**Title of Effort:** PDP - Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Development Process – Part A

**Start & End Dates:**  MAR 2008 – APR 2009

**Link to Effort:** <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2009/irtp-a>

**Key Contributors:**  Chair (Paul Diaz); Staff (Olof Nordling, Marika Konings)

| **Work Product** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NA** | Was this effort a PDP or non-PDP?  if a PDP, were Consensus Policy recommendations made and approved by the GNSO and ICANN Board? | Public Comment Experiences with IRTP – 14 April 2005  Transfers Working Group – June 2005  SSAC DN Hijacking – 12 July 2005  Policy Issues Arising from Transfers – 23 August 2007  Prioritization Committee Transfers Report – 20 December 2007  PDP Grouping Report – 19 March 2008  Working Group – initiated 25 June 2008  No, Consensus Policy recommendations were not made, but recommendations did advise of continued work |
| **NA** | What is the summary of issue/problem addressed by the Working Group? | The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) aims to provide a straight forward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN accredited registrar to another should they wish to do so. The policy also provides standardized requirements for registrar handling of such transfer requests from domain name holders. The policy is an existing community consensus policy that was implemented in late 2004 and is now being reviewed by the GNSO.  The IRTP Part A Policy Development Process (PDP) was the first in a series of five PDPs that address areas for improvements in the existing transfer policy.  The IRTP Part A PDP concerns three "new" issues: (1) the potential exchange of registrant email information between registrars, (2) the potential for including new forms of electronic authentication to verify transfer requests and avoid "spoofing" and (3) to consider whether the IRTP should include provisions for "partial bulk transfers" between registrars. |
| **Final Issue Report** | Was data readily available or specifically collected for this report? (i.e. was data identified, collected and analyzed during the WG deliberations)  If collected, how was it collected, how long did it take and how much did it cost (if any, considering the type of cost (direct bill vs. significant time/effort))? | Issue Report Link (23 MAY 2008): <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf>  The entire issue seems to have been spurred by several fraudulent transfers after the original IRTP was deemed Consensus Policy in 2004 and a follow-up SSAC Report. While all previous reports leading up to this Issue Report contained a list of qualitative issues identifying short-comings to the existing policy, no data or metrics were used to provide quantitative support. Practically all qualitative data were the result of higher profile names being hijacked. |
| **Final Issue Report** | If collected, what were the primary sources of the data? (ICANN, Contracted Party, external)   * Did any data providers impose restrictions on use of data? | No data was collected and it is difficult to ascertain whether there were any requests for data from contracted parties or other service providers. |
| **Final Issue Report** | If not collected, what is the general conclusion as to why no data was used? (i.e. it was not needed, did not exist, lack of access, restrictions that prevented its use, confidential) | Unknown. Emphasis was placed on higher profile names being hijacked. |
| **Charter** | Did the Charter establish a task for the WG to collect data, and if so, what types? Is there reference to costs associated with the request?  Does it refer to analysis to be performed? | Charter Link (25 JUN 2008): <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/transfers/irtp-working-group-charter-jun08.htm>  No. Like previous reports on the issue, no data was requested or provided to understand the true extent of the problem on a macro level. The issues to be addressed in this PDP could have benefited with additional data.  The Working Group initially shall consider the following questions (found in Section 1.3 of the issues report):  1.Whether there could be a way for registrars to make Registrant Email Address data available to one another. Currently there is no way of automating approval from the Registrant, as the Registrant Email Address is not a required field in the registrar Whois. This slows down and/or complicates the process for registrants, especially since the Registrant can overrule the Admin Contact. <How long did the current process take? How often did the Rt need to overrule the admin contact?>  2.Whether there is need for other options for electronic authentication (e.g., security token in FOA) due to security concerns on use of email addresses (potential for hacking or spoofing). <At the time, how often were FOAs used in the transfer process? How many resulted in successful or unsuccessful transfers? What was the quantity of abusive transfers?>  3.Whether the policy should incorporate provisions for handling “partial bulk transfers” between registrars – that is, transfers involving a number of names but not the entire group of names held by the losing registrar. <How many bulk transfers were conducted in a given period? How many had been successful vs unsuccessful?> |
