**Stakeholder Group / Constituency Input Template**

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D Policy Development Process**

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR RESPONSE AT THE LATEST **BY Friday 19 April 2013** TO THE GNSO SECRETARIAT ([gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org](mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org)), which will forward your statement to the IRTP Part D Working Group.

The GNSO Council has formed a [Working Group](https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIPDWG/Inter-Registrar+Transfer+Policy+%28IRTP%29+Part+D+Working+Group+Home) of interested stakeholders and Stakeholder Group / Constituency representatives, to collaborate broadly with knowledgeable individuals and organizations, in order to consider recommendations for a number of issues related to the [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP)](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm). The IRTP is a consensus policy that was adopted by the GNSO Council in 2004, which aims to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another.

Part of the working group’s effort will be to incorporate ideas and suggestions gathered from Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies through this Stakeholder Group / Constituency Statement. Inserting your Stakeholder Group’s / Constituency’s response in this form will make it much easier for the Working Group to summarize the responses. This information is helpful to the community in understanding the points of view of various stakeholders. However, you should feel free to add any information you deem important to inform the working group’s deliberations, even if this does not fit into any of the questions listed below.

For further background information on this issue, please review the [GNSO Final Issue Report on IRTP Part D](http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/issue-report-irtp-d-08jan13-en.pdf). The Working Group [Charter can be found here](https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIPDWG/3.+WG+Charter).

**Process**

* Please identify the member(s) of your stakeholder group / constituency who is (are) participating in this working group Chris Chaplow, Angie Graves, Phil Corwin
* Please identify the members of your stakeholder group / constituency who participated in developing the perspective(s) set forth below. Drafted by Chris Chaplow, reviewed by Angie Graves, Phil Corwin and Steve DelBianco
* Please describe the process by which your stakeholder group / constituency arrived at the perspective(s) set forth below. Chris Chaplow, drafted document, reviewed by Angie Graves, Phil Corwin. Steve DelBianco reviewed that comments were in line with BC positions.

**Questions**

Please provide your stakeholder group’s / constituency’s views on the IRTP Part D Charter Questions:

1. With regard to the IRTP, should reporting requirements for registries and dispute provider be developed in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions?

BC considers that reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers **should** be developed in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions

1. Should additional provisions be included in the [Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy](http://www.icann.org/en/help/dndr/tdrp) (TDRP) that set out how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred?

Additional provisions should be included Multiple transfers in the [Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy](http://www.icann.org/en/help/dndr/tdrp) (TDRP) that set out how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred. As they could help clarify the process and facilitate the handling of

disputes, Multiple transfers are used in domain hijack situations, and also since the aftermarket has developed since the policy was written a third party can easily purchase a hijacked domain in good faith.

Should dispute options for registrants be developed and implanted as part of the IRTP (currently registrants depend on registrars to initiate a dispute on their behalf)?  
The BC believes that there must be a mechanism for registrants to initiate proceedings when registrars decline to initiate them.

1. Should certain requirements and best practices be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants?

In the interests of consumer protection the BC recommends establishing requirements for registrars to publish information pertaining to transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants.

1. Are existing penalties for policy violations sufficient or should additional provisions/penalties for specific violations be added into the IRTP?

The BC believes there should be penalties for specific violations other than ‘notice of breach’. The BC “hopes” that the 2013 RAA has addressed this issue.

1. Did the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes\* eliminate the need of Standard Forms of Authorization (FOAs)\*\*?

In the day to day administrations the FOAs are redundant, however in cases involving unauthorized transfer requests in which the Registered Name Holders’s email address has been hijacked, or its access credentials to the control panel have been stolen, the gaining registrar’s obligation to obtain the FOA from either the Registered Name Holder or the Admin Contact can help protect the domain names from being hijacked, given the Registered Name Holder’s Whois contact information is different from the Admin Contact’s.

Please note that you are very welcome to provide **any additional information** that you may think useful for the Working Group to consider as part of its deliberations on these charter questions. No additional information

\* The Auth-Info Code is a unique code generated on a per-domain basis and is used for authorization or confirmation of a transfer request.

\*\* An FOA is a standardized form of authorization to initiate a domain name transfer, see also: [FOA: Domain Name Transfer – Initial Authorization for Registrar Transfer](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/foa-auth-12jul04-en.htm)