

.pt Registration Rules

Suggestions and Comments: Answers

.pt Registration Rules

Suggestions and Comments: Answers

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 8 paragraph 3	<p>It is suggested that paragraph 4 be deleted. It is also proposed that the expression "working days" be included in paragraph 2 of Article 8, with the consequent renumbering of the subsequent paragraphs/articles.</p>	<p>The deletion of paragraph 4 is not accepted, since this provision allows .PT to act swiftly whenever non-compliance with the Rules is detected. This mechanism is important to ensure trust in the .pt namespace, protect third-party rights and prevent situations of abuse.</p> <p>It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while, naturally, ensuring the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 2 working days to 4 calendar days.</p> <p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 8(2): "2.Following the aforementioned checks, .PT may request the domain holder or the managing body to provide, within a maximum period of 4 days, (...)"</p>
Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains Section I – General conditions Article 3 – Conditions for delegation paragraph 4	<p>In practice, this provision gives rise to some uncertainty. .PT may refuse to delegate a domain based on "reasonable grounds for doubt", but it is not clear how this process is conducted.</p> <p>It is not evident whether the holder is always informed of the issue, what the specific concerns are, or whether there is an effective opportunity to remedy the situation before a final decision is taken.</p> <p>From an operational perspective, this may lead to unnecessary blocking situations, particularly where the issue can be easily resolved (for example, incomplete data or occasional configuration issues).</p> <p>It would therefore be advisable to make this process clearer, ensuring communication with the holder and the possibility of regularisation.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules Paragraph 4 of Article 3 has been removed.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for registration</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 5 – Ownership of the domain name new paragraph (addition)</p>	<p>The transfer of domain names forms part of the normal functioning of the system. However, in practice, it is also associated with situations of speculative resale.</p> <p>There is currently no clear framework allowing a distinction to be made between legitimate transfers and situations where the domain name is used merely as an asset for appreciation and resale purposes.</p> <p>Without restricting the freedom to transfer domain names, it would be reasonable to ensure a certain level of regulation in these situations.</p>	<p>Situations involving the transfer of ownership of domain names are already regulated under Article 14, with paragraph 7 of this article being of particular relevance in this respect. Furthermore, any situations involving bad faith or abusive use of a domain name are already addressed under the existing provisions, namely Articles 6, 8 and 27(3), as well as under the dispute resolution mechanisms provided for therein.</p>
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 8 – Review procedures paragraph 2</p>	<p>The 2-day deadline for responding to requests for information may, in practice, be too short.</p> <p>In many cases, the information is not immediately available or depends on third parties, internal validations, or even the end customer.</p> <p>This may lead to situations where there is an intention to comply, but insufficient time is available to do so, resulting in disproportionate consequences for what is essentially an operational matter.</p> <p>It would therefore be important to preserve the speed of the process while allowing for some flexibility where justified.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while ensuring, of course, the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 2 working days to 4 calendar days.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 8(2): "2.Following the aforementioned checks, .PT may request the domain holder or the managing body to provide, within a maximum period of 4 days, (...)"</p>
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 9 – Validation of data relating to the registration of domain names paragraph 4</p>	<p>The immediate removal of a domain name due to lack of response or incomplete data may be excessively punitive in real-life situations.</p> <p>In practice, communication failures, delays, or technical issues (for example, notifications not being received) are relatively common.</p> <p>In such cases, direct removal may have a significant impact on the holder, even though the issue could be resolved in a simple manner.</p> <p>It would therefore make sense to introduce an intermediate stage (such as suspension), allowing the situation to be regularised before definitive removal.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>The deadline set out in paragraph 2 is intended to allow the holder and the managing entity to regularise the situation, thereby providing an effective opportunity to remedy any identified irregularities.</p> <p>Without prejudice to the above, the deadline referred to in paragraph 2 has been extended to 10 days.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 9 – Validation of data relating to the registration of domain names paragraph 5</p>	<p>Periodic validation of data is important and entirely reasonable.</p> <p>However, in practice, its primary purpose should be to ensure that data remains up to date - rather than serving as an immediate penalty mechanism.</p> <p>Many situations arise merely from ordinary outdated information and not from misconduct.</p> <p>Accordingly, the focus should be on regularisation rather than direct removal.</p>	<p>With the proposed text of Article 9(5), it is not intended that validation procedures should assume a punitive nature.</p> <p>This process is primarily aimed at ensuring compliance with the legal obligations applicable to .PT, as well as to its Registrars, namely those arising from Article 36 of the Legal Framework on Cybersecurity, which requires the collection and maintenance of accurate and complete data relating to the registration of domain names, as well as the adoption of verification policies and procedures to ensure the quality of such information.</p>
