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A short introduction

- Who am I?
  - Hilde Thunem, managing director of Norid

- What is Norid?
  - The registry for .no

- What is the background of this presentation?
  - A model for showing consequences of the different domain name policy (first created in 2000)
  - Collected data from different country code top level registries during the last six years
    - confirm the assumptions made when creating the model
    - see whether there were global patterns regarding which domain name policies were the most popular
Categorizing policies

- Two central aspects
- Requirements for the applicant
  - Document a right to the name
  - Local presence in the area of the ccTLD
  - Be an organization
- Number of domains allowed per applicant
  - Limited/Unlimited
The upper categories

- Priority given to preventing domain registrations by applicants who have no rights to the name
- The applicant must document a right to the word he wants to register
- Lower potential for conflicts, but restricted ability for applicants to freely choose their domains
Strictly regulated policies

- Strict requirements and limited number of domain names
- Allows flexibility in the types of documentation that are accepted
- Few applications per applicant – can be handled by a small registry
- May be a problem for those with many trademarks
Process intensive policies (Bureaucracy)

- Strict requirements, but the applicant can get as many domains as he can document rights to
- Must limit the types of documentation that can be used
  - Evaluation outside registry?
- Hard to automate, large registry needed
The lower categories

- Freedom of choice for the applicant have higher priority than the prevention of illicit registration

- No “prescreening” of applicants by requiring documentation; whoever applies first gets the name

- Higher potential for conflict, but greater flexibility for the applicant
Policies regulated by quota

- No documentation required, but limited number of domain names allowed
- Some flexibility, but limits warehousing and speculation somewhat
- Scales well, small registry possible
- May be a problem for those with many trademarks
Unregulated policies

- No documentation required, unlimited number of domain names allowed
- Scale well, small registry possible
- If no requirements are set for the applicant
  - Full flexibility
  - Difficult to predict who holds the different domains
- Domain warehousing may be a problem
Handling of conflicts

- Conflicts regarding the right to a domain name may arise under *all* domain name policy models.

- Even if the registry evaluates documentation before the registration, final responsibility for the choice of domain name resides with the applicant.
Handling of conflicts

- Usual conflict procedure of most registries is to inform the parties how to get in touch with one another, but otherwise refrain from any involvement in the conflict.

- Some conflict solution mechanisms:
  - Court system – time and resource consuming
  - Alternative dispute resolution

- NB! Even under the unregulated policies, conflicts are few in comparison with the number of names registered.
So, is there a perfect policy?
Changing categories

- Unfortunately there is no “Perfect Policy” that will satisfy all needs. All categories have their advantages and disadvantages.

- Model is chosen depending on what the local Internet community judges to be the most important criteria:
  - Strict or weak requirements: Desire to stop illicit registrations vs. freedom of choice for applicant
  - Limit on number of domains: Desire to restrict warehousing vs. flexibility for applicant
Changing categories

- One-way change
- Liberalizing a restrictive policy is easy, going back again and restricting a liberal policy is very hard
- Make sure that the LIC understands the consequences

Diagram:
- More to less categories
- Strict to weak requirements for applicants
- Limited to unlimited number of domain names
- Freedom of choice and potential for conflict
Typical changes

- Removing the limit on the number of domain names per applicant (.fi)
- Decreasing the requirements for the applicant (.no and later .fi)
- Or doing both at once (.se)
Gathering data on the policies of other ccTLDs

- Recording if there is a limit on the number of domain names per applicant (left or right)

- Recording requirements for the applicant
  - Must document some kind of right to the name?
  - Must have local presence?
  - Must be organization?

- The more requirements the higher the policy is placed on the vertical axis – all policies that requires documentation ends in upper half
Classification of domain name policies
A summary of the “mapping”

- General move towards more liberalized domain name policies: While many once started here, few of the respondents are currently in the *strictly regulated* category.

- Most respondents prefer a domain name policy with no limits on the number of names an applicant may hold.

- While the majority of the respondents allows an unlimited number of domains per applicant, the degree of requirements for the applicant varies:
  - Some requires the applicant to document rights to the domain name (*bureaucracy* category).
  - Majority in the *unregulated* category – do not require any documentation of rights. Some require either a local presence, or that the applicant is an organization (or both), hence the spreading within the category.
Does the choice of policy affect the growth of the ccTLD?
Changing .no

- Before feb 2001:
  - Applicant requirements
    - document right to the name
    - organization
    - in Norway
  - One domain name per applicant

- Need for more names and fewer requirements

- After feb 2001:
  - Applicant requirements
    - organization
    - in Norway
  - 15 domain names per applicant (increased to 20 when introducing IDNs)
Growth in .no

1. Adding universities
2. Introducing registrars
3. Liberalizing the policy (feb 2001)
4. Introducing IDNs
Effect on growth

- General assumption: a liberal policy increases growth in your TLD...

- Results from .no: appears to be no permanent effect on the growthrate caused by the liberalization

- Why?
  - Because the liberalization didn’t increase the group of potential domain name holders? (maybe allowing individuals or holders from outside the country would have a different effect)
  - Because Norway is weird? One case is to little to build a theory upon

- Possible conclusion: The general assumption about growth may be right, but should possibly be approached with some caution
Future study....

- Collecting historic data in order to record the ”migration pattern”
Where are you?

- The name of the TLD you manage
- Is there a limit on the number of domain names that a registrant may have under our TLD? If so, what is the limit?
- Do you require the registrant to document some kind of right to the domain name (e.g. requiring the domain to be a trade name, a trademark, the organization name etc.)
- Do you require the registrant to be
  - Situated in the country of the TLD?
  - A registered organization?
- How did your policy look in the past?
More information

- Hilde.Thunem@uninett.no
- norid.no/regelverk/rammer/regelverksmodeller.en.html