

**2012-03-01c Annex - Article X - Section 3 9 - Redline -  
For Posting - 10 February 2012**

# ARTICLE X: GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

## Section 3. GNSO COUNCIL

9. Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, [Annex A](#) hereto, or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions:

a. Create an Issues Report: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

Author  
Deleted: 25%

b. Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP") Within Scope (as described in [Annex A](#)): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

Author  
Deleted: ;

c. Initiate a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of GNSO Supermajority.

Author  
Deleted: 33%

d. Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

Author  
Deleted: 66%

e. Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

Author  
Deleted: ;

f. Changes to an Approved PDP Team Charter: For any PDP Team Charter approved under d. or e. above, the GNSO Council may approve an amendment to the Charter through a simple majority vote of each House.

Author  
Deleted: more than 75% of one House and a majority of the other House ("

g. Terminate a PDP: Once initiated, and prior to the publication of a Final Report, the GNSO Council may terminate a PDP only for significant cause, upon a motion that passes with a GNSO Supermajority Vote in favor of termination.

Author  
Deleted: ")

h. Approve a PDP Recommendation Without a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation.

Author  
Deleted: ;

i. Approve a PDP Recommendation With a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

Author  
Deleted: ;

j. Approve a PDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

Author  
Deleted: d

Author  
Deleted: ;

Author  
Deleted: e

Author  
Deleted: ; and

Author  
Deleted: f

k. Modification of Approved PDP Recommendation: Prior to Final Approval by the ICANN Board, an Approved PDP Recommendation may be modified or amended by the GNSO Council with a GNSO Supermajority vote.

Author  
Deleted: with respect to any contracting party affected by such contract provision

I. A "GNSO Supermajority" shall mean: (a) two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members of each House, or (b) three-fourths (3/4) of one House and a majority of the other House."

## Annex A: GNSO Policy Development Process

### Section 2. Policy Development Process Manual

The GNSO shall maintain a Policy Development Process Manual (PDP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The PDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a PDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The PDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Article X, Section 3.6.

\*\*\*

### Section 4. Creation of an Issue Report

Within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of either (i) an instruction from the Board; (ii) a properly supported motion from the GNSO Council; or (iii) a properly supported motion from an Advisory Committee, the Staff Manager will create a report (a "Preliminary Issue Report"). In the event the Staff Manager determines that more time is necessary to create the Preliminary Issue Report, the Staff Manager may request an extension of time for completion of the Preliminary Issue Report.

The following elements should be considered in the Issue Report:

- a) The proposed issue raised for consideration;
- b) The identity of the party submitting the request for the Issue Report;
- c) How that party is affected by the issue, if known;
- d) Support for the issue to initiate the PDP, if known;
- e) The opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed for consideration within the Policy Development Process is properly within the scope of the ICANN's mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO as set forth in the Bylaws.
- f) The opinion of ICANN Staff as to whether the Council should initiate the PDP on the issue

Upon completion of the Preliminary Issue Report, the Preliminary Issue Report shall be posted on the ICANN website for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

The Staff Manager is responsible for drafting a summary and analysis of the public comments received on the Preliminary Issue Report and producing a Final

Author  
Deleted:  
Author  
Deleted: at minimum

Author  
Deleted: . of no less than 30 days

Issue Report based upon the comments received. The Staff Manager should forward the Final Issue Report, along with any summary and analysis of the public comments received, to the Chair of the GNSO Council for consideration for initiation of a PDP.

#### Section 5. Initiation of the PDP

The Council may initiate the PDP as follows:

*Board Request:* If the Board requested an Issue Report, the Council, within the timeframe set forth in the PDP Manual, shall initiate a PDP. No vote is required for such action.

*GNSO Council or Advisory Committee Requests:* The Council may only initiate the PDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of a PDP requires a vote as set forth in [Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9\(b\) and \(c\)](#) in favor of initiating the PDP.

#### Section 6. Reports

An Initial Report should be delivered to the GNSO Council and posted for a public comment period [that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN](#), which time may be extended in accordance with the PDP Manual. Following the review of the comments received and, if required, additional deliberations, a Final Report shall be produced for transmission to the Council.

