Proposed Service

Name of Proposed Service:

Release and allocation of previously-reserved IANA strings to second- and higher-level .POST sTLD registrations

Technical description of Proposed Service:

Article III, Section 3.1(d)(C) of the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement currently states the following:

Sponsor shall reserve, and not allow Registry Operator to register any TLD strings (i) appearing on the list of reserved TLD strings attached as Appendix 6 hereto or (ii) located at http://data.iana.org/TLD/tlds-alpha-by-domain.txt for initial (i.e., other than renewal) registration at the second level within the TLD without the express consent of the relevant governments.

The .post Sponsored Community is made up of a number of registrant groups. In order to help identify the community of potential registrants, facilitate the location of qualified registrants within the .post domain, ensure the establishment of the .post brand value and guarantee trust and predictability for the domain structure, the UPU .post policy development group (UPU E-Services Group) proposed in the .post Domain Management Policy to utilize 4 (four) IANA domain strings in second- and higher-level .post registrations, namely “.gov” for UPU member country governments, “.com” for postal commercial entities, “.edu” for postal educational institutions and “.org” for other postal community-based associations and organizations (without prejudice to the possibility to refer to and use other IANA domain strings as the .post Domain Management Policy evolves over time).

It may also be noted that the use of two-letter country codes in .post domain names (for instance, alongside the use of the “gov” string requested herein) is already authorized by the sponsorship agreement between ICANN and the UPU and will be further regulated by the .post Domain Management Policy. Nevertheless, direct second-level registration and use of “[two-letter country code].post” domain names by registrants would not be allowed (i.e., it would continue to be reserved by the Sponsor). Instead, the proposed naming structures would provide for the use, by UPU member country governments and their designated operators, of two-letter country codes only in third-level registrations, as per the current naming conventions and restrictions attached hereto.

Moreover, the proposed service requested herein follows recent ICANN developments and recommendations concerning the use of previously-reserved gTLD strings, particularly the Final Report of the Reserved Names Working Group (GNSO New TLDs Committee) of 23 May 2007, as well as the current version of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (30 May 2011), in which such gTLD string second- or higher-level registration restrictions no longer exist (see section 2.6 of the Draft New gTLD Registry Agreement and its Specification 5 - “Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries”).
In this regard, the aforementioned GNSO reported clearly stated, as the main guiding principles for its recommendation, that 1) "TLD1.TLD2 (e.g., ".com.travel") has been identified as not being a risk to the security and stability of the DNS by an expert technical panel (http://www.icann.org/registries/rsep/RSTEP-GNR-proposal-review-team-report.pdf); that 2) "evidence has not been presented to justify that user confusion would exist as a result of TLD1.TLD2 with the addition of new gTLDs"; and that 3) "there is market evidence to indicate that TLD1.TLD2 has not resulted in user confusion."

Consequently, the UPU hereby requests that the current restriction pertaining to registration of previously-reserved IANA domain strings at the second level within the TLD be removed from the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement, in order to allow for fulfillment of the aforementioned objectives as defined by the UPU .post Domain Management Policy (see attached extract - ".post domain naming conventions and restrictions").

Consultation

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

See the considerations below.

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

The .post policy development process is overseen by the UPU Postal Operations Council and the UPU Council of Administration. Both of these bodies, made up of UPU member countries and representatives of the postal sector, have deliberated over the last 18 months to define the .post Domain Management Policy. Consultations within the .post Sponsored Community took place with UPU member country governments, regulators, postal operators and representatives of the private sector via the UPU Consultative Committee.

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

The UPU did not consider that any feedback for this proposed Registry Service from gTLD registrars would be necessary, considering that the .POST sTLD is as yet not registered in IANA's root servers; therefore, as of this moment there are no .POST domain names available for registration or being processed by registrars.

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

The UPU did not consider that consultations with other constituency groups would be necessary.

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

Considering that .POST end users shall be those entities strictly defined as part of the sponsored community (no individual, physical persons are a part thereof), the results of such consultations is summarized above.

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

This proposal has already been endorsed by representatives from the sponsored community. Moreover, based on the universally supportive feedback received from governments, designated operators and the postal sector in general (through the UPU's Consultative Committee); on the fact that the aforementioned restrictions are no longer applied or supported by the wider ICANN community (including the recently-approved new gTLD process); and on the assessment that they would not impact registry or registrar operations under the .POST sTLD, the UPU does not anticipate any objections to the introduction of this service.

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

Based on the universally supportive feedback received from governments, designated operators and the postal sector in
general (through the UPU's Consultative Committee), on the fact that the aforementioned restrictions are no longer applied or
supported by the wider ICANN community (including the recently-approved new gTLD process); and on the assessment that
they would not impact registry or registrar operations under the .POST sTLD, the UPU does not anticipate any objections to
the introduction of this service.

Timeline

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

This registry service is expected to be included with the launch of the .post sTLD, in accordance with the relevant provisions
contained in Appendix S of the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement.

Business Description

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

The proposed service will be offered during phase 2 (registrations for the .post domain) as described in the revised .post
Start-Up Plan to be communicated to ICANN by the UPU, in accordance with the relevant provisions contained in Appendix S
of the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement. At this time, the .post sTLD will start accepting third-level registrations for
"gov.[2-letter country code].post", "[requested string].com.post", "[requested string].org.post" and "[requested
string].edu.post", based upon the eligibility criteria for each of the concerned registrant groups within the .post sponsored
community.

