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.JP applies local presence policy (1/2)

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} level JP domain names (EXAMPLE.JP)
  – A registrant must be individual, group, or organization which has a permanent postal address in Japan.
  – With the address, a registrant must receive all the notices sent by JPRS and the dispute resolution providers.
.JP applies local presence policy (2/2)

• Organizational/Geographic Type JP domain names (EXAMPLE.CO.JP)
  – Local presence requirements per organizational type are defined.
  – Example:
    • CO.JP: Companies ("kaisha") having an official corporate registration in Japan.
    • OR.JP: Judicial persons (other than "kaisha") established under the laws of Japan.
Aim of the policy

• To secure opportunity to register JP domain names for Japanese Internet users
  – JP domain name is meant to be the interest of the Internet community in Japan.
  – Squatters and unnecessary defensive registrations from abroad should be avoided.

• To make clear the value of .JP as a ccTLD
  – By building perception that .JP is the domain name for the community in Japan.
Difficulties involved in the policy

• Definition of the requirements
  – What constitutes a local presence? - no standard
    • Corporate registration? Resident registration? Working mailing address? P.O. Box?
  – Should a local community located geographically abroad be qualified?

• Effectiveness
  – For 100% certainty, we would have to require documentary proof for every request for registration - onerous and unfeasible.

• Continuous assurance
  – Impossible for us to trace registrant's change of address constantly.
Points we should consider in applying local presence policy

• Is possession of physical address really appropriate as a branding strategy of the ccTLD?
  – In order for the ccTLD to serve the interest of the relevant community.

• How much rigor of the policy is acceptable from the marketing/registry business point of view?
  – Local presence requirements may impose restriction on expansion of the ccTLD.
  – Strict vetting will undermine speediness/efficiency of the registration service. Lax enforcement will undermine effectiveness of the policy.

• Will the dispute resolution scheme properly function in the cases where a registrant does not have local address?
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