Author

**Deleted:** not less than 30 days

**2012-03-01c Annex - Recommendations Report - IRTP  
Part B Rec #9 part 2 - FINAL - 16 February 2012**



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

**TO:** ICANN Board of Directors  
**TITLE:** GNSO Council Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B, Recommendation #9 part 2  
**PROPOSED ACTION:** Board Action to Approve

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council unanimously [approved](#) at its meeting on 19 January 2012 a proposed change to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) and is now seeking Board review and approval. This recommendation is made following completion of the IRTP Part B Policy Development Process (PDP) and concerns the implementation of Recommendation #9 part 2 and the accompanying staff proposal. Recommendation #9 part 2 states that denial reason #7 of the IRTP should be replaced with a new provision that defines when and how domains may be locked or unlocked. The ICANN Staff proposal, taking into account the deletion of denial reason #7 as previously approved by the ICANN Board, proposes to expand the existing section 5 (EPP - based Registry Requirements for Registrars) of the IRTP to modify existing rules applicable to Registrars on the locking and unlocking of domain names. The proposed modifications to the IRTP can be found in redline form in the ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #9 part 2 which is included in the Annex. The main elements of the proposed modifications are:

- Registrar may only impose a lock that would prohibit transfer of the domain name if it includes in its registration agreement the terms and conditions for imposing such lock and obtains express consent from the Registered Name Holder: and
- Registrar must remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five (5) calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to remove the "Registrar Lock" status

Under the ICANN Bylaws, the Council's unanimous (supermajority) support for the motion obligates the Board to adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66%, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

The policy recommendations above, if approved by the Board, will impose new obligations on certain contracted parties. The GNSO Council's unanimous vote in favor of these items exceeds the voting threshold required at Article X, Section 3.9.f of the ICANN Bylaws regarding the formation of consensus policies.

The Annex to this submission provides the background and further details with regard to these recommendations.

## 2. BACKGROUND

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) aims to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another should they wish to do so. The policy also provides standardized requirements for registrar handling of such transfer requests from domain name holders. The policy is an existing community consensus policy that was implemented in late 2004 and is now being reviewed by the GNSO.

The IRTP Part B Policy Development Process (PDP) was the second in a series of five PDPs that address areas for improvements in the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. The GNSO IRTP Part B Policy Development Process Working Group was tasked to address five issues focusing on issues related to domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name and "lock status". The WG delivered its Final Report to the GNSO Council on 31 May 2011. The GNSO Council acted on a number of the recommendations at its meeting on 22 June 2011, which were subsequently adopted by the Board on 25 August 2011. In relation to recommendation #9, part 2, a proposal from staff was requested. Following consultations with the IRTP Part B Working Group and [a public comment forum on the Staff Proposal](#), GNSO Council approved IRTP Part B Recommendation #9, part 2 and the staff proposal at its meeting on 19 January 2012 (see <http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201201>).

## 3. RATIONALE FOR ADOPTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION:

### *Why is this issue addressed now?*

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is a consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 which provides for a straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars. The GNSO



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

Council established a series of five Working Groups (Parts A through E) to review and consider various revisions to this policy.

The IRTP Part B PDP is the second in a series of five scheduled PDPs addressing areas for improvements in the existing policy. The IRTP Part B Working Group has addressed five issues focusing on domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name, and lock status. Most of these recommendations have already been adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. In relation to recommendation #9, part 2, a proposal from staff was requested. Following consultations with the IRTP Part B Working Group and [a public comment forum on the Staff Proposal](#), GNSO Council approved IRTP Part B Recommendation #9, part 2 and the staff proposal unanimously at its meeting on 19 January 2012 (see <http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201201>). The IRTP Part B PDP Final Report received unanimous consensus support from the IRTP Part B Working Group as well as the GNSO Council.

