Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Meeting with the IRT | 31 May 2016

Agenda

- Transition from thin to thick – New Registrations Track - **20 min.**

- Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations Track - **30 min.**

- Updates – 5 min.

Transition from thin to thick – Objective

- Implementation path under discussion: 2 parallel tracks
  - New Registrations Track
  - Existing Registrations Track

- Current Timeline Assumption (Release of Implementation Plan)
  - Implementation Plan for Public Comment: Aug.-Oct. 2016
  - Policy Effective Date Anouncement: Jan. 2017

- Target: Transform path into plan by August 2016
  - Finalization of discussion of Implementation Path by Helsinki
  - Drafting of implementation proposal by End of July
  - IRT Validation of Draft by End of August
  - Proposed increased pace of IRT meetings

Transition from thin to thick – New Registrations

- ⦿ Current timeline estimates (ICANN 55 discussion): 18 to 24 months overall
  - – 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (optional thick)
  - – 12 to 18 months for Registrars to complete the transition
  - – 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (required thick)

- ⦿ Proposed milestones
  - – Registries to make system changes
  - – Registrar notification of changes
  - – Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in OT&E
  - – Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in production
  - – Registrar notification/transition period
  - – Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in OT&E
  - – Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in production

- ⦿ Next Steps
  - – Registries to provide overview of system changes: confirmation of applicable requirements with examples (even if identical to current) + Reference to Verisign SDK
  - – Registries and registrars to agree on a detailed timeline (target: May 2016)

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

Proposal introduced by Staff to IRT (5 April 2016)

- ⊙ Option 1: registries imposes checks on registration data
- ⊙ Option 2: registries do not impose any checks on registration data
- ⊙ Proposal to implement option 2
  - – Community concerns with time taken to implement the transition
  - – Feedback from RrSG meeting in Marrakech

Discussion of Staff's Proposal by IRT (to date)

- ⊙ A majority of contributors are supportive of Option 2 (9 out of 13)
- ⊙ Discussion ongoing on middle ground approach and various **open questions:**

1. What would the a bulk transfer be under option 2 ?
2. How can we minimize the amount of "throw away code" ?
3. Should there be a minimal set of validation parameters ? Numerical/Alphanumerical/ UTF8 contraints on phone fields
4. Should we aim to synchronize the new and existing registrations tracks ?
5. Once data is migrated, what rules to apply ? Should new and existing registrations be treated differently based on their creation date and applicable RAA ?
6. Is the potential impact of option 2 on future transfers of registration acceptable ?

Question 3 – Should there be a minimal set of validation parameters ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Validation parameters agreed upon (required data):
- Contact ID
- Postal Info Type (LOC/INT)
- Auth Info

Principles/intentions discussed:
- Making sure RDDS output is the same before and after the transition
- Same amount of RDDS information is provided before and after the transition
- Minimizing validation to ensure all available data is loaded (even if currently incomplete)
- Fields not required under validation rules can be left blank

Pending further discussion:
a) ~~Confirmation of Postal Info Type requirement (Marc)~~
b) Requirement for registrars to supply all available data (Steve)
c) Gathering Input from Registars (Theo, Marc): share finalized validation rules w/ (Ry)RrSG
d) ~~Impact of missing data on post-transition transfers (Theo)~~ > Refer to Questions 5 & 6
e) ~~Concerns with post-migration impact of proposal (Marc)~~ Refer to Questions 5 & 6

Question 7 – What timeline should be considered for transfering existing registrations ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Pending further discussion:
a) Determination of cut off date after which regular validation rules apply (Marc, Roger)
b) Need a way to estimate system throughput on contact creation (Theo, Roger, Marc)
c) Need to factor in coordination of 2000+ registrars, including potential non-responsivenesss (Theo)
d) Need to determine the level of detail addressed in implementation plan vs. registries requirements (Theo)

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

Question 5 –   Once data is migrated, what rules to apply ?
                Should new and existing registrations be treated differently based on
                their creation date and applicable RAA ?
Question 6 –   Is the potential impact on future transfers of registrations acceptable ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Principles/intentions discussed:
- Minimum validation apply to the transition of exising registration's contact data, until a
  defined date
- after such date, regular validation rule apply to any new or changed contact data

Prending further discussion:
a) Handling of transfers: do not prohibit transfer if contact information is incorrect or not
    complete, this data will cleanse organically over time (Jenifer, Roger, Marc): Registries to
    confirm feasibility
b) Handling of transfers during the transition, especially between two registrars that may be at a
    different stage in terms of data migration from thin to thick (Jodi)

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

Question 1 – What would the bulk transfer be (under option 2) ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Agreed upon:
– Registry will provide option to use EPP for transfering existing registrations

Prending further discussion:
a) Dedicated EPP connections for parallel processing (Roger): Versigin to investigate
b) Alternative option to be considered: Bulk upload of file with defined specification based on validation parameters resulting from Q3 (Roger, Jenifer, Marc): to be confirmed and defined by Registries for .COM, .NET and .JOBS

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

Question 2 – How can we minimize the amount of "throw away code" ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Agreed upon:
- Reuse of current EPP code path (see question 1 on bulk transfer)

Principles/intentions discussed:
- Some level of throw away code may be unavoidable (Marc)

Prending further discussion:
a) Uniformity of Registries SDK is desirable (Jennifer) which does not seem to be an issue (Marc)
   – Pending further input from Jennifer

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

Question 4 –   Should we aim to synchronize the new and existing
                registrations tracks ?

IRT Discussion to date:

Agreed upon:
–   Keep the two tracks separate to mitigate potential delays

Principles/intentions discussed:
–   Focus on New Registrations first
–   When registries can accept new registrations, nothing prevents backfill of exisinting
     registrations, with validation rules applicable to new registrations

Prending further discussion:
a)   ~~When registries can accept new registrations, nothing prevents backfill of exisinting
     registrations (Marc)~~

Updates

Consistent Labeling and Display (CL&D)

- Staff to draft a revised CL&D implementation proposal for subsequent IRT review

T&T Implementation

- Call for volunteers issued on May 29 (see mailing list for details)

Next IRT Meetings:

- Tuesday 7 June 1800 UTC
- Tuesday 14 June 1800 UTC
- Tuesday 21 June 1800 UTC
- 27-30 June , ICANN 56 Helsinki (date & time TBD)

Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Meeting with the IRT | 31 May 2016