



# GNSO Council Open Meeting Agenda Background Information

---

## **Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B**

### **What is the GNSO Council deciding on today?**

The GNSO Council will decide today whether or not to initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part B that concerns three issues related to undoing domain name registration transfers and two issues related to registrar lock status. If the GNSO Council decides to initiate a PDP, it is also expected to vote on a charter for an IRTP Part B Working Group, which has also been put forward for consideration (see background information for more information).

### **Why is this important?**

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is a consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. As part of an overall review of this policy, a number of areas have been identified that require further clarification or improvement. Enhancements of the IRTP would be beneficial to the community in general, particularly for registrants, as well as those parties (gTLD registries and registrars) who are obligated to comply with the policy provisions.

### **How can I get involved?**

Following the adoption of the working group charter a call for volunteers will be launched. Please monitor the GNSO announcement web site (<http://gns0.icann.org/announcements/>) or contact the GNSO secretariat ([gns0.secretariat@gns0.icann.org](mailto:gns0.secretariat@gns0.icann.org)) to be added to the IRTP Part B mailing list.

### **Where can I find more information?**

You will be able to find more information on the IRTP Part B Wiki that will be created to facilitate collaboration and sharing of information. Once created, a link will be provided on the GNSO Council web site (<http://gns0.icann.org/index.html>).



## Background Information

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is a consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. As part of an overall review of this policy, a working group identified issues for improvement and clarification, and then categorized all the issues. In one category, a policy development process (PDP) focused on clarifying the reasons for denial of a transfer. The other issues fell into five PDP categories, labeled Parts A through E, to be addressed sequentially. The request for an issues report to address IRTP Part B, was adopted by the GNSO Council in April 2009. The IRTP Part B issues report (see <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-report-b-15may09.pdf>) addresses three issues on undoing transfers and two issues related to registrar lock status (see proposed charter for further details).

The following charter is under consideration:

The Working Group shall consider the following questions as outlined in the issues report and make recommendations to the GNSO Council:

- a) Whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed, as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report (<http://www.icann.org/announcements/hijacking-report-12jul05.pdf>); see also <http://www.icann.org/correspondence/cole-to-tonkin-14mar05.htm>);
- b) Whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a Registrant and Admin Contact (AC). The policy is clear that the Registrant can overrule the AC, but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar;
- c) Whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant, which often figures in hijacking cases;
- d) Whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of a Registrar Lock status (e.g. when it may/may not, should/should not be applied);
- e) Whether, and if so, how best to clarify denial reason #7: A domain name was already in “lock status” provided that the Registrar provides a readily accessible and reasonable means for the Registered Name Holder to remove the lock status.