### ***What is the proposal being put forward for Board consideration?***

Recommendation #9 part 2 states that denial reason #7 of the IRTP should be replaced by adding a new provision in a different section of the IRTP on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked. The ICANN Staff proposal, taking into account the deletion of denial reason #7 as previously approved by the ICANN Board, proposes to expand the existing section 5 (EPP - based Registry Requirements for Registrars) of the IRTP to address "Registrar Lock Status". The proposed modifications to the IRTP can be found in redline form in the ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #9 part 2 which is included in the Annex. The main elements of the proposed modifications are:

- Registrar may only impose a lock that would prohibit transfer of the domain name if it includes in its registration agreement the terms and conditions for imposing such lock and obtains express consent from the Registered Name Holder: and
- Registrar must remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five (5) calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to remove the "Registrar Lock" status

### ***Outreach conducted by the Working Group to solicit views of groups that are likely to be impacted***

Public comment forums were held by the Working Group on the [initiation of the PDP](#), [the Initial Report](#),





# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

the [proposed Final Report](#) and [the Staff Proposal on Recommendation 9 part 2](#) in addition to regular updates to the GNSO Council as well as workshops to inform and solicit the input from the ICANN Community at ICANN meetings (see for example, [Brussels Meeting](#) and [San Francisco Meeting](#)). Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statements were submitted (see <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoirtpb/IRTP+Part+B>). All comments received were reviewed and considered by the IRTP Part B PDP WG (see section 6 of the [IRTP Part B Final Report](#)). In addition, as prescribed by the ICANN Bylaws, a [public comment forum](#) was held on the recommendations to be considered by the ICANN Board.

## ***What concerns or issues were raised by the community?***

Following the closing of the public comment forum on the staff proposal (no comments received) and the submission of the proposal to the GNSO Council, [the Intellectual Property Constituency submitted a number of comments](#), which ICANN staff [responded to](#) and which were considered as part of the GNSO Council deliberations on the proposal. However, no further changes were deemed necessary to the recommendation and the Staff proposal and the subsequent motion adopting the recommendation and the staff proposal were adopted unanimously.

## ***What significant materials did the PDP Working Group and GNSO Council review outlining the support and/or opposition to the proposed recommendations?***

The materials and input reviewed by the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group are outlined in the [IRTP Part B Final Report](#), which also outlines the full consensus support of the IRTP Part B Working Group for this recommendation. In addition to the regular updates as described above, the GNSO Council reviewed this Final Report and the ICANN Staff proposal, as well as the comments submitted by the IPC and Staff's response to those comments.

## ***What factors the GNSO Council found to be significant?***

The recommendation was developed by the IRTP Part B Working Group following the GNSO Policy Development Process as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and has received the unanimous support from the GNSO Council. As outlined in the ICANN Bylaws, the Council's unanimous



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

(supermajority) support for the motion obligates the Board to adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66%, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. In addition, transfer related issues are the number one area of complaint according to data from ICANN Compliance. Improvements to the IRTP have the potential to reduce the number of complaints, in addition to providing clarity and predictability to registrants as well as registrars.

***Are there positive or negative community impacts?***

Improvements to the IRTP have the potential to reduce the number of complaints, in addition to providing clarity and predictability to registrants as well as registrars. Adoption of the recommendations will require changes in processes for registrars, but these are considered to have a minimum impact and necessary in order to address the issues that are part of this Policy Development Process. The recommendations, if implemented, would usefully clarify and enhance the IRTP, to the advantage of all parties concerned.

***Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?***

Apart from those changes required in process for registrars as outlined above, no other fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN; the community; and/or the public are expected.

***Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?***

There are no security, stability, or resiliency issues related to the DNS if the Board approves the proposed recommendations.

#### **4. COUNCIL MOTION ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION AND STAFF PROPOSAL**

Motion on the Adoption of the Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #9 part 2

WHEREAS on 24 June 2009, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) on IRTP Part B addressing the following five charter questions:



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

- 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); ie. 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.