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:
The UPU shall, through its Registry Operator, undertake all necessary testing activities before implementing the Proposed Service alongside the launch of the .POST sTLD.

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

Not applicable.

Contractual Provisions

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

The main provision impacted by the proposed amendment is Article III, Section 3.1(d)(C) of the .POST Sponsored TLD Agreement (see "Contract Amendments").

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

As already envisaged in the .POST Sponsored TLD Agreement, registered second- AND third-level .POST domains, including those resulting from the Proposed Service, will be shown in the relevant data reports to ICANN.

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

As already envisaged in the .POST Sponsored TLD Agreement, registered second- AND third-level .POST domains,
including those resulting from the Proposed Service, will form part of the relevant WHOIS data for registered .POST domains.

Contract Amendments

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

ICANN and the UPU agree that the following modification is made to the following provision contained in the .POST Sponsorship Agreement:

Article III, Section 3.1(d)(C) of the .POST Sponsored TLD Agreement

[Old Text]

Sponsor shall reserve, and not allow Registry Operator to register any TLD strings (i) appearing on the list of reserved TLD strings attached as Appendix 6 hereto or (ii) located at http://data.iana.org/TLD/tlds-alpha-by-domain.txt for initial (i.e., other than renewal) registration at the second level within the TLD without the express consent of the relevant governments.

[New Text]

Unless otherwise authorized under the terms of the Agreement and without prejudice to any additional registration restrictions defined by the Sponsor in accordance with the Appendices to this Agreement, Sponsor shall reserve, and not allow Registry Operator to register, any TLD strings appearing on the list of reserved TLD strings attached as Appendix 6 hereto.

Benefits of Service

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:

The proposed service will allow for proper differentiation and segmentation of entities within the .post Sponsored Community, thereby enhancing predictability and trust in the .POST domain space. The proposed service should also minimize or remove confusion amongst Internet users by better enabling the identification and location of .POST community resources. The establishment of a specific hierarchy and naming convention for the proposed registrant groups should, in this regard, create
additional opportunities for new registrants, and better meet their needs in terms of increased visibility within the .POST community. Moreover, the proposed service will allow the relevant registrant groups to be defined as entities with common and well-defined needs and interests which are clearly distinguishable from those of the other registrant groups outlined in the .POST Sponsored Community.

Competition

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

The proposed service should enhance competition as it creates opportunities for new registrants to be attracted to and be clearly recognized as a distinct part of the .POST Sponsored Community.

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

The UPU’s proposed Registry Service may compete with other TLDs internationally, but in any case it remains uniquely focused on the .POST sponsored community as defined in the .POST Charter and the .POST Domain Management Policy.

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

The proposed Registry Service is similar in nature to many of the ccTLDs who already use gTLD strings to add value to the structure of the DNS. It should be noted that other sTLDs such as .aero use this segmentation approach as well.

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. The .post registry specifically serves the needs of the .POST Sponsored Community, and there are no other companies
that provide similar products or services to those proposed by the .POST registry.

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 proposed service shall be provided in accordance with the Start-Up Plan defined for the .POST sTLD, through the technical partners already referred to in the .POST sTLD agreement, in particular the Registry Operator. Without prejudice to the possibilities defined in the relevant UPU procurement and financial regulations, no additional vendors or contractors are anticipated for provision of the proposed service.

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.: 

Not applicable.

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).:

No.

Security and Stability

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

No, the proposed service would not alter the storage and input of Registry Data, especially considering that the .POST sTLD is still under implementation (i.e., not yet operational). Therefore, no changes in server configurations, registry operations and systems or registrars are anticipated.
Please explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems:

The UPU anticipates no impacts on the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of 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?:

The UPU is not aware of any technical concerns about the proposed service.

Other Issues

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

The UPU believes that the resolution of any intellectual property concerns or issues that might be raised by the Proposed Service are already properly addressed through established policies and mechanisms such as the UDRP.

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

No.

List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:
There are no disclaimers to be provided.

Any other relevant information to include with this request:

None.
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## .post domain naming conventions and restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrant group</th>
<th>Domain type</th>
<th>Spelling convention</th>
<th>Naming examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The UPU and its permanent bodies</td>
<td>Second-level domain</td>
<td>.post</td>
<td>upu.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poc.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 UPU member countries</td>
<td>Third-level domain</td>
<td>&lt;2-letter code&gt;.post or gov.&lt;2-letter code&gt;.post</td>
<td>ministryofpostalaffairs.ch.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prc.us.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gov.it.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 DOs</td>
<td>Second- or third-level domain</td>
<td>.post or &lt;2-letter code&gt;.post</td>
<td>swisspost.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.com.post</td>
<td>swisspost.ch.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>swisspost.com.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Restricted Unions</td>
<td>Second-level domain</td>
<td>.post</td>
<td>restrictedunion.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appu.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Postal operators other than DOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 through 9 Entities supporting the provision of postal services (comprising communications, logistics, payment, suppliers and technology entities)</td>
<td>Third-level domain</td>
<td>com.post</td>
<td>companyname.com.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Postal educational entities</td>
<td>Third-level domain</td>
<td>edu.post</td>
<td>institutionname.edu.post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Postal communities</td>
<td>Third-level domain</td>
<td>org.post</td>
<td>communityname.org.post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>