Proposed Service

Name of Proposed Service:

RSEP for Release of Country/Territory Names

Technical description of Proposed Service:

Pursuant to Section 4 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement between ICANN and Sharp Corporation (also referred to as "Registry Operator" below), we request the release of country and territory names within .SHARP. This request includes all such names that appear on the following lists:

4.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union;

4.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and


Consultation

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

Sharp Corporation is a Registry Operator of a .BRAND TLD and is thus one of the participants of the community of .BRAND Registry Operators and applicants. The Registry Operator has carried out consultations with other .BRAND registry operators and applicants in Japan about the release of country and territory names at the second level and has arrived to a conclusion that there is demand for the introduction of these names both for the registry operators as providers and for the end users who will benefit from using geo-localized content that is easy to navigate to and that is protected by the enhanced security measures .BRAND registry operators have in place for the maintenance of integrity and stability of their online space.

The Registry Operator has also consulted its backend registry services provider. Furthermore, it has undertaken extensive research that took into consideration the historical availability of country and territory names at the second level of the so-called "legacy" and sponsored TLDs, GAC discussions on the matter (including March 27, 2014 Singapore Communiqué that specifically states that GAC sees no major concerns in regards to brand owners applying for an approval of the release of country and territory names or 2-letter and character codes), as well as the previously submitted similar RSEP requests for the release of country and territory names and public comments to them.
The RSEP request made by NeuStar, Inc. on August 21, 2014 refers to broad consultations that Brand Registry Group (BRG), a body that represents the interests of .BRAND TLDs, carried out with GAC and ICANN in relation to the usage of country and territory names at the second level. The request by NeuStar, Inc. received comments, all of which were in support of the release, and that stated that such introduction would improve user experience, would not cause any known confusion, but, contrarily, would be fully in accordance with the objectives of the new gTLD program that are consumer trust, choice and competition in the global context. The Registry Operator is making this request for the release of country and territory names at the second level as an endorsement of the views publicized in the previous RSEP requests of the same nature and the comments to them.

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

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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?:

.SHARP is intended as a closed .BRAND Registry with the Registry Operator, its Affiliates and Trademark Licensees acting as the registrants for all country and territory names labels within .SHARP. We trust that the end-users will benefit from being able to navigate to these easily distinguishable and trusted domain names and take advantage of their localized content. Specifically, it is hard to imagine that any other type of naming at the second level could be a more potent way to describe, for instance, the Registry Operator's services in France than france.BRAND. The naming clearly serves its purpose and fulfills the expectation of the user.

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

Not Applicable
The Registry Operator, its Affiliates and partners fully endorse the introduction of this service. It is believed that the end-users, the existing and potential customers of the Registry Operator, will highly benefit from the ability to effectively use the localized content associated with the geographic .BRAND domain names. It will also serve to increase the trustability of similar domain names by the other .BRAND Registry operators and thus enrich the experience by the end-users.

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

We are not aware of any specific objections from organizations or individuals but are fully prepared to engage in dialogue should any GAC Representative or other Government Authority raise concerns about their country or territory name being released in .SHARP in response to this RSEP request and in accordance with a process specifically developed for such purpose.

Timeline

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

Immediate

Business Description

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

The Registry Operator will operate its .SHARP as a .BRAND Registry following the requirements specified in Specification 13 of the Registry Agreement. Only the Registry Operator, its Affiliates or its Trademark Licensees may retain the ability to register domain names under .SHARP incorporating country and territory names at the second level. Such names would be used to provide localized content related to the Registry Operator’s business.

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:

Not Applicable

Please list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.:
ICANN Registry Request Service
Ticket ID: J3N3C-8M6O4
Registry Name: Sharp Corporation
gTLD: .sharp
Status: ICANN Review
Status Date: 2016-04-29 13:47:58
Print Date: 2016-04-29 13:48:08

Not Applicable

Contractual Provisions

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

Specification 5, Section 4:
"4. Country and Territory Names. The country and territory names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) contained in the following internationally recognized lists shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at All Levels:
   o 4.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union;
   o 4.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and
provided, that the reservation of specific country and territory names (including their IDN variants according to the registry operator IDN registration policy, where applicable) may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s). Registry Operator must not activate such names in the DNS; provided, that Registry Operator may propose the release of these reservations, subject to review by ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee and approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names 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."

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 proposed release of country and territory names is anticipated in Specification 5, Section 4 of the Registry Agreement. According to Specification 5, Section 4 the release of country and territory names may be approved by ICANN subject to review by ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). The Registry Operator proposes that Exhibit A of the .SHARP Registry would be amended to read:

"Notwithstanding Section 4 of Specification 5 of the Agreement, Registry Operator may offer registrations for and activate in the DNS the country and territory names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) contained in the following internationally recognized lists:

- the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union;

Benefits of Service

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:

The introduction of this service will enable the Registry Operator to appropriately allocate its content under the domain names that are easy to understand and remember and that fulfill the expectations of the end-users.

Competition

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

We trust that since the proposed service has a capacity to increase consumer choice and provide end-users with assurance, it will have a positive effect on competition and its enhancement.

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

The target would be those markets where the Registry Operator is engaged in commercial and otherwise activities.

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

All pre-2010 registries are already permitted to use country and territory names.

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.

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.:  

Yes. Our registry services provider, GMO Registry, will provide the technical ability to register these names.

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.:  

Yes. We communicated with GMO Registry, our registry services provider. They provide all technical backend services associated with the .SHARP and would be directly responsible for implementing the release of country and territory names within .SHARP.

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):  

Not Applicable

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 responses to Internet servers or end systems:

The proposed service will have no effect.

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

No technical concerns have been raised.

Other Issues

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

The proposal does not increase any risk of intellectual property infringement. On the contrary, as a BRAND registry, .SHARP will provide a space virtually free from all risk of intellectual property infringement as Sharp Corporation will be in full control of registrations and content for the TLD.

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

No

List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:

None

Any other relevant information to include with this request:

Not Applicable