WHEREAS this PDP has followed the prescribed PDP steps as stated in the Bylaws, resulting in a Final Report delivered on 30 May 2011;

WHEREAS the IRTP Part B WG has reached full consensus on the recommendations in relation to each of the five issues outlined above;

WHEREAS in relation to recommendation #9 part b, the GNSO Council resolved at its meeting on 22 June to request ICANN Staff to provide a proposal for a new provision on locking / unlocking of a domain name, taking into account the IRTP Part B WG deliberations in relation to this issue (see IRTP Part B Final Report - (Recommendation #9 - part 2). Upon review of the proposal, the GNSO Council will consider whether to approve the recommendation;



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

WHEREAS ICANN staff developed the proposal in consultation with the IRTP Part B Working Group which was put out for public comment (see <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/irtp-b-staff-proposals-22nov11-en.htm>);

WHEREAS comments were received from the Intellectual Property Constituency, and though received after the comment deadline were nonetheless considered by the GNSO Council, and the proposal was submitted to the GNSO Council;

WHEREAS the GNSO Council has reviewed and discussed the ICANN Staff proposal in relation to IRTP Part B recommendation #9 part 2.

RESOLVED, the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Directors that it adopts and implements IRTP Part B recommendation #9 part 2 and the related ICANN Staff proposal (as described in <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf> and <http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg12545.html>).



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

## ANNEX A – STAFF PROPOSAL ON IRTP PART B RECOMMENDATION #9 PART 2

### Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B – Recommendation #9 – part 2

#### New provision on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked

**The Request:** ‘Prior to the consideration of approval of the recommendation which states: "denial reason #7 should be replaced by adding a new provision in a different section of the IRTP on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked", the GNSO Council requests ICANN Staff to provide a proposal for such a new provision, taking into account the IRTP Part B WG deliberations in relation to this issue (see IRTP Part B Final Report - (Recommendation #9 - part 2). Upon review of the proposal, the GNSO Council will consider whether to approve the recommendation.’ (As adopted by the GNSO Council in [resolution 20110622-1](#) on 22 June 2011).

**Background:** The original Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) denial reason #7 reads ‘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’. As a result of the deliberations of the IRTP Part B Working Group, it became clear that in its current form, denial reason #7 cannot be invoked because if ‘a domain is in “lock status”, the registry cannot initiate a transfer request (so there will not be a ground for denial based on #7)<sup>1</sup>. As a result, the IRTP Part B Working Group recommended the removal of this denial reason from the IRTP. At the same time, the Working Group recognized the need for including in the IRTP a provision that would address when and how domain name registrations may be locked or unlocked. ICANN Staff was requested to provide a proposal for consideration, taking into account the deliberations of the IRTP Part B Working Group on this issue.

**Proposal:** Taking into account the deletion of denial reason #7, ICANN Staff proposes to expand the existing section 5 (EPP - based Registry Requirements for Registrars) of the IRTP to address “Registrar

---

<sup>1</sup> See IRTP Part B Final Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf>.



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

Lock Status". The proposed modifications to the IRTP can be found in redline form below. The main elements of the proposed modifications are:

- Registrar may only impose a lock that would prohibit transfer of the domain name if it includes in its registration agreement the terms and conditions for imposing such lock and obtains express consent from the Registered Name Holder: and
- Registrar must remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five (5) calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to remove the "Registrar Lock" status

Note, since denial reason # 7 is being deleted following the adoption by the ICANN Board of this recommendation, registrars will no longer be able to deny any outbound transfers because they are on "lock" status -- whether reflected in WHOIS/EPP or not.



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

## Proposed Modifications To

### Policy on Transfer of Registrations between Registrars

Revision Adopted 7 November 2008

Effective 15 March 2009

[Prior version of Policy](#) (12 July 2004)

#### A. Holder-Authorized Transfers

##### 1. Registrar Requirements

Registered Name Holders must be able to transfer their domain name registrations between Registrars provided that the Gaining Registrar's transfer process meets the minimum standards of this policy and that such transfer is not prohibited by ICANN or Registry policies. Inter-Registrar domain name transfer processes must be clear and concise in order to avoid confusion. Further, Registrars should make reasonable efforts to inform Registered Name Holders of, and provide access to, the published documentation of the specific transfer process employed by the Registrars.

##### 1.1 Transfer Authorities

The Administrative Contact and the Registered Name Holder, as listed in the Losing Registrar's or applicable Registry's (where available) publicly accessible WHOIS service are the only parties that have the authority to approve or deny a transfer request to the Gaining Registrar. In the event of a dispute, the Registered Name Holder's authority supersedes that of the Administrative Contact.

