
Public Comment Summary Report

Transfer Policy Review Working Group Final Report for ICANN Board Consideration

Open for Submissions Date:

Monday, 28 April 2025

Closed for Submissions Date:

Monday, 16 June 2025

Summary Report Due Date:

Wednesday, 02 July 2025

Category: Policy

Requester: ICANN Board

ICANN org Contact(s): policy-staff@icann.org

Open Proceeding Link: <https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/transfer-policy-review-working-group-final-report-for-icann-board-consideration-28-04-2025>

Outcome:

Under the ICANN Bylaws, before any action by the ICANN Board of Directors (hereafter “ICANN Board”) on proposed policies that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, it is required that a reasonable opportunity is provided for the community to comment on these policies.

For the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council-approved Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process Working Group (hereafter “TPR WG”) Final Report, which included 47 policy recommendations, the ICANN Board allowed for the community to provide relevant feedback during the Public Comment period. The Public Comment proceeding was open from 28 April to 16 June 2025. The ICANN Board received a total of 11 submissions from groups and individuals. These are summarized below.

ICANN would like to thank the community for its valuable input, which will assist the ICANN Board in its decision-making process.

Section 1: What We Received Input On

Following the GNSO Council’s approval of the TPR WG’s Final Report, the ICANN Board sought the community’s input on all areas of the policy recommendations to assist the Board in its consideration of those recommendations. The GNSO Council’s approval of all 47 policy recommendations obligates the Board to adopt the recommendations under the ICANN Bylaws unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or of ICANN.

Section 2: Submissions

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc.	George Kirikos	LOF
Registries Stakeholder Group		RySG
Registrar Stakeholder Group	Zoe Bonython	RrSG
Business Constituency		BC
Tucows	Bahar Partov	TC

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Ephraim Sanga		ES
Anshul Goyal	Pro Names Hub	AG
Md Mahamodul Hasan Khan		MK
Matt Lundstrom	GlowHost	ML
Loganaden Velvindron		LV
Mahmoud Nabil		MN

Section 3: Summary of Submissions

The ICANN Board received a total of 11 submissions to the Public Comment proceeding on the TPR WG Final Report. Four of the submissions generally support the TPR WG's Final Report; five of the submissions provide additional points for the Board to consider; one submission recommends the Board reject the TPR WG Final Report, and one submission appears to be unrelated to the TPR WG Final Report.

Four commenters (BC, RrSG, RySG, and TC) generally support the TPR WG Final Report. The BC and RySG fully support the TPR WG's recommendations and recommend the Board adopt those recommendations. The RrSG noted that the Working Group's recommendations support the goals of improving the security and stability of domain name transfers; however, the RrSG noted a concern with Recommendation 26. The RrSG explained that with the proposed removal of the language in Recommendation 26, a registrant could potentially change its contact information in the middle of a dispute such as a Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Procedure (UDRP). The RrSG also noted the need for a sufficient implementation buffer window, given the significant changes to the Transfer Policy.

TC notes that although the WG did not address all of TC's concerns regarding the initial report, the policy recommendations promote both the clarity of Transfer Policy requirements and the security of the transfer process. TC specifically notes its support for Recommendation 33, which proposes that the GNSO Council request an Issues Report or other suitable mechanism to

explore the pros and cons of allowing registrant access to the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy or creating a standalone dispute resolution procedure for registrants.

Five commenters provided input on the Final Report. Specifically, ES noted that a 30-day transfer wait period should be standard. AG and MK both noted that the 60-day lock should be reduced to 30 days. ML noted that resellers “need much better protections for portfolio transfers to eliminate financial and technical hardships or potential service interruptions for the domain owners themselves” as resellers face significant challenges when transferring large portfolios due to registrar acquisition, bankruptcy, sanctions, or dissolution. LV noted that the process for mergers and acquisitions can be tedious and expensive, and there needs to be a proper handover process.

LOF strongly urges the Board to reject the TPR WG’s Final Report in its current form and mandate further work by a truly multistakeholder body. LOF provided its proposals for a push-based transfer system and enhanced Whois/Registration Data Directory Service (“RDDS”) transparency within the losing Form of Authorization (FOA) process. LOF notes that these proposed improvements represent “fundamental shifts necessary for establishing robust domain name security and ensuring comprehensive registrant protection in the evolving digital landscape.”