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 6 – Grounds for refusal of registration paragraph 2</p>	<p>The concept of "bad faith" is essential, but in practice it may be interpreted too broadly.</p> <p>There are many legitimate cases involving the creation of projects or brands that may be mistaken for abusive situations.</p> <p>Without clearer criteria, there may be inconsistent decisions or overly restrictive interpretations.</p> <p>The objective should be to identify clearly abusive conduct, without restricting legitimate initiatives.</p>	<p>The wording of the article was not subject to a proposed amendment. Nevertheless, we consider it important to clarify that, in the assessment of bad faith, this is never interpreted as a broad concept, but rather as an indeterminate legal concept, the determination of which depends on the analysis of the specific circumstances of each case, this being a settled understanding under the Portuguese legal system. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the introduction of excessively narrow or exhaustive criteria could, on the contrary, limit the ability to identify new forms of abusive conduct.</p>
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 7 – Geographical names paragraph 2</p>	<p>The way geographical names are currently defined is rather restrictive.</p> <p>In practice, this may prevent legitimate use by companies or projects that use geographical names merely as a local reference, without any intention of suggesting an institutional association.</p> <p>The real issue is not the use of the geographical name itself, but rather the risk of misleading users.</p> <p>It would therefore make sense to allow such registrations where no such risk exists.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>The wording of paragraph 2 of Article 7 was not subject to a proposed amendment. Nevertheless, its wording has been changed in order to broaden the scope of the provision, by allowing registration to be carried out not only by the competent administrative authority but also by entities authorised by it.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 7(2): "2. The direct registration of geographical names under .pt is only permitted when carried out by the competent administrative authority or by a party duly authorised by it".</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Chapter I – Conditions for the registration of .pt domains</p> <p>Section I – General conditions</p> <p>Article 7 – Geographical names paragraph 3</p>	<p>The real issue is not the use of the geographical name itself, but rather the risk of misleading users.</p> <p>It would therefore make sense to allow such registrations where no such risk exists.</p>	<p>Allowing the registration of domain names incorporating geographical names by entities lacking legitimacy for that purpose may give rise to various legal issues, namely in relation to the protection of official designations, the prevention of misleading practices and, potentially, the safeguarding of the public interest.</p> <p>For this reason, it is common practice among several ccTLDs to establish limitations or specific criteria applicable to the registration of this type of name, precisely in order to avoid situations of confusion regarding ownership or possible association with public authorities.</p> <p>The proposed solution therefore seeks to ensure a balance between the possibility of registration and the necessary protection of users and entities holding authority over the names concerned.</p>
<p>Chapter VI – Arbitration</p> <p>Article 26 – Institutional voluntary arbitration new paragraph (addition)</p>	<p>The current dispute resolution mechanisms are functional, but they are not always proportionate to the reality of every case.</p> <p>In practice, there are many low-value domain names or straightforward situations in which resorting to arbitration becomes excessively costly or complex.</p> <p>This creates a real problem: in many cases, it is easier to pay the current domain holder than to formally challenge the situation, which ultimately encourages speculative behaviour.</p> <p>It would therefore make sense to create a simpler and more proportionate procedure for such cases.</p>	<p>Institutional arbitration constitutes a consolidated and expedited mechanism, based on clear rules and defined procedural safeguards, ensuring a high degree of legal certainty. By contrast, referring to a procedure “to be defined by .PT in coordination with the competent arbitration centre” introduces a significant level of regulatory uncertainty, insofar as essential elements such as the procedure itself, the safeguards afforded to the parties and the decision-making criteria are not previously established. Such absence may compromise fundamental principles such as predictability, equal treatment and transparency, which are essential in the context of dispute resolution.</p>
<p>Chapter VI – Arbitration</p> <p>Article 27 – Criteria for institutional voluntary arbitration paragraph 3(c)</p> <p>Article 26 – Institutional voluntary arbitration new paragraph to be added to the article</p>	<p>There are many domain names registered without any connection to trademarks, which simply remain "on hold" without any effective use.</p> <p>In practice, such domain names are often retained for the purpose of future resale, thereby preventing legitimate access to relevant names for genuine projects.</p> <p>These situations do not always clearly fall within the current bad faith criteria, which makes their resolution more difficult.</p> <p>It would therefore make sense to clarify that this type of conduct may also be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>We appreciate the suggestion submitted. However, the text of paragraph 2(c) of Article 7 was not subject to any proposed amendment, except for a merely formal modification to the identification of the respective subparagraphs, whereby the former subparagraphs i), ii) and iii) were renumbered as a), b) and c).</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 8	We added the contraction "aos".	<p>Changed in the .pt Registration Rules Given the amendments introduced to Articles 8(2) and 9(2), those provisions now expressly establish that the deadlines correspond to calendar days and are not suspended on Saturdays, Sundays, or public holidays.</p> <p>Accordingly, paragraph 3 of both aforementioned articles were removed, making the inclusion of the contraction "aos" [only for the portuguese version] no longer justified.</p>
