

**GNSO IRTP Part C Working Group Meeting with the ccNSO  
Wednesday 14 March 2012 from 10.15 – 10.45**

---

## **Introduction**

The GNSO Inter-Registrar Transfer (IRTP) Part C Working Group is tasked by the GNSO Council, as part of an overall review of the existing IRTP, to address three Charter Questions as part of this Policy Development Process<sup>1</sup> (PDP). The IRTP is an existing GNSO consensus policy (binding on gTLD registries and ICANN accredited registrars), which was adopted in 2004 to provide a straightforward procedure for gTLD domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars.

## **Topic for discussion with the ccNSO**

One of the Charter Questions that the WG has been tasked to address is:

- "Change of Control" function, including an investigation of how this function is currently achieved, if there are any applicable models in the country-code name space that can be used as a best practice for the gTLD space, and any associated security concerns. It should also include a review of locking procedures, as described in Reasons for Denial #8 and #9 [of the IRTP], with an aim to balance legitimate transfer activity and security.

The primary function of the IRTP is to permit Registered Name Holders to move registrations to the Registrar of their choice, with all contact information intact. However, it has been observed that the IRTP is also widely used to affect a 'change of control', namely by moving the domain name to a new Registered Name Holder, in conjunction with a transfer to another registrar. For example, in the domain name aftermarket it is not uncommon to demonstrate control of a domain name registration through the ability to transfer the domain name registration to another registrar following which the registrant information is changed to the new registrant. Nevertheless, the concept of 'change of control' is not defined in the context of gTLDs. At the same time, the WG notes that many country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs) do have a procedure or process for a 'change of control'.

The WG has recognized that further work on this issue would benefit from an analysis of the different approaches to 'change of control' in the ccTLD community as well as identifying potential benefits and/or possible negative consequences from applying a similar approaches in a gTLD

---

<sup>1</sup> IRTP Part A and B have already completed their tasks, and IRTP Part D and E will follow once Part C has been completed.

context. Some of the questions the WG will be looking at addressing based on this information are: whether it would be beneficial to develop a separate process for ‘change of control’ for gTLDs; if so, should such a ‘change of control’ be separate from a change of registrar or should it be possible to combine the two; what elements of such a ‘change of control’ process should be required; how would such a ‘change of control’ should be integrated with the IRTP, if at all.

#### Current information on ccTLD ‘change of control’ processes

ccTLD	Name	Characteristics	Further information	Comments / Questions
.UK	Registrant Transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Handled by registry operator</li> <li>Change of registrant can be combined with change of registrar</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.nominet.org.uk/registrator/maintain/transfer/">http://www.nominet.org.uk/registrator/maintain/transfer/</a> <a href="http://www.nominet.org.uk/registrator/maintain/transfer/Process/">http://www.nominet.org.uk/registrator/maintain/transfer/Process/</a>	
.EU	Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Handled by accredited registrar</li> <li>Automatic one-year extension</li> <li>Needs to be confirmed within 14 days by both parties</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.eurid.eu/en/eu-domain-names/trades-transfers">http://www.eurid.eu/en/eu-domain-names/trades-transfers</a>	
.IE	Transfer Domain Holder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Handled by registry operator</li> <li>A signed fax on headed paper from the current Administrative Contact must be submitted to initiate the transfer</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.domainregistry.ie/index.php/mnumods/mnuxferdomholder">http://www.domainregistry.ie/index.php/mnumods/mnuxferdomholder</a>	
.ES	Transmisión de dominio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two processes – one for ‘ordinary’ changes of control and one for ‘special’ cases (as the</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.dominios.es/transfer-procedure/article/267">http://www.dominios.es/transfer-procedure/article/267</a>	

		<p>result of death, company take-over)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process can be initiated by registrar, registrant or admin contact</li> <li>• If initiated by registrar, request needs to be confirmed by registrant or admin contact</li> <li>• New registrant needs to confirm transfer and accept registration terms and conditions</li> <li>• In case of a 'special' transfer, an ID needs to be provided.</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	--	--

**Questions for the ccNSO**

- Are there any other models / processes applied by ccTLDs to enact a 'change of control' that the WG should consider as part of its deliberations?
- What are the pros / cons encountered by ccTLDs that have or do not have a separate process for 'change of control'?
- What other elements should the WG take into account when evaluating the approaches taken by ccTLDs (for example, in the case of .uk and .ie, the change is handled by the registry, while in the context of gTLDs the change process would be handled by the registrar)?
- Feedback received regarding Registrar / Registrant experience with their trade / change of control process (if any)
- Is there any other information or outreach the WG could be conducting that you think might help the WG in its deliberations?

**Further Information**

IRTP Part C Working Group Workspace - <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoirtppdpwg/Home>

IRTP Part C Final Issue Report - <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/issue-report-irtp-c-29aug11-en.pdf>

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - <http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/policy-12jul04.htm>