Additionally, LOF notes the push-based transfer system and enhanced RDDS transparency in the losing FOA proposals “address inherent vulnerabilities in the current transfer policy that the Transfer Policy Review Working Group’s Final Report has, regrettably, failed to adequately address.” LOF goes on to note that the TPR WG’s dismissal of these proposals “reveals a systemic bias within ICANN policy development towards minor adjustments over truly transformative ideas” and highlights the critical need for Board intervention. LOF also notes the dominance of registrars within the TPR WG, and how the Board’s decision on this report will “signal its commitment not only to domain transfer security but also to the integrity of genuine multistakeholder engagement and registrant representation, thereby impacting ICANN’s overall legitimacy and accountability.”

Lastly, MN provided a comment that is unrelated to the TPR WG Final Report and seems to have been provided in error.

Section 4: Analysis of Submissions

Two commenters (BC and RySG) support the policy recommendations from the TPR WG Final Report.

Two commenters (AG and HK) noted the “60 days lock” should be removed or at least reduced to 30 days. It is not entirely clear which “60 days lock” the commenters are referencing, as the current Transfer Policy has a 60-day transfer restriction following the creation or inter-registrar transfer of a domain name. The current Transfer Policy also has a 60-day transfer restriction following a Change of Registrant. The TPR WG has recommended reducing the 60-day post-creation and post-transfer restrictions to 30 days. The TPR WG has also recommended eliminating the 60-day post Change of Registrant transfer restriction, so it appears the TPR WG has already recommended what both commenters are requesting.

Both LV and ML noted concerns with mergers and acquisitions. ML noted that resellers face significant challenges when transferring large portfolios due to registrar acquisition, bankruptcy,

sanctions, or dissolution. The TPR WG did discuss the impact of its recommendations on resellers and wholesale registrars and endeavored to expand access to the Bulk Transfer After Partial Portfolio Acquisition (“BTAPPA”) to customers of the registrar, including domain name resellers. The Working Group supported an expansion of the BTAPPA to allow for additional partial bulk transfers, such as for resellers or service providers to transfer their names to a different sponsoring registrar. The Working Group recognized that there are situations where this may be necessary, such as when a registrar’s customer (e.g., a reseller) may need to change its sponsoring registrar due to data privacy concerns within a particular jurisdiction, and there is currently not a way to do this that does not involve significant manual effort.

Both RrSG and TC support the recommendations of the TPR WG but noted that the TPR WG did not address all outstanding concerns provided by RrSG and TC in their comments on the TPR WG’s initial report. Specifically, RrSG noted a concern with Recommendation 26, asking whether the TPR WG intended to allow a registrant to update its contact details during a domain name dispute such as during a UDRP. The TPR WG noted the requirements it recommends removing as part of Recommendation 26 are largely duplicative of existing policies and therefore do not need to be restated. For example, the definition of “lock” under the UDRP provides “a set of measures that a registrar applies to a domain name, which prevents at a minimum any modification to the registrant and registrar information by the Respondent, but does not affect the resolution of the domain name or the renewal of the domain name.” Accordingly, the UDRP rules already require registrars to prevent registrants from updating their contact information during a pending UDRP proceeding. TC noted its specific support of Recommendation #33, which recommends that the GNSO Council “request an Issues Report or other suitable mechanism to further research and explore the pros and cons of (i) expanding the TDRP to registrant filers and (ii) creating a new standalone dispute resolution mechanism for registrants who wish to challenge improper transfers, including compromised and stolen domain names.”

LOF strongly urges the Board to reject the TPR WG Final Report. LOF urges the Board to “mandate further work by a truly multistakeholder body, with explicit instructions to thoroughly evaluate and prioritize the push-based transfer system and the enhanced WHOIS transparency proposal within the Losing GOA.” The TPR WG previously discussed the two proposals from LOF during its deliberations; however, the TPR WG did not ultimately support these proposals and favored incremental improvements to the Transfer Policy.

The ICANN Board will carefully consider all submissions on the TPR WG recommendations during its Public Comment review process.

Section 5: Next Steps

The ICANN Board will review all the Public Comments received for the TPR WG Final Report and then decide on the Final Recommendations. As part of its decision, the ICANN Board will provide direction to ICANN staff regarding the necessary next steps.