

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT on Tuesday, 21 June 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux, with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.

I see that currently we have with us from the IRT Jody, Joyce, Richard, Roger, Steve, and Theo. I hope that by the time we're done with this introduction we'll have other IRT members joining us.

Quickly, let me ask you if I'm missing anyone who'd be on the line but not in the Adobe Connect. Not hearing anybody.

Okay, so a few reminders before we jump into our agenda. Please make sure your line is muted when you're not speaking. This meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purpose of the transcript, please don't forget to state your name when you speak. Finally, if at any time you'd like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

In terms of our agenda for today, here's my suggestion. We would go through an update of some of the key discussions we've had so far around the validation rules and any updates we might get in that area from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and eventually the Registry Stakeholder Group, which have been consulted on this topic.

Bulk transfer, I think there was quite some discussion there last week, and those two items – validation rules and bulk transfer – will then lead us into discussing further our timeline for the transition of the single registrations in particular and how any updates affect that timeline.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

Then we'll look at the timeline for the new registration track, which we have not discussed in further detail yet. Hopefully, we'll find time to do that today.

If we have more time, we'll look at one of the other open items we have on the scorecard for the existing registration, and that's the inter-registrar transfer issue.

We'll make sure we have a few minutes to discuss our meetings in Helsinki and next steps.

Let me see if anybody has any comments or questions on the agenda.

Okay. I'm not hearing any, so let's get started. [Let me] load the scorecard, the latest version which we shared yesterday on the mailing list.

Okay. Let's go, as I suggested, to the validation rules first. The only one that's really open is 3c here that I've highlighted in blue.

Let me stop here and see if Theo can provide an update on the discussion with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Theo? Yes, please. Go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Thank you, Fabien. Hello, everybody. Not much there. We had a meeting yesterday and, basically, from the previous input, there are no additions to the previous input. So I'm pretty done quick here. Thanks.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. If I remember correctly, the input we got from the Registrar Stakeholder Group revolved around potentially using registrar data escrow format for the bulk upload of registration data through files. Is that correct, Theo?

THEO GEURSTS: Yeah. Okay. Let me go back here really quick. What we discussed on the list was the validation rules. There's no objection there, so they proposed minimal requirements. We don't see any issues there – at least I didn't see any. I can't speak for the Registrar Stakeholder Group itself, but I didn't observe any objections there.

Then there was, indeed, as you mentioned, the RDE deposits as an alternative way of migrating data. I shared the RDE deposits specs from ICANN last Tuesday on the list last week.

From what I gathered, Mark was going to look into it. Mark was also going to gather some input from the Registrar Stakeholder Group regarding their call. I'm not sure how that went. I'm curious, though. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. Thanks, Theo. We'll get to a discussion of alternative ways of transferring existing registration data just after this. Let's just make sure we close this discussion on the validation rules. If I understand correctly, the feedback from the Registrar Stakeholder Group seems to be that there is no objection – at least no objection observed from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, or registrars participating in the Registrar

---

Stakeholder Group, to the proposal for the validation rules that were shared.

Let me see if Mark has any specific update. I think Mark suggested that he did not expect any substantive feedback or objection, either. But let's make sure that's the case. If that's the case, then we can potentially close our discussion of the validation rules.

Mark, are you with us?

MARK MONITOR:

Yes, Fabien, I am. I don't have an update from the Registry Stakeholder Group yet on that one. You're correct. I don't expect that they would have substantive feedback or potentially any feedback at all. So I would ask that you leave this open a little bit longer so I can just give them a chance to respond before we close this one out. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Mark. Would it be realistic to assume that we could get the feedback, if any, by Helsinki so that, when we're there, we can decide whether there's anything to do there or if we can close our discussion?

MARK MONITOR:

Part of the reason why I don't have feedback yet is the Registry Stakeholder Group is really busy preparing for Helsinki. I will not be able to attend Helsinki, so I don't know how realistic it would be to – I don't know if it's realistic to say we'd be able to close it in the next week. Maybe two weeks would be more realistic.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. I don't want us to spend too much time on that, but I think another alternative could be, if we don't expect any objection, we could close this one and reopen, should we hear any – I think this element is quite key for us to make sure that any discussion we have on the timeline in particular is founded on firmer ground. So that's why I'm eager to have this one clarified and potentially closed as soon as possible. But for now, I'll just leave it open, as you suggested. We'll move forward from there.