Article 9	We added the contraction "aos".	<p>Changed in the .pt Registration Rules Given the amendments introduced to Articles 8(2) and 9(2), those provisions now expressly establish that the deadlines correspond to calendar days and are not suspended on Saturdays, Sundays, or public holidays.</p> <p>Accordingly, paragraph 3 of both aforementioned articles were removed, making the inclusion of the contraction "aos" [only for the portuguese version] no longer justified.</p>
Article 12	Delete the reference to paragraph 1.	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p>
Article 14	We added the reference to mediation, which had been inadvertently omitted.	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p>
Article 26	Renumber so as to begin with paragraph 1.	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules [Only in the Portuguese version]</p>
Article 26	Number 5 is duplicated.	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules [Only in the Portuguese version]</p>
Article 26 paragraph 5(b)	<p>We believe that this provision may raise doubts regarding the assessment of the admissibility of domain name registrations by .PT (whether systematically or only on a sample basis), potentially leading to a greater number of proceedings against .PT.</p> <p>It seems important to avoid any suggestion that .PT is subject to a general and permanent duty to carry out a substantive assessment of admissibility.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules The cross-reference to Article 6 has been corrected to Article 8, which is the provision that effectively refers to the procedure for assessing the admissibility of a domain name arising from a sampling process.</p> <p>[New wording]: "Against .PT, following the admissibility assessment under Article 8."</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 27, paragraph 5 – DELETED</p>	<p>We believe that the deletion of paragraph 5 of Article 27 will create a significant gap regarding the criteria to be taken into consideration by the Arbitral Tribunal in proceedings brought against .PT.</p> <p>In proceedings against .PT, what criteria should the arbitrator analyse, assess and verify going forward? This is a question that remains unanswered.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules.</p> <p>The deletion of paragraph 5 of article 27 is justified because its content is already provided for in paragraph 2. Nevertheless, in order to ensure greater clarity, the wording of paragraph 2 has been revised.</p> <p>[New wording]: "For the purposes of this article , the arbitrator shall review, assess and verify compliance with the provisions set out in these Rules, and the corresponding legitimacy of the registration of the domain name, with particular regard to the provisions of Article 6.</p>
<p>Article 20 – Current version</p>	<p>Deletion of Article 20.</p>	<p>That would create yet another exception scenario. The fact is that any registration request, regardless of whether it is accepted or rejected, entails the execution of a set of acts and procedures with associated costs.</p>
<p>Article 2, 9, 13 & 14</p>	<p>Data verification becomes a mandatory requirement for registration, transfer of ownership, and amendment of contact details (email/telephone).</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while ensuring, of course, the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 8 working days to 10 calendar days.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 9(2): "2. Whenever there are well-founded doubts as to the accuracy, veracity or completeness of the information and contacts associated with the registration of the domain name, .PT may request the registrant or the managing body of the domain to, within a maximum period of 10 days, (...)"</p>
<p>Article 22</p>	<p>Introduction of the possibility of blocking or redirecting domain names following notification by a "competent authority", in alignment with the new.</p>	<p>The introduction of this provision into the .pt Registration Rules stems from a legal obligation, namely article 57 of the Cybersecurity Legal Framework. Therefore, .PT, in its capacity as registry, will act in such cases in accordance with the notifications issued by the competent authority and with the applicable legal and regulatory provisions.</p>
<p>Article 8 & 33</p>	<p>The 10-day period for .PT to assess the domain name's compliance may now be suspended.</p>	<p>The 10-day period referred to in Article 8(1) shall only be suspended where any of the procedures referred to in paragraph 2 of that article and in Article 9 are pending. Except for these two situations, the 10-day period shall run continuously, including on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays, as provided for in Article 33.</p> <p>Paragraph 6 of article 8 clarifies precisely that the period referred to in paragraph 1 of that article shall be suspended while the periods referred to in Article 8(2) and Article 9 are running.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 2 paragraph 1b	What does the verification of the "managing body" actually entail- what does it mean? Are there differences between registrars and "direct" registrants? What does this process look like for the managing bodies?	<p>The data of the managing entity of a .pt domain name is also subject to validation and verification. This requirement arises, moreover, from a legal obligation pursuant to article 36 of the Cybersecurity Legal Framework.</p> <p>It should be recalled that .PT allows for the existence of managing entities other than registrars.</p> <p>Attention is drawn to the definition of "managing entity" set out in paragraph (i) of the Glossary annexed to the .pt Registration Rules.</p>
Article 3 paragraph 4	It would be helpful to have examples of under what circumstances .PT would not delegate a domain immediately and whether the registering registrar would be notified.	Amended in the .pt Registration Rules Paragraph 4 of Article 3 has been removed.
Article 4 paragraphs 3 & 4	Duplicated paragraph. This paragraph is written very broadly. We would be interested to know what what happens in the instance of email bounceback and whether this would still be deemed to have been received.	Amended in the .pt Registration Rules (English version only) <p>We consider that the "Recommendations for the implementation of NIS2 Directive Article 28 (Database of domain name registration data)" should be taken into account. However, if we have correctly understood the comment, it appears to us that the bounce-back of an electronic communication cannot be regarded as an email duly received.</p>
Article 4 paragraph 5	Unclear what this refers to - possible translation issue.	Amended in the .pt Registration Rules (English version only). <p>This provision establishes a formal and validity requirement for communications with .PT: whenever documentation must be sent to .PT (for example, for data validation or verification purposes), the specific channels defined for that purpose (such as a designated email address) must be used. Where no specific channel for the submission of documentation is indicated, the means and contact details made available at www.pt.pt shall be used.</p> <p>[New wording]: "When submitting documentation to .PT, including the documentation referred to in paragraph 2 of Articles 8 and 9, the channels specifically specified for that purpose must be used. If no specific channels are indicated, the means set out in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply. Only documentation submitted through these channels will be considered valid and effective".</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 7 paragraph 3	How will .PT determine whether the intention of the domain registrant at the point of registering the domain was to mislead the public?	<p>.PT will not assess the registrant's subjective intention at the time of the domain name registration. The analysis focuses on the composition of the domain name; in particular, it will be assessed whether the word, expression, acronym, abbreviation or set of characters associated with a geographical name is, by its nature, positioning or context, likely to mislead the public as to the ownership of the domain name.</p>
Article 8 paragraph 1	Are you able to provide more information on how the registry carries out sampling and what methodology is being used?	<p>The assessment of the compliance of domain names based on a sampling process has been enshrined in the .pt Registration Rules since their publication in February 2021.</p> <p>The sampling corresponds to a percentage of the domain names registered daily and is automatically generated through technical mechanisms implemented for that purpose.</p>
Article 8 paragraph 2	Two days is a very short timeframe to respond to these requests. Please consider extending this timeframe.	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while ensuring, of course, the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 2 working days to 4 calendar days.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 8(2): "2. Following the aforementioned checks, .PT may request the domain holder or the managing body to provide, within a maximum period of 4 days, (...)"</p>
Article 9 paragraph 2	<p>We welcome the extension of time to 8 days to provide the confirmation, correction or supplementation of the data provided at registration. It would be helpful to clarify if that is working days or calendar days. We would suggest this could be extended further to 10 working days. If this was added paragraph 3 could be deleted.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while ensuring, of course, the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 8 working days to 10 calendar days.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 9(2): "2. Whenever there are well-founded doubts as to the accuracy, veracity or completeness of the information and contacts associated with the registration of the domain name, .PT may request the registrant or the managing body of the domain to, within a maximum period of 10 days, (...)"</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 13 paragraph 2</p>	<p>What are the "supporting elements" required. As a corporate registrar who would be requesting documentation from our clients it would be helpful to know the process for this and what would be required.</p>	<p>.PT may request the submission of supporting documentation, with the aim of ensuring that the request for amendment of data (e.g. email address) is being made by the data subject themselves or by a person duly authorised for that purpose.</p> <p>This constitutes a security measure intended to prevent unauthorised amendments and to safeguard the integrity and reliability of the data associated with domain names.</p>
<p>Article 21 paragraph 1b</p>	<p>Please clarify what is meant by 'termination of the registrant's activity' - does this relate to a registrant, where it is a company etc. ceasing to trade or something else? Also what is the process for removing the domain immediately?</p>	<p>Yes, it refers to situations in which the holder of the domain name, being a legal person, ceases its activity and proceeds with the liquidation of its assets. In such cases, the removal of the domain name is not immediate, as provided for in article 21(2).</p> <p>.PT notifies the holder and the managing entity so that, should they wish to do so, they may remedy the grounds underlying the removal of the domain name, namely by providing evidence that, within the scope of the liquidation of the legal person's assets, the domain name has been transferred to one of the shareholders or to another duly entitled entity.</p>
<p>Article 22 : .PT proceeds to block or redirect domain names, through and under the exact terms of the notification, duly substantiated, that is sent to it by a legally competent authority.</p>	<p>This needs more information. It is not clear on what grounds a domain would be suspended or redirected or whether the registrant/registrar will be notified before this happens. We would advocate for notifications to be sent to the registrar and the registrant if the registry is intending to take this action and for there to be a period of time for either to object and remedy the issue.</p>	<p>The introduction of this provision into the .pt Registration Rules stems from a legal obligation, namely article 57 of the Cybersecurity Legal Framework. Therefore, .PT, in its capacity as registry, will act in such cases in accordance with the notifications issued by the competent authority and with the applicable legal and regulatory provisions.</p>
<p>Article 23 paragraph 4</p>	<p>2 days is a very short timeframe to deal with a cyberattack/threat especially when this obligation lies with a registrant who may not be technically competent. We would advocate for this to be at least 72 hours. Furthermore if the registry is introducing an obligation on the registrant with regards to incident reporting this may benefit from being outlined in a separate section.</p>	<p>The 2-day period provided for in this provision corresponds to the timeframe that is most consistent with the legally established deadlines for the notification and handling of security incidents, as well as with the nature and potential impact of the cyberattack or incident resulting from the abusive use of a domain name.</p> <p>It should, however, be clarified that this period is intended for the adoption of the measures which, at the relevant time and on the basis of the information available, are deemed most appropriate and effective for the handling and resolution of the situation in question, as well as for the submission to .PT of any information that may be made available at that stage.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 24 paragraph 1</p>	<p>There is reference to a separate contractual instrument that details the other liabilities to a registrar but it is not annexed or linked to from the terms and conditions.</p>	<p>The autonomous contractual instrument (Protocol Registrar Status)</p>
<p>Article 27</p>	<p>I note the removal of <i>"the domain name consists of one or more given names or the combination of the applicant's given name and surname;"</i> Curious as to why this has been removed.</p>	<p>The removal of the reference in question is due, firstly, to the very limited - virtually residual - number of situations in which .PT has been called upon to assess domain names falling within that criterion, which demonstrates its minimal practical relevance.</p> <p>Furthermore, the wording of paragraph (iii) further develops the general criterion of "abusive and bad-faith appropriation" by including examples that allow situations which might previously have fallen within the scope of the now deleted provision to be covered in a more appropriate and flexible manner.</p>
<p>Article 28</p>	<p>What is this procedure for and under what circumstances is it used?</p>	<p>Although this article has not undergone any amendment in the present revision of the .pt Registration Rules, it should be clarified that it concerns an interim measure intended to provide urgent protection to a right at risk in the context of a dispute concerning a domain name.</p> <p>Should the arbitral tribunal grant such request, the decision shall be communicated to .PT, which will implement the suspension of the domain name, thereby ensuring the provisional protection of the right until a final decision is rendered.</p> <p>Further clarification regarding interim relief proceedings in the context of arbitration proceedings may be requested directly from ARBITRARE: www.arbitrare.pt.</p>
<p>Article 29 paragraph 2(g)</p>	<p>Requesting an IBAN number (which we assume is a financial IBAN number) for the purposes of registering a domain seems like an overreach for a registry particularly in the context of only collecting the data that is necessary.</p>	<p>It should be recalled that .PT, in addition to acting as a registry, also acts as a registrar, insofar as it accepts direct registrations. In this context, the collection of the IBAN may prove necessary for the purposes of payment for the registration and renewal of a domain name.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 30 paragraphs 2 & 4	Are these missing?	<p>These amendments are related to the changes that will be introduced to our WHOIS Policy upon the publication of the amendments to the .pt Registration Rules.</p> <p>Regardless of the type of entity, the registration date, expiration date, domain status and technical information will be visible in the WHOIS. In addition to this information, where the domain name holder is a legal person, the name and address will also be made available.</p> <p>With regard to natural persons, we will cease publishing their personal data in the WHOIS and, consequently, will no longer collect their consent for that purpose. Contact details relating to telephone number and email address will not be visible to any entity, with only anonymised contact being possible.</p> <p>These changes shall apply from 30 June 2026.</p>
Article 2 & Article 9	<p>The new validation and verification obligations – particularly mandatory TIN/NIF validation against official documentation and live phone verification – represent a material change to registrar duties that was not present in any reasonably interpretable provision of the existing Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA). DNS.PT has asserted that registrars were already contractually obliged to perform these checks, but no specific clause in the current RRA can be identified that requires active phone verification or TIN/NIF validation. Under the RRA's own amendment provisions, changes to registrar obligations must be made in writing and signed by both parties and cannot be imposed unilaterally.</p>	<p>From our perspective, this does not constitute any form of unilateral imposition without prior agreement between the parties. Rather, it merely seeks to reflect the applicable legal framework and to anticipate the new wording of the Registrar Status Agreement, which will itself be subject to the consent of the respective signatories.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
