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Background

- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP)
- Straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars
- Currently under review to ensure improvements and clarification - nr 1. area of complaint according to data from ICANN Compliance
- IRTP Part B PDP Working Group - second in a series of five PDPs
Charter Questions

- Should there be a process or special provisions for urgent return of hijacked registration, inappropriate transfers or change of registrant?
- Registrar Lock Status (standards / best practices & clarification of denial reason #7)
Recent Developments

- PDP was initiated in June 2009
- Publication of Initial Report on 29 May 2010
- Opening of Public Comment Forum after meeting in Brussels
- Seventeen Community submissions received
- WG reviewed public comments and continued deliberations
- WG published proposed Final Report for public comment on 21 February 2011 containing 9 recommendations
The Recommendations

Overview
Charter Question A

a) Whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed, as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report (http://www.icann.org/announcements/hijacking-report-12jul05.pdf); see also (http://www.icann.org/correspondence/cole-to-tonkin-14mar05.htm);
Recommendations (Question A)

- #1 - The WG is considering recommending requiring registrars to provide an Emergency Action Channel (as described in SAC007 [PDF, 400 KB]). The WG recognizes that there are further details that would need to be worked out. This Emergency Action Channel could also be used for non-transfer abuse issues.

- #2 - The WG recommends that registrants consider the measures to protect domain registrar accounts against compromise and misuse described in SAC044, Section 5.
Charter Question B

b. Whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a Registrant and Admin Contact (AC). The policy is clear that the Registrant can overrule the AC, but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar;
Recommendations (Question B)

• #3 - The WG recommends requesting an Issues Report on the requirement of 'thick' WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs.
• #4 - WG recommends requesting an Issue Report to examine ‘Change of Control’ function, including an investigation of how this function is currently achieved, if there are any applicable models in the country-code name space, and any associated security concerns.
• #5 - The WG recommends modifying section 3 of the IRTP to require that the Registrar of Record/Losing Registrar be required to notify the Registered Name Holder/Registrant of the transfer out.
Charter Question C

c. Whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant, which often figures in hijacking cases;
Recommendation (Question C)

• #6 - Modification of denial reason #6 so that language is expanded and clarified to tailor it more to explicitly address registrar-specific (i.e. non-EPP) locks in order to make it clear that the Transfer Contact (often the registrant) must give some sort of informed opt-in express consent to having such a lock applied, and the registrant must be able to have the lock removed upon reasonable notice and authentication.
d. Whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of a Registrar Lock status (e.g. when it may/may not, should/should not be applied);
Charter Question D

• #7 - if a review of the UDRP is conducted in the near future, the issue of requiring the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings is taken into consideration

• #8 - The WG recommends standardizing and clarifying WHOIS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status
Charter Question E

e. Whether, and if so, how best to clarify denial reason #7: A domain name was already in 'lock status' provided that the Registrar provides a readily accessible and reasonable means for the Registered Name Holder to remove the lock status.
Charter Question E

• #9 - The WG recommends deleting denial reason #7 as a valid reason for denial under section 3 of the IRTP as it is technically not possible to initiate a transfer for a domain name that is locked, and hence cannot be denied, making this denial reason obsolete. Instead denial reason #7 should be replaced by adding a new provision in a different section of the IRTP on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked.
Next Steps

- WG to review comments received and finalize report for submission to GNSO Council
Further Information

- IRTP Part B PDP WG Workspace - [https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/](https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/)