Let me now go to the discussion of the bulk transfer. There were several elements still open. 1a is the discussion around dedicated EPP connection. That one we want to discuss, and the second one is what we just discussed with Theo. It's the data escrow-based mechanism.

I think, on both of these, Mark, if I understand correctly, you may have – do you have any news to share based on your investigations on any of these two?

MARK MONITOR: Thank you, Fabien. On the EPP question, we wouldn't do dedicated a EPP connection, but we do have two EPP channels available. We've talked about this in previous meetings, but there's what we call a standard EPP connection channel and a batch connection channel. They're both, feature/functionality-wise, the same. It's just that one is designed to ensure registrars have access to the SRS to be able to do their standard operations, whereas the bulk or batch EPP connections are designed for more bulk or batch-intensive operations. In particular,

---

it's used heavily by registrars trying to re-register [deleting] domains every day.

So what I had proposed last week is that registrars use the bulk EPP connection pool for the backfill of thick registration data for existing domains. I guess both Jody and Theo had some concerns about that, that that would involve additional work for them. So I had the action item to go back and look at what would it mean or what we'd be able to support as far as allowing the backfill of data against the standard EPP connection pool.

So I did take that back to the team. My technical team is evaluating that, and I don't have a final answer on that. They sort of had the reaction that I did. They were a little surprised and concerned that there was concern from Jody and Theo about their ability to do their bulk updates in the batch pool.

But we'll continue to look at that and see what we can reasonably support from a system and a [through port] perspective on the standard pool versus the batch pool.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, yes? Please, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Okay. Thank you. Mark, a question there. Maybe I didn't hear it right. We were discussing, indeed, last week about standard connection pool and the batch connection pool. We also talked – and it seems like that one is out of the window – about the one connection and go as fast you

---

can. Was that the dedicated one you were talking about that is no longer available? Or did I miss something here? Thanks.

MARK MONITOR:

Thank you, Theo. Yes, that was a proposed alternative, using the batch EPP pool. So it wouldn't be a separate dedicated EPP pool. It would be using the existing batch EPP connection pool.

What was proposed to me were two options as far as how many transactions we could reasonably support. The two alternatives that were suggested was, one, limiting transactions to 30 TPS without any cap on the number of connections. As an alternative, though, my engineering team felt very confident that, if the bulk update of existing contact data was done using a single connection, we'd be comfortable with registrars sending as many transactions as their systems would support over that single connection. So, basically, no restriction on the number of TPS if you're using a single connection.

Does that make sense?

THEO GEURTS:

Yes, almost. The single connection: is that still an option or is that off the table?

MARK MONITOR:

That's still an option. Absolutely.

---

THEO GEURTS:

Okay. One question there, at least from our technical guys here in Holland. We discussed it, and they were really curious as to how that would go down in the sense that we can transmit boatloads of data really fast, but we were wondering how Versign, the registry, would deal with the responses. I mean, you got to give something back to us. So they thought there would be some disconnect there.

So I'm not sure. Unless we keep on transmitting data, and at the end of the session, there is some kind of acknowledgment, like a data receipt. I'm not sure how that goes there, but we have some concerns there because every time we send something, we expect something back. At least that's the way we're thinking now. We don't see how fast that could actually go. We see a huge drag factor there, but maybe this is not wise to discuss without the actual specifics here. But that was our way of thinking here. Thank you.

MARK MONITOR:

Yeah, fair question. I think your question is probably the answer there. For each EPP transaction, for the transaction to be complete, there's the command and then the response. Over a single connection, each of those happens serially. That in effect provides the throttling. Both systems will go only as fast as they're able to.

You hit the nail on the head exactly. You send a command, then we send a response; then you send the next command, and we send the next response. The two systems can do that as fast as they're both capable of doing it, but not any faster than that.



---

So by limiting the transaction to a single connection, it keeps things serial, but then we could allow both systems basically to go as fast as the two of them can operate together.

[inaudible] Does that answer your question?

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, it sure does, and, actually, that sounds like it's going to be pretty fast if that actually works. Maybe we can go back to this at a later time and maybe discuss the actual speed. Maybe that is something other registrars would be interested in to see if it's an alternative or maybe a very workable solution. Maybe we can speed up things here.

I actually don't know how fast it will go. It would be faster than 30 TPS for sure, I assume, but those are the details we could...

MARK MONITOR:

Yeah. I would assume so. Yeah. I would assume they would be considerably faster. Yes. But a lot of external factors would be involved as well. The network latency certainly would be a factor in how much other traffic the systems involved are doing. But, yeah, I would anticipate that you'd be able to go much faster than 30 TPS using that mechanism.

THEO GEURTS:

Okay. Thanks.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Mark and Theo. I see that Roger has a specific question. “Mark, what do you think that the transaction [inaudible] is realistically on a single connection? 50/100 TPS?”

MARK MONITOR: Alright. Roger putting me on the spot there. If everybody agrees not to hold me to this, I would guesstimate at around 80. That would be a realistic guesstimation.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Mark, for sharing. Am I allowed to take note of it and put it in our scorecard?

MARK MONITOR: [laughs]

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I can just mention it as a [inaudible].

MARK MONITOR: As long as nobody holds me to that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Mark. Just to make sure I captured this correctly for our scorecard, can you confirm that the single connection would be on the batch pool of connections, or if it’s still an option being considered, that it could be on the standard pool of connection? Can you just confirm that to me? I’m not sure.

MARK MONITOR: Our proposal would be for that to be on the batch pool, not the standard pool, for the single connection approach.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thanks. I see we have Theo in the queue. Yes, Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. Mark, [I'm just going to] circle back on this a little bit. I think it's important timeline-wise. This is then one single connection we have, and it could maybe go to, like, a 50 to 100 TPS ballpark number there. But we are still thinking, if we are doing this through the shared pool, and we do a 30 TPS over 50 connections, we would easily exceed the numbers of connections of the fast-lane, the fast one connection, so to speak.

Any thoughts on that? Thanks.

MARK MONITOR: Yeah. I think that's accurate. Having multiple connections is more taxing. If you constrain the backfill to a single connection, then we don't feel it's necessary to have a TPS limit. We'd basically allow the systems to process as fast as they can.

So, yeah, I think it's reasonable to assume that the single connection alternative would allow for more TPS.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo and Mark. Jody?

JODY KOLKER: This is my observation, and this might be from a year ago or so. Just performing a check command usually takes about 30 milliseconds. And that's just a check. That's not a Create or a Contact Create and all of that on top of that. So, realistically, you have to account for the traffic, the amount of latency between the registrar server and the registry server. In actuality, getting 30 TPS per second I think would be pretty good, from what I can see.

I'm just curious, Mark. I know that our servers are coming from across the United States. I'm just curious what you think about that, Mark.

MARK MONITOR: Fair point. We did some analysis based on some tests we did. I guess I use the caveat: "Your mileage may vary there."

JODY KOLKER: Yeah.

MARK MONITOR: But, yeah, I think there's maybe some tuning that can be done there, but I think you can probably get well up over 30 with there. Like I said, we were looking at the low 80s range at what we were doing when we did some tests there.

---

JODY KOLKER: Okay. Alright. Thanks.

MARK MONITOR: It's a fair point. Writeable transactions are more intensive and will take longer, but we did our testing in trying to use a mix of transactions on that.

JODY KOLKER: Okay. Thanks, Mark.

MARK MONITOR: Yeah.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. How far are we from closing this one, if I may ask? I'm trying to understand what we need next to consider this as closed. It seems to me that Mark's and the [Registry's] proposal is to offer those two options. It would be on the batch connection pool, to either use several connections [with] limiting at 30 TPS over each of those connections or use a single one and have no limitation other than technical network and systems limitations.

So I'd be curious to see where registrars think we are on that path.  
Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. I still wouldn't rule out the SRS pool here. We are still dealing with the fact that there's some development time involved there if

---

people are not using the batch pool. From my point of view, if we are able to use the SRS pool, the shared pool, and Verisign would accommodate that, then we would have just the registry accommodating us. Regardless if there's 1,000 registrars using the batch pool and the other [thousands of registrars] are using the SRS pool, at least those who are using the SRS pool don't have to make any modifications on their side. So that is a modification on one side versus 1,000 modifications on the other side, on the registrar side.

