Proposed Service

Name of Proposed Service:

non-two-letter-two-character-domains

Technical description of Proposed Service:

Registration of non-two-letter two-character domains, which are domains that are composed by two characters that are not letters or by two characters where only one of the character is a letter, provided they are valid according to RFC 2181 and all other applicable RFCs, STDs and BCPs. Examples of newly allowed domains: a1.globo, 1a.globo, 11.globo.

Counter examples of what wouldn't be allowed by this service: --.globo, -a.globo,a-.globo, -1.globo,1-.globo, due to RFC violations (a valid DNS label doesn't start or end with an hyphen). These are not addressed in this procedure since technical compliance will be still be required from registry operator.

Consultation

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

The process that developed AGB, the Applicant Guide Book, was one of the most extensive in ICANN history, taking years of development in may cross-constituency workgroups. This process generated a registry agreement where non-two-letter-two-characters domains were allowed.

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

Registry is not a sponsored TLD.

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

Since registry is a brand-kind TLD where only Globo media group organizations are eligible to register domains, and that will likely be serviced by a single or a few registrars, we found that consultations with Registrar SG were not in order, although we don't imagine any reason for them to object.

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

Due to lack of brand-type TLDs affiliated with constituency groups we have not consulted any of these at this time, but we don't imagine any reason for any constituency group to object.

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

Organizations eligible to .globo, the ones part of the Globo media group, are all in favor of this service.

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

Other gTLD registries were informally consulted and showed no issues with this service. Holiday season prevented getting formal legal approval of those organizations to be on record for those endorsements, but such can be provided upon request.

We consider though that since this was exactly the output of community process resulting in the applicant guidebook that this service is the result of a broad multi-year cross-constituency consultation process.
f. Who would object the introduction of this service? What were (or would be) the nature and content of these consultations?

*Competing media groups and online services that have not applied to gTLDs in the 2012 round could object trying to prevent the ones that did apply, including the .globo registry, from using product names that this service would enable.*

**Timeline**

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

*After service approval, one week will be required to implement such change into the registry system. After the change is implemented it would become immediately available for new registrations.*

**Business Description**

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

*Registration of those non-two-letter two-character domains will be provided through all registration channels currently providing registration services of .globo domains, and will be offered to all registrants of .globo domains, the companies of the Globo media group.*

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:

*Implementation changes to registry system will be first deployed at internal development system. Once it passes QA on this system, it will be deployed to externally available OT&E system. Once it pass QA on OT&E system it will be deployed to production system at the next maintenance window.*

Please list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.:
Applicant Guide Book version 4 June 2012 provided a draft registry agreement that only blocked two-letter two-character domains, like all previous revisions of it we could find. From this AGB version to final registry agreement the expression "two-letter" was changed to "two-character", causing the limitation to be addressed with this RSEP.

ISO 3166-1:2006 represents countries with either two-letter, three-letter or three-digit codes, corroboring AGB referencing two-letter labels as country codes, not non-two-letter two-character labels.

Contractual Provisions

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

Specification 5 - “Schedule of Reserved Names” Paragraph 2.

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

Reported transactions that would not include two-character domains now would included non-two-letter two-character domains.

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

None. WHOIS could already show two-character domains for two-letter domains with approval of relevant authorities.

Contract Amendments

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

Paragraph 2 would of Spec 5 would now read:

“2. Two-letter labels. All two-letter ASCII labels shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the
second level within the TLD. Such labels may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator, provided that such two-character label strings may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code manager of the string as specified in the ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 standard. The Registry Operator may also propose the release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes, subject to approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such labels that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

Benefits of Service

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:

Media services that are already known for a letter-digit combination like “f1” could be properly mapped to the domain name space. Future media services with such names could be envisioned and be made available to the public.

Competition

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

As competing media groups that have applied for a gTLD during 2012 Round could also request similar measures for the names of their services, we don’t see negative effects on competition.

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

Portuguese-speaking countries and regions.

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

.tel registry initially had a block on two digits domains that were later lifted through registry services changes and now provides such services.

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?:

Not if they are also allowed similar changes, which we would think as fair and support such changes.

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.: The operation of the .globo registry is outsourced to NIC.br, and this proposed registry service would be performed by the same contractor (NIC.br) of the already in place registry services.

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.: No, the possible affected parties like recursive DNS operators already answer such non-two-letter two-character second-level DNS labels on other TLDs.

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).:

Security and Stability

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

No. Two-character domains were already a possibility for approved two-letter domains.

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

According to NIC.br, technical service provider for the .globo registry, it won’t affect response time, consistency or coherence on both 5 critical registry services and non-critical registry interfaces. The existence of two-character second-level DNS labels on other TLDs also indicate no effect on performance and integrity of Internet servers and end systems.

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

No concerns are known to have been raised. Some specific non-two-letter two-character labels might not be delegated due to namespace collisions or other SSR issues, but the proposed changes do not entitle such labels on the .globo registry.

Other Issues

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

Marks with two-characters were already eligible to inclusion in the Trademark Clearing House and also eligible to Rights Protection Mechanisms such as UDRP, URS and TM-PDDRP, so we found no IP-related considerations to apply.

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

No. We hereby dedicate all text filed within this RSEP to CC0 1.0 Public Domain Dedication license.

List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:
Some non-two-letter two-character, notably the two-digit ones, might not be correctly understood as valid hostnames by some applications. It's up to registrant and users of registrant-provided service to verify feasibility of such uses.

Any other relevant information to include with this request: