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)
  - Policy Effective Date Announcement: 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)
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/Alphanumeric/UTF8 constraints 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 Registrars (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 transferring 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-responsiveness (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 existing registration’s contact data, until a defined date
- after such date, regular validation rule apply to any new or changed contact data

Pending 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)
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 transferring existing registrations

Prepending further discussion:
- Dedicated EPP connections for parallel processing (Roger): Versigin to investigate
- 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
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)

Pending further discussion:
a) Uniformity of Registries SDK is desirable (Jennifer) which does not seem to be an issue (Marc)
   – Pending further input from Jennifer
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 existing registrations, with validation rules applicable to new registrations

Pending further discussion:
- When registries can accept new registrations, nothing prevents backfill of existing 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)