So I just don't want to exclude that just straightaway, unless there are only a few registrars who use the SRS pool. But if there are some numbers here and we come up with a 50/50, then it wouldn't make any sense from a logical perspective that 1,000 registrars have to modify or switch over to the batch pool, which will require all kinds of development time on their side. And we have no clue how well that is going to go over there. We are just a tiny registrar. We need to plan stuff, like, a half-year in advance, and that is when we know it. If we are talking to registrars who are doing this at the very last minute, that can be tight. That can be problematic.

Then, again, we do have no [idea, but that is my] logic here for supporting both SRS pool and the batch pool. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Mark, may I ask if there is any possibility or if you envision any possibility of registrars using the SRS pool in one way or another for completing the transfer of existing registration data?

---

MARK MONITOR: Yeah. Thank you, Fabien. I guess I hadn't anticipated the batch pool being sufficient. Really, functionality-wise, it's the same. It's just a matter of changing the VIP, the IP address that you can connect to. It's the only thing that changes, from my perspective, at least.

So I frankly hadn't anticipated Theo's concerns there. We certainly can consider it. I'll just need more time, is all, to take a look and see what we can reasonably support there.

FABIEN BETREMIEXU: Thank you, Mark. I think the key, as far as I'm concerned, is whether the registries offering this option and the standard pool would change anything to the timeline. It doesn't seem to me because, in the best case scenario, you would offer – I'm not saying that you would – potentially what you offer on the batch pool in terms of throughput on the standard pool. So it seems to me that we really should take time to get back to the IRT on this topic. We can still move on to discuss what this all means timeline-wise. Would that be correct, Mark?

MARK MONITOR: Sorry. I'm not sure I follow. Can you say that again?

FABIEN BETREMIEXU: Yeah, sure. Let me try to say it more simply. It seems to me that your investigation of using the standard pool would most likely not have an effect we need to have to plan the entire transition for all the registrars. Is that correct?

Am I making sense? Sorry, go ahead.

MARK MONITOR: Yeah. I guess, from my perspective, it wouldn't, but I guess I'm concerned that, if maybe I do some analysis and I come back and I'm not comfortable supporting the backfill over the standard pool and then there's some impact to registrars who need to do additional development or to be able to do the backfill over the batch pool – I guess depending on the answer there could potentially be some impact to the timeline and transition.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Mark. That makes sense. Theo, I saw your hand raised.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. Just really quick there. It is maybe an idea that we just ask this to some registrars in Helsinki while we're doing sessions. Just [open] the question and see if we can get any response. Is that an idea?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. I think we're hoping that Helsinki will indeed be an opportunity for the IRT to engage in hallways or in various meetings with other contracted parties. So that certainly makes sense. Thanks, Theo.

THEO GEURTS: One more thing. Personally, I don't see many issues here. We have some little development time, just an hour or so, making sure everything is set up correctly. So that's about it. But like I said, we are



---

spread pretty thin here, so we are not able to speak for everybody else here. That's my concern here. We have no idea what's going on. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks, Theo. I think, yeah, hopefully in meetings like the Helsinki meeting, we'll have the opportunity to share [sideways] with the various groups what's happening. There's also the public comment eventually. We can always run documents through the stakeholder groups, as we've done with the validation rules. So, yeah. Thanks, Theo, for sharing that.

Can I suggest we move on to 1e and discuss whether there's any update or see if there's any update on Mark's analysis of the registrar data escrow [specification] that was shared by Theo on the mailing list?

Mark? Yes, please.

MARK MONITOR:

Thank you, Fabien. Just from my initial review of that, there isn't auth info in there. At a minimum, there would be changes necessary to that to be able to support the backfill of data. It doesn't contain the complete set of information, so it would require work in addition to whatever work we would need to do in order to support it. Registrars would need to do some work in order to change that.

I see a couple of people typing and hands. I guess I'll stop there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Theo, I see you're in the queue. Then we'll go to the chat.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, quick question, sort of. Mark, your guys already got the auth code, right? You're already validating transfers. Or am I missing something here?

MARK MONITOR: There's a domain auth code, and there's a contact auth code.

THEO GEURTS: Ah, okay.

MARK MONITOR: I see you're saying, that answers your question?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, it does. I was mixing them up. Thanks for the correction there, Mark. Thanks.

