

IRTP-D

Question Zero

Background session first?

Maybe look to the slides in the Initial Report?  
 Maybe one of the registry reps could take a look at those and determine whether they would be a good basis for a session?  
 Maybe also reach out to some of the providers -- at least for TDRP?  
 Barbara Knight has stepped forward -- LARS gets to forward the slides to her  
 Action: Barbara to develop a process diagram of the current practice would be really helpful

a) Whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed, in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions;

What has changed since this question was posed?  
 Poll stakeholders for their sentiment?

Sometimes called "domain laundering"  
 this would confound efforts of Registrars to work through this at their level -- thus only the Registries could address it  
 Use case -- during sunrise  
 When this was written, less-mature aftermarket -- which may make it easier to hijack/launder  
 Much of this may have been addressed in IRTP-C -- 30 day window, and owner-change rules  
 How is TDRP being used today -- often? only needed for very unusual events  
 TDRP applies to all gTLDs -- but registry operators can also put supplemental rules in place -- and registrars agree to those rules  
 Action: poll registries with regard to supplemental rules

b) Whether additional provisions should be included in the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred;

This one is a good candidate for "more data" to determine whether there is really a problem

Anonymizing  
 Likely easier to get data from registrars "early" in the chain  
 Acknowledge that the data may be biased in this way  
 May be indicative but not complete, as its going to be harder to get data from "late in the chain" registrars  
 At the registry level, very few data points  
 Registrars also have a hard time identifying these -- because they tend to look like a transfer. So complaints are about the only way to tell

Questions to ask

How common is this?  
 Urgent/emergency issues tend to be handled before TDRP  
 Verisign is seeing less of this today than in the past  
 Two kinds of statistics -- how common for registries. how common for registrars'  
 Don't leave 3rd party dispute resolution providers in the statistics-collection process 3-5/month

What are the implications, from the reigstrants' point of view -- what would they do, how would they recover the money they've spent, what would their recourse be?  
 it will be hard for Ry/Rrs to determine whether transfers have been done in good faith  
 he problem exists when people come into possession of stolen merchandise in any scenario

Hard to recreate the scenarios that this question was posed to address

Charter question discussion

c) Whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as part of the policy (registrants currently depend on registrars to initiate a dispute on their behalf);

Current situation: Registrar is the "gatekeeper" between registrants and this process

the only way for a registrant to proceed is through the courts -- maybe a better solution is to require all domain-service contracts to provide the path for the registrant to compel this -- maybe better to let them file a TDRP directly, paralleling UDRP  
 Goal: providing a mechanism for the registrant to participate int he process directly  
 Option: a mechanism for the registrant to start the process, which then leads to mechanisms to compel the other parties to participate in the process  
 Concern: authenticate the registrant  
 neither thin registries or 2nd level providers have a direct mechanism to do this directly  
 would need to get back to the registrar of record

3rd party dispute resolution providers are seeing direct requests from registrants

provides another avenue for registrants to jump-start the process  
 contracts between registrant/registrar to deal with hijacking?

Do we know why Registrars are refusing?

Cost?  
 Maybe registrant could offer to pay the fee?  
 are Rr's in breach of the policy if they refuse? who adjudicates?

Implication: TDRP may need to be reengineered to accomodate the addition of a registrant "start point" Perhaps a simpler approach would be a mechanism to compel the Rr to act

d) Whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants

Key issue -- disclosure

What are current practices  
 Challenge: tradeoff between ease of understanding vs tight definitions of all use-cases  
 Is that the sort of information tht shouldd be in the Registrants Rights & Responsibilities

e) Whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provisions/penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy

f) Whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need of FOAs.

New charter question?: Given the other changes, especially those arising from IRTP-C, has the nature of the TDRP changed in a fundamental way?

Current language MAY be flexible enough, but it would be worth taking a look to ensure consistency of the policies

Additional IRTP issues identified during the WG discussion

This is the last instance of IRTP  
 Risk of overload  
 But this is the last time  
 Requires balance  
 Caution is the watchword

Question: whether registries should even be in the 1st-level resolution role? Maybe go to something like UDRP?

May tie to the "open to registrants" question -- smaller number of providers may be relevant  
 "Change of registrant" also needs dispute resolution - that may be another topic for this  
 Many of the charter questions deal with TDRP  
 Dramatic increase in the number of registries -- many of whom (eg brands) may not have much dispute resolution

Questions for next time

actively recruit attendees in Beijing??