

PEDNR - Draft Recommendations (to be reordered once complete)

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
1	7	All unsponsored gTLD Registries shall offer the Redemption Grace Period (RGP). For currently existing gTLDs that do not currently offer the RGP, a transition period shall be allowed. All new gTLDs must offer the RGP.	<u>Converge to consistent policy for all gTLDs to aid education policy.</u>	Should there be an exemption for TLDs that do not sell domains at all (what has been referred to in the VI WG as SRSU)?		Drafted - AG
2		Define “Original Registered Name Holder” as the Registered Name Holder of record just prior to the Expiration of the Registered Name. <u>Troubled by the term Original, as domain name could have been registered to different registrants in the past. Also concerned with Registered as redundant or is there an “Original Unregistered Name Holder”. Also “Registered Name Holder” sounds a bit like “Registered Registrant”. Is there a difficulty with RAE? Would “Pre-Expiration Registrant” fix it?</u>	If WHOIS records are changed by the Registrar after expiration (often allowed under registration agreements), it is essential that the RAA is explicit when referring to the original Registered Name Holder.		This is the formal definition of what we have been referring to as the RAE	Drafted - AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:11
Deleted: Version 2a (RW)
 Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
3	6	Following expiration, during Autorenew Grace Period, if a Registrar Deletes a Registered Name and that Registered Name enters the RGP, the Registrar must allow the Original Registered name Holder to redeem the Registered Name. This is regardless of any changes made to Whois data or other records between expiration of the domain and entering RGP. This is excepted where the Registrant has explicitly agreed to a reassignment of the domain, in a separate unilateral action at the time of reassignment, name to another Registered Name Holder.	The right implied by RGP must be available to the Registrant.			Drafted - AG
4	4 , 6	A change of WHOIS data or other records by the Registrar which is not done at the explicit request of the Original Registered Name Holder must not alter the Original Registered Name Holder's right and ability to renew the Registered Name during the guaranteed retrieval period following expiration.	There have been reported cases of such changes contributing to the inability of a Registered Name Holder in exercising their rights under the RGP.			Drafted - AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

myoung 25/1/11 13:23
Deleted: I

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:11
Deleted: If

myoung 25/1/11 13:23
Deleted: I

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Deleted: f

myoung 25/1/11 13:26
Deleted: .

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:11
Deleted: .

myoung 25/1/11 13:26
Deleted: .

myoung 25/1/11 13:25
Deleted: the post-expiration period or under the any ensuing RGP.

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
5	8	All RAA provisions applicable to Registrars dealing with registrar-registrant interactions must be carried out by either the registrar or, at their option, <u>delegated to</u> by a reseller. In the latter case, Registrars <u>remain now</u> responsible for any breaches as per RAA 3.12.6.		There was a suggestion that the wording of this recommendation needed to be “tightened”. Suggestions are welcome.	It has been claimed that the present recommendation is an implicit term of any contract in that a registrar cannot relieve themselves of an RAA responsibility simply because it is delegated to a reseller (and possibly to multiple nested resellers). delegated. The current RAA 3.12.2 and 3.12.5 provide a subset of this requirement but does not cover the entire range of responsibilities that may be delegated.	Drafted - AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:11
Deleted:

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Deleted: are still

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
6	11	<p>The price charged for post-expiration renewal during the [guaranteed renewal period] must be explicitly stated in the registration agreement or on the Registrar's web site (if any). This price must also be provided to the Original Registered name Holder at registration time and when pre-and post-expiration renewal notices are provided.</p> <p>There is no requirement that the price remains constant during the entire post-expiration period, but if it varies over time, that variation must be included in the above disclosures. The price may not vary based on any perceived or measured value <u>beyond the "face" value</u> of the Registered Name.</p>	Just as the RGP redemption price is required to be made readily available, the much more commonly user post-expiration price should similarly be available.	[guaranteed renewal period] to be replaced by whatever term is developed to refer to this period.	<p>The intent here is that the price displayed is the then-current price.</p> <p>This is similar RAA 3.7.5.6 "If Registrar operates a website for domain registration or renewal, it should state, both at the time of registration and in a clear place on its website, any fee charged for the recovery of a domain name during the Redemption Grace Period."</p>	Drafted - AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
7	12	In the event that ICANN gives reasonable notice to Registrar that ICANN has published web content providing educational materials with respect to registrant responsibilities and the gTLD domain life-cycle, and such content is developed in consultation with Registrars, Registrars who have a web presence must <u>provision a referral</u> to it.	The WG unanimously recognized that education was a critical aspect of ensuring reliable name retention.			Drafted - AG
8	22	In all RAA, Registry agreements and associated documentation, rename the “Auto-renew Grace Period” to “Registry-renew Grace Period”	Registration agreements often refer to the Auto-renew Grace Period (ARGP) as well as the service offered by Registrar to registrants to use a credit-card based “Auto-renew” service. The similarity of the two names causes confusion.			Drafted – AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

myoung 25/1/11 13:29
Deleted: point
myoung 25/1/11 13:30
Deleted: .

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
9	9	<p>Best practice recommendation: A registrar will design and host a neutral-content site with important information about how to properly steward a domain name and prevent unintended loss. Each Registrar should provide on its web site, and send to registrant in separate e-mail to registrant immediately following initial registration, a set of instructions for keeping domain name records current and for lessening the chance of mistakenly allowing the name to expire.</p> <p>At-Large should work with Registrars on this effort and to the extent possible with resources at its disposal. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of a public education campaign to encourage renewals and prevent unwanted loss of a name.</p>				Drafted – AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
10	10	The registration agreement and registrar web site (if one is used) must clearly indicate what methods will be used to deliver pre- and post-expiration notifications.	It is unreasonable to expect Registered Name Holder to be prepared to receive notification of expiration from Registrar if the Name Holder does not know how such notification will be sent.		The RAA would not prescribe specific notification methods, but the agreement must alert the registrant to what methods will be used (as a minimum).	Drafted – AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18

Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
11	14	Subject to an Exception policy, Registrar must notify Registered name Holder of impending expiration no less than two times. One such notice must be sent one month or 30 days prior to expiration (± 4 days) and one must be sent one week prior to expiration (± 3 days). If more than two alert notifications are sent, the timing of two of them must be comparable to the timings specified.	One notice should be sent sufficiently early as to allow standard business practices to request renewal prior to expiration. However, the notice should not be so far from expiration so as to encourage that a response be deferred. A another notice should be send relatively close to expiration to alert the Registered Name Holder that expiration is close.		The Exception process will allow a Registrar who wishes to use a different but similar in intent to do so. Exceptions might be requested do to varying business models or registration periods other than one year.	Drafted – AG
12	-	Exception Process		Process, level of public disclosure		

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18

Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus
13	17	Notifications of impending expiration must include method(s) that do not require explicit action other than standard e-mail receipt in order to receive such notifications.	The practice of notifying Registered Name Holders solely via the Registrars domain management system is not sufficient for the Registered Name Holders who have few or a moderate number of names and do not use such systems regularly.			Drafted – AG
14	16	Unless the Registered Name is deleted by the Registrar, at least one notification must be sent after expiration and at least 7 days prior to the Registered Name no longer being renewable by the Original Registered Name Holder.				Drafted – AG

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table

Rec. No.	Source Proposal	Recommendation	Rationale / Intent	For Discussion	Comments	Status / Consensus

Marika Konings 25/1/11 20:18
Formatted Table