



Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) Request

August 29, 2023

Registry Operator

AmFam, Inc.

Request Details

Case Number: 01247339

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.

1. PROPOSED SERVICE DESCRIPTION

1.1. Name of proposed service.

Removal of searchable whois for the .amfam and .americanfamily TLDs.

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 RDDS and is currently offered by the registry for the .amfam and .americanfamily TLDs. The .amfam and .americanfamily TLDs have no searchable whois users or queries. Therefore, the registry would like to remove searchable whois from Exhibit A (Approved Services) of the Registry Agreements.

1.3. Provide a technical description of the proposed service.

Amfam's technical service provider Verisign offers searchable WHOIS services on a web-based Directory Service. We are proposing to remove this service in its entirety.

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.

The same request for a .brand TLD was recently approved for .kpmg (see <https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/kpmg/kpmg-amend-1-pdf-31-08-2022-en.pdf>).

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

The proposed service removal will optimize the efficiency of the .amfam and .americanfamily registries. It will benefit internet users by preventing abuse by any bad actors that use the service to harvest domain name information for illicit purposes.

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

We will remove the searchable WHOIS as soon as it is approved 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.”

N/A

2. SECURITY AND STABILITY

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

None

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

No

2.3. Explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems.

It 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.

No

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

The service will be removed, so there is no service to implement quality assurance or testing for.

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

There are none on the service's removal that we are aware of.

3. COMPETITION

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

No

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

This is not applicable, because the service is being removed so there is no market.

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

This is not applicable, because the service is being removed so there is no market.

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?

This is not applicable, because the service is being removed.

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.

We will work with our registry service provider Verisign to remove the service.

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.

This is not applicable, because the service is being removed.

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.

Section 3 of Exhibit A of the Registry Agreements.

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

None

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

None

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.

No

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.

Section 3 of Exhibit A of the Registry Agreements should be deleted in its entirety.

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.

The searchable WHOIS service was permissible under Section 3 of Exhibit A of the Registry Agreements. If we remove that section from the Registry Agreements, it is not required to be provided and so can be removed under the remaining Registry Agreements.

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.

We discussed the RSEP process with Lisa Carter on 1/4/23. We informed Lisa of the intent to submit this RSEP on 8/29/23.

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?

We have reviewed previously-approved RSEP requests to remove searchable WHOIS services.

7. OTHER

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

No

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

No

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

N/A

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

Affected TLDs

Current Registry Operator	Top Level Domain	Registry Agreement Date
AmFam, Inc.	.americanfamily	2015-07-23
AmFam, Inc.	.amfam	2015-07-23