Registrars may use Whois data from either the Registrar of Record or the relevant Registry for the purpose of verifying the authenticity of a transfer request; or from another data source as determined by a consensus policy.

##### 2. Gaining Registrar Requirements

For each instance where a Registered Name Holder requests to transfer a domain name registration to a different Registrar, the Gaining Registrar shall:



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

2.1 Obtain express authorization from either the Registered Name Holder or the Administrative Contact (hereafter, "Transfer Contact"). Hence, a transfer may only proceed if confirmation of the transfer is received by the Gaining Registrar from the Transfer Contact.

2.1.1 The authorization must be made via a valid Standardized Form of Authorization (FOA). There are two different FOA's available at the ICANN website. The FOA labeled "Initial Authorization for Registrar Transfer" must be used by the Gaining Registrar to request an authorization for a registrar transfer from the Transfer Contact. The FOA labeled "Confirmation of Registrar Transfer Request" may be used by the Registrar of Record to request confirmation of the transfer from the Transfer Contact.

The FOA shall be communicated in English, and any dispute arising out of a transfer request shall be conducted in the English language. Registrars may choose to communicate with the Transfer Contact in additional languages. However, Registrars choosing to exercise such option are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the translation into such additional non-English version of the FOA.

2.1.2 In the event that the Gaining Registrar relies on a physical process to obtain this authorization, a paper copy of the FOA will suffice insofar as it has been signed by the Transfer Contact and further that it is accompanied by a physical copy of the Registrar of Record's Whois output for the domain name in question.

2.1.2.1 If the Gaining Registrar relies on a physical authorization process, then the Gaining Registrar assumes the burden of obtaining reliable evidence of the identity of the Transfer Contact and maintaining appropriate records proving that such evidence was obtained. Further the Gaining Registrar also assumes the burden for ensuring that the entity making the request is indeed authorized to do so. The acceptable forms of physical identity are:

- Notarized statement
- Valid Drivers license
- Passport
- Article of Incorporation
- Military ID
- State/Government issued ID
- Birth Certificate





## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

2.1.3 In the event that the Gaining Registrar relies on an electronic process to obtain this authorization the acceptable forms of identity would include:

- Electronic signature in conformance with national legislation, in the location of the Gaining Registrar (if such legislation exists).
- Consent from an individual or entity that has an email address matching the Transfer Contact email address.

The Registrar of Record may not deny a transfer request solely because it believes that the Gaining Registrar has not received the confirmation set forth above.

A transfer must not be allowed to proceed if no confirmation is received by the Gaining Registrar. The presumption in all cases will be that the Gaining Registrar has received and authenticated the transfer request made by a Transfer Contact.

2.2 Request, by the transmission of a "transfer" command as specified in the Registrar Tool Kit, that the Registry Operator database be changed to reflect the new Registrar.

2.2.1 Transmission of a "transfer" command constitutes a representation on the part of the Gaining Registrar that the requisite authorization has been obtained from the Transfer Contact listed in the authoritative Whois database.

2.2.2 The Gaining Registrar is responsible for validating the Registered Name Holder requests to transfer domain names between Registrars. However, this does not preclude the Registrar of Record from exercising its option to independently confirm the Registered Name Holder's intent to transfer its domain name to the Gaining Registrar in accordance with Section 3 of this policy.

### 3. Obligations of the Registrar of Record

A Registrar of Record can choose independently to confirm the intent of the Registered Name Holder when a notice of a pending transfer is received from the Registry. The Registrar of Record must do so in a manner consistent with the standards set forth in this [policy](#) pertaining to Gaining Registrars. In order to ensure that the form of the request employed by the Registrar of Record is substantially administrative and informative in nature and clearly provided to the Transfer Contact for the purpose of verifying the intent of the Transfer Contact, the Registrar of Record must use the FOA.



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

The FOA shall be communicated in English, and any dispute arising out of a transfer request, shall be conducted in the English language. Registrars may choose to communicate with the Transfer Contact in additional languages. However, the Registrar choosing to exercise such option is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the translation into such additional non-English version of the FOA. Further, such non-English communications must follow the processes and procedures set forth in this policy. This includes but is not limited to the requirement that no Registrar shall add any additional information to the FOA used to obtain the consent of the Transfer Contact in the case of a transfer request.

