Registry Name: fTLD Registry Services LLC** 

gTLD: .bank

Status: ICANN Review

Status Date: 2016-03-17 14:18:50 Print Date: 2016-03-17 14:19:10

fTLD is not aware of any intellectual property considerations.

Does the proposed service contain intellectual property exclusive to your gTLD registry?:

(1) Trademark or similar rights may exist or arise with respect to trade names or terminology used in connection with the proposed service. (2) Copyright protection may exist or arise in connection with code written or materials created in connection with the proposed service. (3) Certain information or processes related to the service may be confidential to Verisign and/or subject to trade secret protection. (4) fTLD is not aware of the issuance of any patents by any party with respect to the service.

List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:

fTLD intends to include industry standard disclaimers, such as a disclaimer of all warranties, in the service agreement.

Any other relevant information to include with this request:

None.