

IRTP Part B PDP Final Report

Overview



Background



- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP)
- Straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars
- 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
- Publication of Proposed Final Report for public comment on 21 February 2011
- Following review of comments, publication of Final Report on 30 May 2011, containing 9 recommendations for GNSO Council consideration



One World
One Internet

The Recommendations

*All have full consensus support from
the IRTP Part B WG*



Overview



Total of 9 recommendations:

- 4 recommendations for changes and/or additions to the existing IRTP, Transfer Emergency Action Contact, section 3 of the IRTP, Denial Reason #6 and Denial Reason #7
- 2 recommendations requesting an Issue Report related to 'thick' WHOIS and 'change of control & denial reason #8 and #9
- 1 recommendation for the promotion of an SSAC report
- 1 recommendation to defer an issue
- 1 recommendation for ICANN staff to standardize and clarify WHOIS status messages

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-tonkin-14mar05.htm>);

Recommendations (Charter Question A)

- Requiring registrars to provide a Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) for urgent communications relating to transfers. The goal of the TEAC is to quickly establish a real-time conversation between registrars in case of an emergency such as hijacking. Responses are required within 4 hours of the initial request, although final resolution of the incident may take longer. (#1)
- Promoting proactive measures to prevent hijacking such as outlined in the recent report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on 'A Registrant's Guide to Protecting Domain Name Registration Accounts (SAC 044).



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 (Charter Question B)

- Requesting an Issue Report on the requirement of 'thick' WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs. (#3)
- Requesting an Issue Report to examine the 'change of control' function as well as a review of locking procedures as described in IRTP Reasons for Denial #8 and #9. (#4)
- Modifying section 3 of the IRTP to require that the Losing Registrar notifies the Registrant of the transfer out. (#5)



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 (Charter Question C)

- Clarifying IRTP Reason for Denial #6 to make it clear that the registrant must give some sort of informed opt-in express consent of having registrar-specific locks applied, and the registrant must be able to have the lock removed upon reasonable notice and authentication. (#6)

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);



Recommendation (Charter Question D)

- 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 taking into consideration. (#7)
- Standardizing and clarifying WHOIS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status. The WG recommends that ICANN staff is asked to develop an implementation plan for community consideration which ensures that a technically feasible approach is developed to implement this recommendation. (#8)



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.

Recommendation (Charter Question E)

- 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. (#9)

Further Information



- IRTP Part B PDP Final Report - <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf>
- IRTP Part B Public Comment Review Tool <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/12746774/Public+comment+review+tool+-+Proposed+Final+Report+-+5+May+2011+-+FINAL.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1305793631000>
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - <http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/>

Questions?

One World

One Internet



Thank You