MARK MONITOR: Yeah. For everybody else, we do have the domain auth code. We do not already have the contact auth code. It just is not included in what was provided. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Mark. So this seems to leaving open the question of an alternative way of transferring existing registration data. I wonder if

---

anybody would like to discuss this further or if this is something that needs some sort of engagement.

Theo, I see your hand raised.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah. Thanks. Looking at this, basically what it boils down to, in my opinion, is an additional [proposal] to migrate data. I think registrars would be able to accommodate this, but if it's something that is not implementable at the registry side – this is fairly new territory what we are doing here, this isn't exactly textbook stuff here, so there's a whole lot of considerations there – if we can shoot this down at the registry level real quick, then I don't see any issues with it to dismiss this option.

I was already a little bit skeptical in the first place, but if we are hitting really technical barriers here, then I'm not sure if we as an IRT should be exploring into the unknown here and spend a whole lot of focus on this and in the end to discover that we can do it because for this and this and this and this technical reason.

So I'm pretty cautious here on how to move forward here. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Mark, can you share a sense of whether this auth code issue is a significant obstacle that would need significant work to overcome, or do you foresee that this could find a resolution in the timeline we're considering for our implementation plan?

---

MARK MONITOR: Sure, Fabien. Yeah, I think it is reasonable for the registries to provide a file-based bulk transfer option. I just have some concerns about using the existing registrar data escrow file format as the basis for that.

So, yeah, I certainly understand Theo's hesitation there. I think Theo and Jody and others have said they would prefer to use EPP. I think from a registry's perspective that's certainly easier. It means less development work for us. So if everybody were to say, "Yes, we're just going to use EPP," I certainly wouldn't object to that at all.

But I do think it's reasonable for the registries to provide a bulk transfer option and for it to be based on the validation rules that the IRT has already agreed upon. I think even that, I guess I just would put to the IRT: "Is it enough for everybody to leave it up to the registries' discretion on defining what that bulk transfer option would be and leaving it up to us to implement that and make it available to the registrars? Or does the IRT feel we should get into more specifics on how it's implemented?" I think that's the outstanding or the ongoing question there with bulk transfer option. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Mark, for summarizing. Let's see if anybody on the IRT from the registrar side, would like to respond. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes. This is me personally speaking. I don't see an issue there. I think, if the registry comes up with whatever additional methods of migrating the data on their terms, I don't see an issue there. And this is me personally speaking. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. Any other feedback? Jody?

JODY KOLKER: This Jody from GoDaddy. I don't have a problem with the data escrow, but I just don't think that's something that GoDaddy is going to use. We'd rather use the EPP commands to be able to do this because we can throttle this and it can just work very consistently over a long period of time to be done instead of a lot of back and forth between the registrar and the registry because, unfortunately, that's what I see: it will take time for [DBAs] to develop the scripts, to get the information ready, and send it to the registry. The registry will have to implement, create the contacts, attach them to the domains, and then send them back with the contact [droids]. Then we have to update the database again.

I guess I'm not seeing how it's easier to do the data escrow than to filter it in with EPP at a very throttled rate so as not to overload the registry because it still has business to conduct. This is part of – what do I want to say? – the overflow, basically, and should be throttled. You can't have 2,000 registrars hitting the registry at the same time, trying to create as many contacts as possible.

Anyways, those are my thoughts on the data escrow or using that because I think it's going to require much more manual intervention between the registry and the registrar on both sides. I guess Mark could speak to it on the registry side, but I know what it would cost for us on the registrar side.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you, Jody. If I understand correctly, your feedback is that a file-based bulk transfer option is not appealing to you, and so you have no such issue with the registry potentially proposing one with any given format. Is that correct?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. I just can't see the value in it as far as we're concerned because of the manual interaction that it's going to take from our side. I think it would be much faster for us to implement performing the EPP command and modifying our systems to do that much more efficient, I guess, as far as developer time is concerned. Although it's going to take a very long time to get through all of them, once it's completed, we'd just let it run, and it goes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you, Jody. Mark?

MARK MONITOR: Sorry. I was on mute. Jody, you couldn't tell, but I was nodding my head when you were speaking there. I do agree with you. I think the file-based approach would be more work, more back and forth between the registrar and the registry, and it introduces much more opportunity for human error, using that approach. So I absolutely agree with your comments there. Thank you.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you. Before we move on to look at what this all means to the timeline and the assumption that we've discussed so far, let me just see whether you think that this should remain open and discussed further, or should we close? I'm talking about 1e here as well as 1b, potentially, where there seems to be, at least in the IRT, a sort of consensus that this is more complicated and more work than the EPP channel for completing the bulk transfer and therefore we may consider only doing EPP.