This requirement does not preclude the Registrar of Record from marketing to its existing customers through separate communications.

The FOA should be sent by the Registrar of Record to the Transfer Contact as soon as operationally possible, but must be sent not later than twenty-four (24) hours after receiving the transfer request from the Registry Operator.

Failure by the Registrar of Record to respond within five (5) calendar days to a notification from the Registry regarding a transfer request will result in a default "approval" of the transfer.

In the event that a Transfer Contact listed in the Whois has not confirmed their request to transfer with the Registrar of Record and the Registrar of Record has not explicitly denied the transfer request, the default action will be that the Registrar of Record must allow the transfer to proceed.

Upon denying a transfer request for any of the following reasons, the Registrar of Record must provide the Registered Name Holder and the potential Gaining Registrar with the reason for denial. The Registrar of Record may deny a transfer request only in the following specific instances:

1. Evidence of fraud
2. UDRP action
3. Court order by a court of competent jurisdiction
4. Reasonable dispute over the identity of the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact
5. No payment for previous registration period (including credit card charge-backs) if the domain name is past its expiration date or for previous or current registration periods if the domain name has not yet expired. In all such cases, however, the domain name must be put into "Registrar Hold" status by the Registrar of Record prior to the denial of transfer.
6. Express objection to the transfer by the authorized Transfer Contact. Objection could take the form of specific request (either by paper or electronic means) by

the authorized Transfer Contact to deny a particular transfer request, or a general objection to all transfer requests received by the Registrar, either temporarily or indefinitely. In all cases, the objection must be provided with the express and informed consent of the authorized Transfer Contact on an opt-in basis and upon request by the authorized Transfer Contact, the Registrar must remove the lock or provide a reasonably accessible method for the authorized Transfer Contact to remove the lock within five (5) calendar days.

- ~~6. Express written objection to the transfer from the Transfer Contact. (e.g. email, fax, paper document or other processes by which the Transfer Contact has expressly and voluntarily objected through opt-in means)~~
- ~~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.~~~~Deleted~~*[Note: Ground for Denial Reason #7 was removed/deleted based on the recommendation of the IRTP Part B Working Group, as approved by the ICANN Board]*
8. The transfer was requested within 60 days of the creation date as shown in the registry Whois record for the domain name.
9. A domain name is within 60 days (or a lesser period to be determined) after being transferred (apart from being transferred back to the original Registrar in cases where both Registrars so agree and/or where a decision in the dispute resolution process so directs). "Transferred" shall only mean that an inter-registrar transfer has occurred in accordance with the procedures of this policy.

**Comment [MK1]:** Modified as approved by the ICANN Board on 25 August 2011.

Instances when the requested change of Registrar may not be denied include, but are not limited to:

- Nonpayment for a pending or future registration period
- No response from the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact.
- Domain name in "Registrar Lock" status, ~~unless the Registered Name Holder is provided with the reasonable opportunity and ability to unlock the domain name prior to the Transfer Request.~~
- Domain name registration period time constraints, other than during the first 60 days of initial registration or during the first 60 days after a registrar transfer.
- General payment defaults between Registrar and business partners / affiliates in cases where the Registered Name Holder for the domain in question has paid for the registration.

The Registrar of Record has other mechanisms available to collect payment from the Registered Name Holder that are independent from the Transfer process. Hence, in the event of a dispute over payment, the Registrar of Record must not employ transfer processes as a mechanism to secure payment for services from a Registered Name Holder. Exceptions to this requirement are as follows:



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

(i) In the case of non-payment for previous registration period(s) if the transfer is requested after the expiration date, or

(ii) In the case of non-payment of the current registration period, if transfer is requested before the expiration date.

#### 4. Registrar Coordination

Each Registrar is responsible for keeping copies of documentation, including the FOA and the Transfer Contacts response thereto, that may be required for filing and supporting a dispute under the dispute resolution policy. Gaining Registrars must maintain copies of the FOA as received from the Transfer Contact as per the standard document retention policies of the contracts. Copies of the reliable evidence of identity must be kept with the FOA.