Article 2(1)(b) & Article 9 & Article 31	<p>The requirement to submit the ptnis2-1.0 EPP extension at the time of registration means full verification must be completed before a domain can be registered. This changes registrar architecture from synchronous to asynchronous – requiring domains to be held pending verification before fulfilment. This is not a configuration change; it is a significant re-engineering of registration and provisioning systems. The current timeline (rules effective 30 June 2026) does not accommodate a change of this magnitude. Industry standard for architectural changes is a minimum of six months' notice following publication of final, stable technical specifications, which have not yet been provided.</p>	<p>There are a number of obligations arising from the applicable legislation in this matter and from the deadlines established therein. .PT's position on this issue is that the parties involved should work towards ensuring full compliance.</p>
Article 9(1) & Article 24(3)	<p>There is a material inconsistency between how phone "verification" was presented at the registrars' webinar (18 March 2026 – outbound contact mandatory, number must be confirmed live and operational) and what the subsequently published FAQ states ("does not define a specific methodology for verifying contact data, leaving it to each Registrar to define and implement the procedures it considers appropriate"). This ambiguity makes it impossible for registrars to implement a compliant workflow with confidence.</p>	<p>This constitutes a legal requirement and, therefore, in our view, the Rules should merely reflect the principles underlying the relevant legal provisions. Nothing prevents the interested parties from establishing common procedures, namely within the framework of best practices and taking into account any guidance that may exist on this matter. In any event, such procedures should always be based on the applicable legal obligations.</p>
Article 9 & Article 13(3) & Article 14(3)	<p>The .PT registry operates a shared contact handle system in which a single contact object may be used by multiple registrars. If a contact handle was validated by another registrar, there is no visibility into when that validation occurred, what process was used, or whether it meets the now-required standard. It is unclear whether a registrar may rely on another registrar's prior declaration of verified status or bears independent responsibility for re-verifying any contact they use, even one they did not create.</p>	<p>This is considered to be a matter that may be regulated, where appropriate, under the terms of a protocol/agreement.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 1 – How to Register</p>	<p>Unfavourable opinion. We reiterate our view that this new revision of the .pt Registration Rules would be an opportunity for registrations to be carried out exclusively through Registrars, meaning that direct registrations via www.pt.pt should no longer be possible.</p>	<p>For the time being, .PT maintains the position upheld since the beginning of the IANA technical delegation. This is a matter that may be subject to further discussion, for example within the framework of the .PT Advisory Board, in accordance with the formal procedures applicable following any decision that may eventually be proposed.</p>
<p>Article 4 – Contacts and Notifications</p>	<p>Comment: Paragraph 2 of this article refers to electronic mail as the preferred means of communication and to the possibility of .PT using other means whenever necessary. As a Registrar, we would stress the importance of .PT making telephone contact with the domain holder in cases where it is evident that the email address is unavailable or corresponds to an @empresanahora.pt address.</p> <p>Based on our experience, and on feedback received from some end customers, such contact is not always made by .PT and, in many situations, this would avoid the removal of the domain name.</p> <p>As Registrars, we confirm that we communicate with our Clients by electronic mail using addresses other than @empresanahora.pt.</p>	<p>We appreciate the suggestion. It is considered that the proposed wording does not prevent an internal assessment as to the feasibility or appropriateness of our internal services adopting such measure.</p>
<p>Article 8 – Assessment procedures</p>	<p>This article has been subject to minor amendments, but we would highlight the fact that it still establishes a short period of 2 days (suspended on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays) whenever, following a sampling procedure, a domain name requires the holder to submit information and/or documentation in order to avoid removal.</p> <p>Reference is also made to the "suspension of the 10-day period for analysing the conformity of the domain name (Articles 8 and 33)", since this period continues to be set out in Article 8. We understand that this suspension relates to the fact that this article now includes a new paragraph 7 specifying that the 10-day period referred to in paragraph 1 is suspended during the periods established in paragraph 2 of the same article (2 days) and/or the periods established in paragraph 2 of Article 9 (8 days).</p> <p>For the sake of consistency of deadlines and to avoid misunderstandings or incorrect interpretations by holders, we suggest that these periods should be aligned with the period established in Article 9, namely 8 days.