

# IRTP PDP-A WG Charter

## Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Part A - PDP Working Group Charter

This charter is based on the GNSO council decision to create a PDP WG to recommended policy solutions to the issues defined in "New IRTP Issues Report" <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf> in the following resolution approved on 25 June 2008,

*Whereas: The GNSO council has decided to initiate a PDP on Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Issues Report - Part A*

*The GNSO council had decided against initiating a Task force as defined in the bylaws,*

*The GNSO Council RESOLVES:*

*To form a Working Group of interested stakeholders and Constituency representatives, to collaborate broadly with knowledgeable individuals and organizations, in order to develop potential policy options to address the three issues covered, while seeking additional information as appropriate to inform the work. The WG will also be open to invited experts and to members of the ICANN advisory committees, whether acting in their own right or as representatives of their AC.*

*That a charter will be drafted for this working in 14 days and that this charter will contain the required work items, milestones especially those related to bylaws mandated constituency reviews and public comment periods, and guidelines for WG procedures. This charter will be discussed and decided upon at the next GNSO council meeting following the release of the charter.*

## Charter

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.
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).
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.

## Working Group processes:

While the development of [Guidelines for Working Group Operations](#) are still to be developed the following guidelines will apply to this WG:

- The WG shall function on the basis of rough consensus, meaning all points of view will be discussed until the chair can ascertain that the point of view is understood and has been covered. Consensus views should include the names and affiliations of those in agreement with that view. Anyone with a minority view will be invited to include a discussion in the WG report. Minority report should include the names and affiliations of those contributing to the minority report.
- In producing the WG report, the chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:
  - Unanimous consensus position
  - Rough consensus position - a position where a small minority disagrees but most agree
  - Strong support but significant opposition
  - Minority viewpoint(s)
- If several participants in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the chair or any other rough consensus call, they can follow these steps sequentially :
  1. Send email to the chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
  2. If the chair still disagrees, forward the appeal to the council liaison(s) to the group. The chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response. \* If the liaisons support the chair's position, forward the appeal to the council. The liaison(s) must explain his or her reasoning in the response.
  3. If the council supports the chair and liaison's position, attach a statement of the appeal to the board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the council.
- The chair, in consultation with the GNSO council liaison(s) is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the WG. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the GNSO council. Generally the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances this requirement may be bypassed.
- The WG will have an archived mailing list. The mailing list will be open for reading by the community. All WG meetings will be recorded and all recordings will be available to the public. A IRTP PDP A mailing list has been created xxxxx public archives are at: yyyy
- A SocialText wiki will be provided for WG usage
- If the guidelines for WG processes change during the course of the WG, the WG may continue to work under the guidelines active at the time it was (re)chartered or use the new guidelines.
- The council liaisons to the WG will be asked to report on the WG status monthly to the council.
- All WG charters must be reviewed by the GNSO council every 6 months for renewal.

## Milestones (dates to be updated if/when charter is approved)

- WG formed, chair & Council liaison & staff coordinator identified = T
- Template for constituency comments completed: T + 21 days

- Constituency comments due: T + 56 days
- Initial Report: T + 70 days
- First comment period ends: T + 100 days
- Preliminary Final Report: T + 120 days. *Note: If the WG decides that a change is needed to the milestone dates, it should submit a revised timeline to the GNSO council for approval*

### **Working Group chair(s):**

Paul Diaz

### **GNSO Council Liaison(s) to Working Group:**

Mike Rodenbaugh

### **Staff Coordinator**

Marika Konings

### **Subject Matter References:**

GNSO Issues Report: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy: Set A; "New IRTP Issues" <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf>

[Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Issues - PDP Recommendations - 19 Mar 08](#)

### **Process References:**

[Tutorial on IETF WGs](#)  
[Information on W3C working group processes](#)

### **Documents/Draft Documents Produced by the WG**

TBD