

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy: Policy Status Report (IRTP PSR)

Agenda Item #6

IRTP PSR: Background

- ⦿ **IRTP-D Working Group Final Report, Recommendation 17:**
 - “The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.”

- ⦿ **Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, Stage 5, “Support and Review: Policy Status Report”:**
 - “Compliance and GNSO Policy Staff should provide a report to the GNSO Council when there is sufficient data and there has been adequate time to highlight the impact of the policy recommendations, which could serve as the basis for further review and/or revisions to the policy recommendations if deemed appropriate.”

IRTP PSR analysis structured according to three overarching goals of the IRTP:

- ◉ Domain name “portability”
- ◉ Transfer-related abuse prevention
- ◉ Transfer-related information provision

IRTP PSR: Key Findings

- ⦿ Average of **≈414,000 domain transfers occurred per month (4,968,000 per year)** during observation period (2009 – 2017)
- ⦿ **Total domain registrations per year** averaged to **≈157,000,000**, which means domain transfers represented **≈ 3% of total domain registrations** per year
- ⦿ In general, number of **transfer-related tickets received by Contractual Compliance** went down from 2012 – 2018
- ⦿ ICANN org’s Global Support Center reported that the transfer-related inquiries it receives largely pertain to issues with the **60-day lock period** or with **obtaining an “AuthCode”** to carry out a transfer

IRTP Goal: Portability

- ⦿ Fewer and/or less complicated steps for registrants to transfer their domain(s), and quicker transfer times. Respondents indicated the **60-day “Change of Registrant” lock** requirement was frustrating.
- ⦿ Improve standards and security for transfer **AuthCodes**, and rely on them to carry out transfers via the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)

IRTP PSR: Public Comment and Survey Summary of Input

IRTP Goal: Preventing Abuse

- ◎ **Verify transfers** with registrants using all available means, including voice calls, email, text, and paper forms
- ◎ **Reduce or eliminate need for email verification of a transfer**, as hijackings regularly occur using compromised email addresses
- ◎ **Eliminate or modify the “Form of Authorization” (FOA) requirement**—especially for losing registrars—as it does not prevent domain hijacking. However, **some respondents indicated the FOA requirement should remain** as it provided an extra layer of security around the transfer process.
- ◎ **The Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) requirements should be modified.** The mandated 4-hour response time is unfair to registrars in different time zones and registrars do not have a process to work together on resolving an urgent transfer issue.
- ◎ Improve capabilities and/or processes to determine whether a domain being transferred is subject to a **Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) case**, and **strengthen enforcement of dispute resolution providers’ decisions**

IRTP Goal: Information Provision

- ⦿ Respondents indicated that **registrants are often unfamiliar with the details of the Transfer Policy**, and express frustration when they encounter barriers to transferring their domain name(s) (e.g. the “Change of Registrant” lock)

IRTP: Other Considerations

Expedited PDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data

- ◉ **20 February 2019:** EPDP [Final Report](#) published
 - ◉ See Transfer Policy-related recommendations:
 - ◉ **15.2:** TDRP
 - ◉ **24:** FOA, AuthCodes
 - ◉ **25:** GDPR-focused Transfer Policy review
- ◉ **April 2019:** [ICANN Board consideration of EPDP Final Report](#)

Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)

- ◉ Delivers registration data like the WHOIS protocol, but standardizes data access and query response formats
- ◉ Allows for new transfer capabilities (e.g. provision of AuthCodes for transfers)
- ◉ **26 August 2019:** [gTLD registries and registrars required to implement an RDAP service](#)

IRTP PSR: Anticipated Next Steps

- ✓ **14 November 2018 – 7 January 2019:** Public comment and survey open
- ✓ **1 February 2019:** Staff report of public comments and survey [published](#)
- ❑ **February – March 2019:** Update PSR with relevant public comments and survey input
- ❑ **8 April 2019:** Submit updated PSR to GNSO (document submission deadline for 18 April Council meeting)
- ❑ **April – June 2019 (est):** GNSO Council determines next steps, which may include:
 - ❑ Further review of the Transfer Policy
 - **See EPDP Rec 25:** “The EPDP Team recommends that the GNSO Council, as part of its review of the Transfer Policy, specifically requests the review of the implications, as well as adjustments, that may be needed to the Transfer Policy as a result of GDPR, with great urgency.”
 - ❑ New GNSO policy work on transfers
 - ❑ Other options as determined through Council – Org discussions

IRTP PSR: For Discussion

- ⦿ Which issues, if any, need immediate attention, either in the form of implementation guidance or policy development? Or should all issues be dealt with collectively?
- ⦿ How should the next steps of the review be structured?
- ⦿ What expertise and/or further input is needed to inform the review?