Both the Gaining Registrar and the Registrar of Record must provide the evidence relied on for the transfer during and after the applicable inter-registrar domain name transaction(s). Such information must be provided when requested by, and only by, the other Registrar that is party to the transfer transaction. Additionally, ICANN, the Registry Operator, a court or authority with jurisdiction over the matter or a third party dispute resolution panel may also require such information within five (5) days of the request.

The Gaining Registrar must retain, and produce pursuant to a request by a Losing Registrar, a written or electronic copy of the FOA. In instances where the Registrar of Record has requested copies of the FOA, the Gaining Registrar must fulfill the Registrar of Records request (including providing the attendant supporting documentation) within five (5) calendar days. Failure to provide this documentation within the time period specified is grounds for reversal by the Registry Operator or the Dispute Resolution Panel in the event that a transfer complaint is filed in accordance with the requirements of this policy.

If either a Registrar of Record or a Gaining Registrar does not believe that a transfer request was handled in accordance with the provisions of this policy, then the Registrar may initiate a dispute resolution procedure as set forth in Section C of this policy.

For purposes of facilitating transfer requests, Registrars should provide and maintain a unique and private email address for use only by other Registrars and the Registry:



## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

- . This email address is for issue related to transfer requests and the procedures set forth in this policy only.
- i. The email address should be managed to ensure messages are received by someone who can respond to the transfer issue.
- ii. Messages received at such email address must be responded to within a commercial reasonable timeframe not to exceed seven (7) calendar days.

### **5. "Registrar Lock" Status and EPP - based Registry Requirements for Registrars**

Subject to ICANN specifications or policies and any applicable laws or regulations, Registrars must follow the requirements set forth below.

Registrar may set a domain name in "Registrar Lock" status (or with the EPP status code "clientTransferProhibited") upon registration or subsequent request by the Registered Name Holder provided that the Registrar includes in its registration agreement and obtains express consent from the Registered Name Holder the terms and conditions upon which it locks and prohibits transfer of the domain name. Further, the Registrar must remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five (5) calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to remove the "Registrar Lock" status.

In EPP based gTLD Registries, Registrars must follow the requirements set forth below.

Registrars must provide the Registered Name Holder with the unique "AuthInfo" code and remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five (5) calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to generate and manage their own unique "AuthInfo" code and to remove the "Registrar Lock" status.

Registrars may not employ any mechanism for complying with a Registered Name Holder's request to remove the "Registrar Lock" status or obtain the applicable "AuthInfo" code that is more restrictive than the mechanisms used for changing any aspect of the Registered Name Holder's contact or name server information.

The Registrar of Record must not refuse to remove the "Registrar Lock" status or release an "AuthInfo" code to the Registered Name Holder solely because there is a dispute between the Registered Name Holder and the Registrar over payment.

Registrar-generated "AuthInfo" codes must be unique on a per-domain basis.



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

The "Auth-Info" codes must be used solely to identify a Registered Name Holder, whereas the FOA's still need to be used for authorization or confirmation of a transfer request, as described in Section 2 and Section 4 of this policy.

## 6. Registry Requirements

Upon receipt of the "transfer" command from the Gaining Registrar, Registry Operator will transmit an electronic notification to both Registrars. In the case of those Registries that use electronic mail notifications, the response notification may be sent to the unique email address established by each Registrar for the purpose of facilitating transfers.

The Registry Operator shall complete the requested transfer unless, within five (5) calendar days, Registry Operator receives a NACK protocol command from the Registrar of Record.

When the Registry's database has been updated to reflect the change to the Gaining Registrar, Registry Operator will transmit an electronic notification to both Registrars. The notification may be sent to the unique email address established by each Registrar for the purpose of facilitating transfers or such other email address agreed to by the parties.

The Registry Operator shall undo a transfer if, after a transfer has occurred, the Registry Operator receives one of the notices as set forth below. In such case, the transfer will be reversed and the domain name reset to its original state. The Registry Operator must undo the transfer within five (5) calendar days of receipt of the notice except in the case of a Registry dispute decision, in which case the Registry Operator must undo the transfer within fourteen calendar days unless a court action is filed. The notice required shall be one of the following:

- . Agreement of the Registrar of Record and the Gaining Registrar sent by email, letter or fax that the transfer was made by mistake or was otherwise not in accordance with the procedures set forth in this policy;
- i. The final determination of a dispute resolution body having jurisdiction over the transfer; or
- ii. Order of a court having jurisdiction over the transfer.

