



## Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) Request

April 5, 2022

### Registry Operator

Knock Knock WHOIS There, LLC

### Request Details

Case Number: 01119675

This Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) request form should be submitted for review by ICANN org when a registry operator is adding, modifying, or removing a Registry Service for a TLD or group of TLDs.

The RSEP Process webpage provides additional information about the process and lists RSEP requests that have been reviewed and/or approved by ICANN org. If you are proposing a service that was previously approved, we encourage you to respond similarly to the most recently approved request(s) to facilitate ICANN org's review.

Certain known Registry Services are identified in the Naming Services portal (NSp) case type list under "RSEP Fast Track" (example: "RSEP Fast Track – BTAPPA"). If you would like to submit a request for one of these services, please exit this case and select the specific Fast Track case type. Unless the service is identified under RSEP Fast Track, all other RSEP requests should be submitted through this form.

## Helpful Tips

- Click the "Save" button to save your work. This will allow you to return to the request at a later time and will not submit the request.
- You may print or save your request as a PDF by clicking the printer icon in the upper right corner. You must click "Save" at least once in order to print the request.
- Click the "Submit" button to submit your completed request to ICANN org.
- Complete the information requested below. All fields marked with an asterisk (\*) are required. If not applicable, respond with "N/A."

## 1. PROPOSED SERVICE DESCRIPTION

### 1.1. Name of proposed service.

Removal of searchable whois for .blog

### 1.2. Provide a general description of the proposed service including the impact to external users and how it will be offered.

Searchable Whois is a service which offers searchability capabilities on the Directory Services and is currently offered by the registry for the .blog TLD. The .blog TLD has no searchable Whois users or queries. Therefore, the registry would like to remove the searchable Whois from the Exhibit A (Approved Services) of the Registry Agreement.

### 1.3. Provide a technical description of the proposed service.

We are proposing that the requirement to operate a searchable WHOIS service be removed from the following tld .blog as per the registry agreement. We note that operating a searchable WHOIS service is not mandatory for the .blog registry and will continue to comply with all other WHOIS requirements set forth in the Registry Agreement.

### 1.4. If this proposed service has already been approved by ICANN org, identify and provide a link to the RSEP request for the same service that was most recently approved.

None

### 1.5. Describe the benefits of the proposed service and who would benefit from the proposed service.

The proposed service removal will optimise the efficiency of the .blog TLD and the registry.

1.6. Describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed service.

The .blog Registry would like to implement the service immediately after approval by ICANN.

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

1.8. If the proposed service adds or modifies Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) languages or scripts that have already been approved in another RSEP request or are considered pre-approved by ICANN org, provide (a) a reference to the RSEP request, TLD(s), and IDN table(s) that were already approved or (b) a link to the pre-approved Reference Label Generation Rules (LGR). Otherwise, indicate “not applicable.”

None

The most current IDN requirements will be used to evaluate a submitted table.

## 2. SECURITY AND STABILITY

2.1. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the life cycle of domain names?

The removal of the proposed service will not have any effect on the life cycle of domain names.

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

The removal of the proposed service has no effect on the storage and input of Registry Data

2.3. 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 not affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems.

2.4. Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service? If so, identify the concerns and describe how you intend to address those concerns.

None

2.5. Describe the quality assurance plan and/or testing of the proposed service prior to deployment.

None

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

None

### 3. COMPETITION

3.1. Do you believe the proposed service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.

None

3.2. How would you define the markets in which the proposed service would compete?

None

3.3. What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to the proposed service?

None

3.4. In view of your status as a Registry Operator, would the introduction of the proposed service potentially affect the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?

The introduction of the proposed registry service will not affect the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete.

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

None

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

None

3.7. If you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of the proposed service, attach them below. ICANN will keep the documents confidential.

## 4. CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS

4.1. List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the proposed service. This includes, but is not limited to, Consensus Policies, previously approved amendments or services, Reserved Names, and Rights Protection Mechanisms.

Exhibit A, Approved Services, Section 3 Searchable Whois of the ICANN Registry Agreement.

4.2. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the reporting of data to ICANN?

There will be no change in the reporting of data to ICANN. Even though the searchable WHOIS is currently offered, it is not in use.

4.3. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS)?\*

The searchability capabilities of WHOIS service will no longer be offered by the .blog TLD. The .blog TLD supports the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) which provides searchability capabilities .

4.4. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the price of a domain name registration?

None

4.5. Will the proposed service result in a change to a Material Subcontracting Arrangement (MSA) as defined by the Registry Agreement? If so, identify and describe the change. Please note that a change to an MSA requires consent from ICANN org through the MSA change request process. The RSEP request must be approved prior to submitting the MSA change request.

None

## 5. AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE

5.1. A Registry Agreement (RA) amendment is required when the proposed service: (i) contradicts existing provisions in the RA or (ii) is not contemplated in the RA and, therefore, needs to be added to Exhibit A of the RA and/or as an appropriate addendum/appendix. If applicable, provide draft language (or a link to previously approved RA amendment language) describing the service to be used in an RA amendment if the proposed service is approved. If an RA amendment is not applicable, respond with “N/A” and provide a complete response to question 5.2.\*

For examples or for IDN services, you may refer to the webpage for standard RA template amendments for commonly requested Registry Services.

The .blog Registry would like to amend Exhibit A of the Agreement by deleting section 3

5.2. If the proposed service is permissible under an existing provision in the Registry Agreement, identify the provision and provide rationale. If not applicable, respond with “N/A” and provide a complete response to question 5.1.

Searchable Whois is specified in Specification 4, Section 1.10 Searchability and Exhibit A, Approved Services, Section 3 of the ICANN Registry Agreement.

## 6. CONSULTATION

6.1. ICANN org encourages you to set up a consultation call through your Engagement Manager prior to submitting this RSEP request. This is to help ensure that necessary information is assembled ahead of time.

Identify if and when you had a consultation call with ICANN org. If you did not request a consultation call, provide rationale.

None

6.2. Describe your consultations with the community, experts, and/or others. This can include, but is not limited to, the relevant community for a sponsored or community TLD, registrars or the registrar constituency, end users and/or registrants, or other constituency groups. What were the quantity, nature, and results of the consultations? How will the proposed service impact these groups? Which groups support or oppose this proposed service?

None

## 7. OTHER

7.1. Would there be any intellectual property impact or considerations raised by the proposed service?

None

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

None

7.3. Provide any other relevant information to include with the request. If none, respond with "N/A."

None

7.4. If additional information should be considered, attach one or more file(s) below.

**Affected TLDs**

<b>Current Registry Operator</b>	<b>Top Level Domain</b>	<b>Registry Agreement Date</b>
Knock Knock WHOIS There, LLC	blog	2015-05-14