

IRTP Part A PDP Final Report

Thursday 16 April 2009
GNSO Council Meeting



Background

- Part A PDP – part of the overall Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy review process
- First in a series of five upcoming PDPs
- Part A addresses the following issues:
 - Issue I – Potential need for exchange of registrant e-mail data between registrars
 - Issue II – Potential need for electronic authentication
 - Issue III – Potential need for provisions for partial bulk transfers between Registrars

The Working Group

- Working Group started its deliberations on 5 August 2008
- 15 Members with representatives from the Business, IPC, Registrar and Registry Constituencies and the At-Large Advisory Committee
- Group decided to discuss issues in parallel to public comment period and Constituency statements completion
- 27 meetings, over 200 emails exchanged

The Final Report

- Final Report published on 19 March 2009
- Report covers input provided by the constituencies (Statements were received from the IPC, RyC, RC and BCUC), overview of the deliberations of the Working Group and feedback from public comment period

Issue 1 – Options for exchange of Registrant E-mail data

- Topics considered include: Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP), Internet Registry Information Service (IRIS), Registrant vs. Admin contact approval, Thin vs. Thick registries, Whois, AuthInfo code
- Conclusion: “The Working Group, recognizing that it is not specifically in the remit of this Working Group to make any recommendations for Whois modification, does support further assessment of whether IRIS would be a viable option for the exchange of registrant email address data between registrars and recommends an analysis of IRIS’ costs, time of implementation and appropriateness for IRTP purposes.”

Issue 1 – Options for exchange of Registrant E-mail data

Conclusion continued:

- “The WG noted that, in the absence of a simple and secure solution for providing the gaining registrar access to the registrant email address, future IRTP working groups should consider the appropriateness of a policy change that would prevent a registrant from reversing a transfer after it has been completed and authorized by the admin contact. This option would not change the current situation whereby a losing registrar can choose to notify the registrant and provide an opportunity to cancel a transfer before the process is completed.”

Issue 2 – Need for Electronic Authentication

- Topics considered include: Incidence of hacking / hijacking, additional security measures, market solutions vs. mandating technologies
- Conclusion: “there appears to be broad agreement that there is a need for other options for electronic authentication. However, opinions in the Working Group differ as to whether these options should be developed by means of GNSO policymaking or should be left to market solutions”.

Issue 3 – Need for Partial Bulk Transfer Provisions

- Topics considered include: Definition / requirements, security considerations, partial bulk transfer scenarios, current market solutions and existing bulk transfer provisions
- Conclusion: “there appears to be broad agreement that there is no need to incorporate provisions for handling partial bulk transfers between registrars at this stage. The Working Group believes that these scenarios can be addressed either through the existing Bulk Transfer provisions, or through existing market solutions. The Working Group would recommend the GNSO Council to clarify that the current bulk transfer provisions also apply to a bulk transfer of domain names in only one gTLD”

Further Information

- IRTP Part A Final Report
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-final-report-a-19mar09.pdf>
- IRTP Part A Public Comment Forum
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-initial-report/>
- Summary of Public Comment Forum
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-initial-report/msg00004.html>

Proposed motion

- Translates WG recommendations into actionable items:
 - 1) To encourage staff to explore further assessment of whether IRIS would be a viable option for the exchange of registrant email address data between registrars and conduct an analysis of IRIS' costs, time of implementation and appropriateness for IRTP purposes.
 - 2) To include in future IRTP working groups the issue of the appropriateness of a policy change that would prevent a registrant from reversing a transfer after it has been completed and authorized by the admin contact.
 - 3) Recommends that ICANN staff communicate to registries and registrars that the current bulk transfer provisions do apply to cases requiring the transfer of all names in one single gTLD under management of a registrar



Questions?