## 7. Records of Registration

Each Registrar shall require its customer, the Registered Name Holder, to maintain its own records appropriate to document and prove the initial domain name registration date.



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

## 8. Effect on Term of Registration

The completion by Registry Operator of a holder-authorized transfer under this Part A shall result in a one-year extension of the existing registration, provided that in no event shall the total unexpired term of a registration exceed ten (10) years.

### B. ICANN-Approved Transfers

Transfer of the sponsorship of all the registrations sponsored by one Registrar as the result of (i) acquisition of that Registrar or its assets by another Registrar, or (ii) lack of accreditation of that Registrar or lack of its authorization with the Registry Operator, may be made according to the following procedure:

(a) The gaining Registrar must be accredited by ICANN for the Registry TLD and must have in effect a Registry-Registrar Agreement with Registry Operator for the Registry TLD.

(b) ICANN must certify in writing to Registry Operator that the transfer would promote the community interest, such as the interest in stability that may be threatened by the actual or imminent business failure of a Registrar.

Upon satisfaction of these two conditions, Registry Operator will make the necessary one-time changes in the Registry database for no charge, for transfers involving 50,000 name registrations or fewer. If the transfer involves registrations of more than 50,000 names, Registry Operator will charge the gaining Registrar a one-time flat fee of US\$ 50,000.

### C. Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy

Procedures for handling disputes concerning inter-registrar transfers are set forth in the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. Procedures in this policy must be followed by the applicable Registry Operators and ICANN accredited Registrars.



# GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

## ANNEX B - PDP Checklist

<b>Request for an Issue Report</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200904">http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200904</a>
<b>Preliminary Issue Report</b>	N/A <sup>2</sup>
<b>Public Comment Forum &amp; Report of Public Comments on Preliminary Issue Report</b>	N/A <sup>2</sup>
<b>Final Issue Report</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-report-b-15may09.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-report-b-15may09.pdf</a>
<b>Initiation of the PDP</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200906">http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200906</a>
<b>Approval of the WG Charter</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200907">http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#200907</a>
<b>Stakeholder Group / Constituency Statements received</b>	<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoirtpb/IRTP+Part+B">https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoirtpb/IRTP+Part+B</a>
<b>Statements from other SOs/ACs received</b>	ALAC Statement: <a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-proposed-final-report/msg00003.html">http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-proposed-final-report/msg00003.html</a>
<b>Initial Report published by WG</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-initial-report-29may10-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-initial-report-29may10-en.pdf</a>
<b>Public Comment Forum on Initial Report &amp; Report of Public Comments</b>	<a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-initial-report/">http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-initial-report/</a>
<b>Additional Reports</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-proposed-final-report-21feb11-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-proposed-final-report-21feb11-en.pdf</a>
<b>Additional Public Comment Forums &amp; Public Consultations</b>	<a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b">http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b</a> <a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-proposed-final-report/">http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b-proposed-final-report/</a> <a href="http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12502">http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12502</a> <a href="http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22083">http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22083</a>
<b>Final Report published by WG</b>	<a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf</a>

<sup>2</sup> Not applicable as this PDP was conducted under the GNSO PDP rules that applied prior to 8 December 2011





## GNSO Council Recommendations Report

16 February 2012

---

<b>Approval of Final Report and Recommendations by GNSO Council</b>	<a href="http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201201">http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201201</a>
---	---

**Pages 26 – 46 Intentionally Omitted  
Item Removed From Agenda**

**2012-03-01e Annex - Julie Hammer Bio for ICANN SSAC  
Dec11**

**Julie Hammer Bio & SOI  
for ICANN SSAC Membership Committee**

Personal Information Redacted

Personal Information Redacted

# **2012-03-01e Annex - Robert Guerra Bio February 2012**

**Robert Guerra**

Personal Information Redacted

**Pages 52 – 121 Intentionally Omitted  
Item Removed From Agenda**