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules It is considered that the domain registration process should be as streamlined and expeditious as possible, while ensuring, of course, the protection of the rights of the parties concerned. In any event, it has been decided to amend the deadline from 2 working days to 4 calendar days.</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 8(2): "2.Following the aforementioned checks, .PT may request the domain holder or the managing body to provide, within a maximum period of 4 days, (...)"</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>NEW Article 9 – Validation of domain dg to the registration of domain names + New paragraph 1(b) in Article 2 + New paragraph 3 in Article 14 + New paragraph 3 in Article 13</p>	<p>These are the articles/paragraphs which now establish that registration, data updates and transfers of ownership become subject to/dependent upon the validation of the holder's and managing entity's data. Our opinion is unfavourable for the reasons set out below:</p> <p>1) We consider that both Article 9 and Article 23 (Rights and Responsibilities of the Holder) should also clearly establish the holder's responsibility in the procedure for validation of its data, whether with .PT or with the Registrar Entity through which the holder intends to successfully complete the registration, data update or transfer of ownership of a domain name;</p> <p>2) Assuming that Article 24 applies only where the Managing Entity is a Registrar (and not the holder itself), we consider it necessary to specify that, in the case of direct registration with .PT, responsibility for data validation is ensured by .PT itself. Article 25 also fails to mention such responsibility on the part of .PT in the case of direct registrations (as contemplated in subparagraph b) of Article 1).</p> <p>However, our opinion is favourable regarding paragraph 2 of Article 9, which establishes a longer period of 8 days, thereby providing Registrars and Holders with a broader timeframe to clarify data and avoid the removal of a domain name.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>[New wording]: Article 23(3): "The domain name holder is fully responsible for providing the registry with complete, accurate and up-to-date information, as well as for supplying any supporting evidence or documents requested for the purposes of validation and verification, in accordance with the Rules and applicable legislation"</p> <p>[Note: Former paragraph 3 becomes paragraph 4, and the subsequent paragraphs shall be renumbered accordingly.]</p> <p>Article 25(3): "In cases of direct registration with .PT, it is the responsibility of .PT to ensure that the domain name holder's details are validated and verified, where these have not already been validated and/or verified, in accordance with the Rules, applicable legislation and the policies and procedures approved for this purpose."</p> <p>[Note: Former paragraph 3 becomes paragraph 4, and the subsequent paragraphs shall be renumbered accordingly.]</p>
<p>Article 11 – Registration of a domain name under .gov.pt</p>	<p>It no longer refers to CEGER and instead merely states that the registration process under .gov.pt shall be carried out with the competent public authority.</p> <p>We would appreciate confirmation as to whether the competent public authority continues to be CEGER and, if so, we request clarification as to why it is no longer expressly referred to in the Rules.</p> <p>We also request confirmation that Article 11 (Other Registrations) of the previous Rules has been deleted.</p>	<p>This is considered to be an option more consistent with the dynamic nature of the organisational structure of the Government and Public Administration in general.</p> <p>In this specific case, and according to the information currently available to us, CEGER (Centre for the Management of the Government's IT Network) was dissolved through a merger as part of the Public Administration reform. Its responsibilities were mainly distributed between: the Government General Secretariat – Digital Transformation Services Department (DSTD); and the Administrative Modernisation Agency (AMA, I.P.), with regard to electronic certification and digital certificate matters.</p> <p>Accordingly, the entity that most directly succeeded CEGER was the Government General Secretariat, although certain specific functions were transferred to AMA.</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 17 – Renewal</p>	<p>A new paragraph 3 has been introduced, in respect of which we request clarification.</p> <p>Will a recovery fee now apply where renewal is carried out within the 30 days following expiry? If that is the intention, our opinion is unfavourable.</p> <p>In our view, the 30-day period should be treated as a Grace Period and, during such period, renewal should only be capable of being initiated by the current holder, but at the normal price and without additional fees.</p>	<p>We consider that this additional period constitutes an added value for the holder and entails additional operational procedures associated with the removal and possible reinstatement of the domain name in the zone. We therefore consider the application of a recovery fee to renewals carried out after expiry to be justified.</p>
<p>Article 18 – Pricing</p>	<p>Our opinion is unfavourable regarding paragraph 3, which specifies that .PT may revise the pricing table at any time without specifying the advance notice with which such revisions will be made.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>[New wording]: Article18(3): “The .PT may, at any time, revise the price list referred to in paragraph 1, giving 60 days’ notice where possible”</p>
