



Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP Proposed Final Report

IRTP Part B PDP Working Group



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



One World

One Internet

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



Charter Question D

- 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



- Public comment forum open until 31 March
- please provide your feedback
<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/public-comment-201103-en.htm#irtp-b-proposed-final-report>
- WG to review comments received and finalize report for submission to GNSO Council



Further Information



- IRTP Part B PDP Proposed Final Report - <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-proposed-final-report-21feb11-en.pdf>
- IRTP Part B Public Comment Forum - <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/public-comment-201103-en.htm#irtp-b-proposed-final-report>
- IRTP Part B PDP WG Workspace - <https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/>





Questions