| **WG Final Report** | Was data readily available or specifically collected for this report? (i.e. was data identified, collected and analyzed during the WG deliberations)  If collected, how was it collected, how long did it take and how much did it cost (if any, considering the type of cost (direct bill vs. significant time/effort))? | Final Report Link (19 MAR 2009): <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-final-report-a-19mar09.pdf>  None. Public comments and SO/AC inputs were gathered per the WG Guidelines |
| **WG Final Report** | If collected, what were the primary sources of the data? (ICANN, Contracted Party, external)   * Did any data providers impose restrictions on use of data? | NA |
| **WG Final Report** | If not collected, what is the general conclusion as to why no data was used? (i.e. it was not needed, did not exist, lack of access, restrictions that prevented its use, confidential) | Unknown. It is not clear whether data was requested on the issue from ICANN Contractual Compliance or Contracted parties. |
| **WG Final Report** | What types of data may have been useful that was not considered by the WG? If, possible make reference to data that was likely available at the time and did not appear to be used and also make a distinction of data available only today that could have been useful during the past effort. | Macro level data of transfers, both successful and unsuccessful, may have provided insight as to the extent of the abuse or fraudulent transfers. Data from Registry Performance reports could have provided high level data. However, the success or failure of transfers would have to be provided by Contracted Parties. Further, data to the amount of bulk transfers could have been useful. Lastly, WRT to Issue #1, WHOIS data regarding the difficulty of not having WHOIS Registrant email addresses, as well as, time duration data may have provided additional perspective to the issue regarding legitimate transfers. |
| **WG Final Report** | What type of problems/difficulties faced during the collection of data, if collected? Any suggestion/proposals to resolve the issues to collect data next easily | Unknown. It is not clear if requests for transfer data were made to ICANN Contractual Compliance or Contracted Parties. |
| **WG Recommendations/**  **GNSO Council adoption** | List the Final outcomes (recommendations) of WG effort.  Did the recommendations refer to additional data collection to measure the effectiveness? | The GNSO Council adopted the following resolutions 16 APR 2009. <http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200904>  The GNSO Council RESOLVES:  To encourage staff to explore further assessment of whether IRIS would be a viable option for the exchange of registrant email address data between registrars and conduct an analysis of IRIS' costs, time of implementation and appropriateness for IRTP purposes.  To include in future IRTP working groups the issue of the appropriateness of a policy change that would prevent a registrant from reversing a transfer after it has been completed and authorized by the admin contact. <Passed to IRTP-B>  Recommends that ICANN staff communicate to registries and registrars that the current bulk transfer provisions do apply to cases requiring the transfer of all names in one single gTLD under management of a registrar.  Footnote:  From the Policy on Transfer of Registrations between Registrars: 'Transfer of the sponsorship of all the registrations sponsored by one Registrar as the result of  acquisition of that Registrar or its assets by another Registrar, or  lack of accreditation of that Registrar or lack of its authorization with the Registry Operator, may be made according to the following procedure:  The gaining Registrar must be accredited by ICANN for the Registry TLD and must have in effect a Registry-Registrar Agreement with Registry Operator for the Registry TLD.  ICANN must certify in writing to Registry Operator that the transfer would promote the community interest, such as the interest in stability that may be threatened by the actual or imminent business failure of a Registrar.  Upon satisfaction of these two conditions, the Registry Operator will make the necessary one-time changes in the Registry database for no charge, for transfers involving 50,000 name registrations or fewer. If the transfer involves registrations of more than 50,000 names, Registry Operator will charge the gaining Registrar a one-time flat fee of US$ 50,000.' |
| **ICANN Board adoption / staff implementation** | List the Final outcomes (recommendations) of the Board and ICANN staff.  Did the recommendations refer to additional data collection to measure the effectiveness? | NA |