<p>Current Article 20 – Refund of amounts paid (to be deleted)</p>	<p>Our opinion is unfavourable regarding the deletion of this article, since we consider that its removal is significant and will have an impact on the management of processes between Registrars and their end customers.</p> <p>The fact that all registered domain names, even where removed due to some non-compliance, become chargeable implies that the Registrar will have to charge twice for the same domain name should the holder wish to register it again.</p>	<p>That would create yet another exception scenario. The fact is that any registration request, regardless of whether it is accepted or rejected, entails the execution of a set of acts and procedures with associated costs.</p>
<p>Article 26 – Voluntary Arbitration</p>	<p>Alert: typo to be corrected - it starts at paragraph 2 (there is no paragraph 1) and contains two paragraphs numbered 5.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules [Only in the Portuguese version]</p>
<p>Article 27 – Criteria for institutionalised voluntary arbitration</p>	<p>We seek confirmation that the deletion of paragraph 5 of this article is intentional.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p> <p>The deletion of paragraph 5 of article 27 is justified on the grounds that its content is already provided for in paragraph 2. Nevertheless, in order to ensure greater clarity, the wording of paragraph 2 has been revised.</p> <p>[New wording]: “For the purposes of this article , the arbitrator shall review, assess and verify compliance with the provisions set out in these Rules, and the corresponding legitimacy of the registration of the domain name, with particular regard to the provisions of Article 6.”</p>

ARTICLE	COMMENT	.PT RESPONSE
<p>Article 29 – Processing of personal data</p>	<p>3 new paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 – Favourable opinion regarding the clarification of these provisions in relation to the processing of personal data.</p> <p>5. Managing entities may process personal data within the scope of the registration process on behalf of .PT, without prejudice to any processing carried out for their own purposes associated with the provision of services to the holder, in accordance with the applicable data protection legislation.</p> <p>6. The policies and procedures for the validation and verification of data relating to domain name holders shall be published and made available for consultation at www.pt.pt.</p> <p>7. Data subjects may request the exercise of the rights provided for under the applicable data protection legislation, namely the rights of access, rectification, restriction of processing, objection, portability and erasure, within the terms and limits established by law. NOTE: We have identified that, at least in this article, there are differences between the PT and EN versions (the EN version contains fewer paragraphs). We therefore request clarification regarding this situation.</p>	<p>Amended in the .pt Registration Rules</p>
<p>Article 30 – Processing of Whois data</p>	<p>It contains significant amendments, being reduced from 8 paragraphs to only 3.</p> <p>Current paragraphs 2 to 7 are replaced by a single paragraph 3, which we understand is intended to be broader in scope, but which also no longer specifies the issue of consent.</p> <p>According to our interpretation, the consent option is definitively removed for personal data subjects and, whenever personal data is involved, such data will remain hidden, without the data subject having the possibility of giving consent for its publication. We would appreciate confirmation that our interpretation is correct.</p> <p>This amendment implies that we will remove from our systems the option of collecting consent decisions (which is feasible on our side). If our interpretation is correct, our opinion is favourable, provided that this new paragraph 3 (replacing current paragraphs 2 to 7) translates, in practical terms, into the rectification of a situation already flagged by us Registrars, namely that Whois data sometimes displays personal data (email addresses) even where the holder is a legal entity. To date, there are situations in which the email address included in the contacts of a company constitutes personal data, for example: nome.sobrenome@gmail.com.</p> <p>However, we would raise the following two questions:</p> <p>Question 1) In the case of personal data subjects who may previously have given their consent under the regulations currently in force, will such consent cease to be taken into consideration, with the data thereafter becoming hidden?</p> <p>Question 2) Before the entry into force of the current Rules (namely under the Rules in force as of 25 May 2018 and 1 February 2021), some companies were able to designate their Whois data as confidential, since the possibility of anonymisation for legal entities was only removed at a later stage. In respect of companies that opted to classify their Whois data as CONFIDENTIAL, .PT maintained such status under the 2021 Rules. We request confirmation that, following this amendment in 2026, Whois data in such cases will remain confidential.</p>	<p>Question 1) Yes. With the amendment introduced, the consent previously collected shall no longer be used as the legal basis for the public disclosure of personal data in the Whois, and such data shall instead be concealed in accordance with the Whois.pt Policy.</p> <p>Question 2) We also confirm that situations currently configured as CONFIDENTIAL shall remain in that condition, and this amendment shall not imply any reversal of previously assigned confidentiality statuses.</p> <p>We further recall that, even where the holder is a legal person, certain contact details associated with the registration may constitute personal data (e.g. nominative email addresses), and shall therefore remain subject to the applicable data protection framework.</p>

pt.pt
facebook.com/dns.pt
pt.linkedin.com/in/dnspt