Would that be an option, and therefore we close 1b and 1e on our scorecard and focus our discussion on the EPP channel?

Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. I'm not sure there. It came up during the discussion there, so I'm not sure. This may be an option. We put it on the backburner and we just put it up for the registrars. Like Jody said, we are going to do an EPP also. We were talking about alternatives, and that was an alternative. If the registry wants to set up an alternative, I'm okay with that. I'm just not too keen on shooting down an alternative because we all here on the IRT feel we should do EPP.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo, for sharing that. So then my question may be to Mark. Mark, how fast or when would be able to share some kind of first approach to how a file-based protocol could work? Like a description of the file you would propose and how that would work at a high level. Not necessarily with all the details, but at a high level. I'm just trying to

---

understand what is next from here and how we can include this into our consideration of developing an implementation plan.

MARK MONITOR: Thank you, Fabien. I guess it depends on how much detail you need.

[music playing] That's not me, by the way.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. It seems to be Jody. Let me just...okay. It's fixed. Okay, Mark.

MARK MONITOR: Thank you. I guess it depends on how much detail you need. Certainly, it would be a file option based on the validation rules and the fields in the validation rules that we developed as part of the IRT. For example, it would be a CSV file, and each column in the CSV file would correspond to one of the fields defined in the validation rules and each row would represent a contact. So it would be just a basic CSV-type format. Registrars would provide that to us. We would process that file and then send the results back to the registrar, letting them know the successes and failures.

At a high level, that's basically how it would work. I can provide more detail on that or, if it's sufficient within the IRT, we could just say that the registry may provide a file-based bulk transfer option to registrars to facilitate that. We can leave it open-ended for us to work out the details if that would be sufficient. Thank you.



---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Mark, for the high-level description and the suggestion that it'd be left open in the [condition then.]

Let's go to the queue. Jody, I see you have your hand up. I assume it's an old hand? Okay. Not hearing from Jody.

Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Basically, you got your answer there, Fabien, at least from my point of view. There is an alternative. It's something like a CSV file, like Mark mentioned. It's pretty high-level, but at least there's an alternative for registrars who want to use it. We are not going to use it. That's for sure. But if there are registrars who want to have an alternative, there they go. They can put it in a CSV file, upload it, and get back the results. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. I agree, Theo. Thanks. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Hi. Yeah, I think that I understand. I agree with Mark and Theo here. I think that, from the IRT's perspective, we should say: EPP and an agreed-upon format between registrars and registries independently. And I think that, really, we could close these, just saying that verbiage: "It's something that Verisign and a registrar can agree on, that file format."

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah. Thanks, Roger, for the suggestion. I was actually thinking that, yes, we could just close those, 1b and 1e, based on this discussion, and describe what's the [other] proposal that Mark just described.

So if there's no objection, I suggest we quickly moved to discussing further our timeline. I see that we have ten minutes left, so let's see how we can do this as rapidly as possible.

I'm going here to 7. We have two elements, mainly, in the discussion of the timeline. We have 7, where we discuss what would be the length of the window which would be available for registrars to transfer their existing registration data. From last week, we have a rough estimate of 18 months so far. There was discussion as to whether the file-based option or the various EPP options, in terms of throughput, could impact this timeline and potentially reduce it.

Let's see if anybody think that, based on our discussion today, we can consider reducing that estimate of 18 months or whether we should stay with that estimate.

Theo, please?

THEO GEURTS:

I think we should still stick with the 18 months there, at least for now, until a couple of things are being fleshed out or are being more detailed here. I think, for now, put it on 18 months. If we get more information that things will go faster, then we can maybe put it to 12 months, but for now, keep to 18 months. Thanks.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. Any other contribution? I saw Roger's hand come up. I don't know if it's gone. I see Roger is [concerning]. Okay. Alright.

Then we'll keep it where it is for now. The other discussion on the timeline – I see Jody. Jody, would you like to speak to this topic?

