

Transfer Policy Preliminary Issue Report

Alan Greenberg

11 November 2020

Transfer Policy

- Policy governing moving a gTLD domain from one registrar to another
- Current policy includes several mechanism to ensure that domains are transferred with the full knowledge and at the request of the actual registrant
- Some of these broken by the Temporary Specification and EPDP addressing GDPR
 - The public WHOIS identifying the registrant information was used by the gaining registrar.
 - Form of Authorization (FoA)

Related issues

- Several previous PDPs to create and the amend the policy.
 - More PDPs on this one issue than any other!
 - Arguably largest single issue for registrants
- Transfer of registrant also has some issues.
 - Domain locked after change of registrant info.
- Authcode management
- Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC)
- Transfer Dispute Resolution Process (TDRP)
- Other issues caused by the EPDP policy
- ICANN-approved transfers

Documents

- Scoping Paper (8 pages)
 - Outlines issues and assigns priority and complexity measures
 - <https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/transfer-policy-review-scoping-team-06apr20-en.pdf>
- Preliminary Issue Report (111 pages)
 - Detailed history and analysis of issues
 - Staff recommendation on how to proceed
 - <https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/preliminary-issue-report-pdp-transfer-policy-03jun20-en>

Staff Recommendation

Single PDP, but multiple Phases

Phase 1(a): Form of Authorization and Authcodes

Phase 1(b): Change of Registrant

Phase 2: TEAC and reversing inter-registrar transfers, TDRP, NACKing transfers, ICANN-approved transfers

Analysis

- Issue Report seems to be comprehensive and exhaustive
- Staff recommendation factors in the relative priority of the issues and allows for an organized approach to them.
- No issues identified that clearly need to be changed from an At-large point of view.

ALAC Action

- No action needed at this point.
- Presuming a PDP is approved, work will be highly technical, but there should be some At-Large involvement.

Discussion