JODY KOLKER: I'm just agreeing with Theo. I think that 18 months is the minimum for now until we can see how fast we can get through adding the domains or adding the contacts. I wouldn't want to make it any less to start out of the gate with.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you, Jody. The other topic we had discussed with respect to the timeline is what sort of measures should be considered to avoid any bottlenecks right before the closure of that window to transition existing registration data.

There were discussions of the challenge with silent registrars, [although] they are not necessarily engaged in this work or may not be very proactive.

Yeah, so that's mainly the discussion. Let's see if there are any updates there before we move on. Any additional thoughts? I see that Steve is typing in the chat: "When will we revisit the timeline?"

I think that speaks to Jody's point, that we should move forward with this assumption until we can refine it. So from my understanding, it seems that we're waiting for additional feedback from Mark on the EPP channel for the backfill of exiting registrations. And we'd have the file-

---

based option, which I'm not sure we've discussed the impact of on the timeline.

Let me stop here and see if anybody would like to respond to your question, Steve.

Theo, I see your hand raised. Is this a new hand?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, this is a new hand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Please, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Well, I was going to answer on 7b. Let me address some of Steve's thoughts there. We also need to factor in how well the [OT] tests go. We are assuming that everything will be tickety-boo there, but we still need to do the actual testing, so you need to factor in that. So that's my point to Steve there.

When it comes to 7b, I think it's an excellent question to put out in the Helsinki meeting to see if some of the brilliant minds there in the community have some input there. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. I see that Joyce was asking whether this 18-month window would be for loading contacts or everything, including the domain.

---

I assume we've been talking about transferring all the existing registration data, including inclusive of domain registration, which should already be actually with the registry at this stage.

But let me stop here and see if anybody would like to respond to that. Okay. I'm not hearing any answers, so I believe then what I said is correct. So this would be for all data, Joyce.

Steve, I see you're asking: "When will the advance agenda for Helsinki be available so those of us attending can plan itineraries?"

Let's move on to that, unless anybody would like to further discuss the timeline topic. We have five minutes left, so let's move on to discussing next steps.

Okay. The dates of the meeting are set now, and it's those that we shared last week. We're now sure of the timing. It's going to be Wednesday, 12:30 to 1:30, local time, and Thursday, 9:15 to 10:30, local time as well.

We initially set the goals of those meetings to really close the discussion of the implementation path, and that's mainly our scorecard, so that we're in place where we can start drafting an implementation plan that can be reviewed by the IRT. Hopefully, by the end of the summer, we can agree on that proposed implementation plan, which would be submitted for public comment. So that's our target.

Steve, does that answer your question? Or are you asking about specific agenda discussions of those meetings in Helsinki?

---

Okay. While Steve is typing, I just want to mention as [soon] as possible would be great. Yeah, sure. We're discussing internally how to best structure those two meetings and the discussion in Helsinki. We will get back to the mailing list with the details as soon as possible.

But I believe we would at least try to take stock of our scorecard and certainly discuss further our timeline so that we clarify exactly the type of timeline work, which is a key parameter of the implementation plan.

Finally, I just want to mention that, after the Helsinki meeting – based on the progress in the meeting, we'll decide what pace we'll take for the IRT meetings after the meeting, whether we keep this weekly pace or whether we can take a bit more time, including for reviews of documents we shared with the IRT. Because in particular, in addition to our transition discussion, we intend to have a revised [inaudible] implementation proposal for the IRT's review before it is published, which currently is targeted for this summer as well.

Let me stop here and see if anybody has any questions or comments, specifically related to our sessions in Helsinki. Theo, yes? Go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

I just want to echo on what Steve Metalitz said, that it should be as specific as possible. That would be great. I'm looking forward to that also. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Okay. Thank you, Theo. Roger, it's your question in the chat: "Does the [CLD] include RDAP?"

---

We've agreed a while ago that we would implement those in parallel, so our expectation is that we would indeed, when it comes the time, publish those two together at the same time.

Does that answer your question, Roger?

Okay. I'm not hearing any questions or comments. Thank you again for taking the time to be with us today. Thank you for the conversation and sharing your perspective on each of these questions.

We will be back in touch with you with an updated scorecard and specifics for next week's meetings in Helsinki. Thank you all. Safe travels, indeed, for those who are traveling to Helsinki. We'll be in touch soon. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**