
DENNIS CHANG:

Hello everyone. This is a Thick Whois policy implementation meeting with the IRT on the 6th of September, 2016. We're going to start it now. Let me see if there is one more – Marika? So, Marika recognizes the Dutch. I don't know, I already did that, but it's kind of nice to have different languages. I think I know what she said; I think she said that recording is in progress.

So on the agenda today, we're going to review our draft consensus policy document that I provided to you last week, and hopefully you have had a chance to review it. Then we will talk about our public comment readiness, and then Whois conflict procedure that Theo wanted to bring up on the email – I assume everyone saw that – and also Theo wanted to add to the agenda the draft memo to the GNSO Council on privacy. Is everybody okay with the agenda? Okay.

This is a reminder that we're still shooting for this implementation path, and that hasn't changed. So on the draft CP review, we're going to look at the actual document together, paragraph by paragraph. But first, what I wanted to do is get everybody on the same page on the timeline and our objective for this IRT. When we have our IRT review completed for the consensus policy document, we're going to start our public comment in mid-September, hopefully. And it's a 45-day public comment period; that's the standard. This actually nicely puts the ICANN 57 towards the end of the public comment, and we can have some substantive discussions, assuming that we have some comments by then. Of course, as our standard process, we will publish a summary and analysis review report, and have an IRT discussion, and have the

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.

policy announcement in February 2017. That's our goal. Everybody is on the same page there, right?

Okay, so let's look at the announcement itself. What I'm going to do is walk through it slowly. A quick scan of the document has the standard IETF definition of how we use the must and must-not terminology, scope, definition of the key terms, effective dates. Two effective dates. This is sort of unusual, but I think everybody understands why now. And we have a requirement that is split up by registry operator, and then registrar, in two sections, followed by a simple implementation note. That's the makeup of the document. Everybody ready to go through it together?

Alright, then. This standard terminology of use of the terminology notes of capitalize, must, and must not require, shall, shall not. This is standard engineering terminology; you're quite used to it if you're an engineer, to separate the real requirement versus a suggestion. So that hasn't changed. I think we used the same terminology in our prior policy language, and you will see this often from now on.

The scope of the policy is, as all of you know – .com, .net, and .jobs – is to transition from thin to thick. We talked about this definition and refined it together at our last IRT meeting, so I'm assuming that everybody's okay with this definition, and I haven't received any comments via email, either. So – let me see – there is a chat coming. Let me just see if somebody raised a hand. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE 1: Yes, thank you. My only comment on the definitions was in the definition of thin registration in the last sentence.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

STEVE 1: The contact information for these domain names is maintained by the sponsoring registrar. It might be helpful just to say, “ – is maintained *only* by the sponsoring registrar.”

DENNIS CHANG: I see.

STEVE 1: Because –

DENNIS CHANG: Only. I think you mean something like this. Let me turn on the tracking so we can see what we change together. Right?

STEVE 1: Yes. That was my suggestion. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. I don't there is any issue with that. Anybody have any objections to putting the "only"? I think that's an accurate statement. Alright, thank you, Steve; and we'll continue. Any other comments on thick registration, existing domain names, transition progress metrics? Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. This is Roger. I want to apologize; I thought I had sent off a list of comments last Friday, but it looks like it was still in my drafts folder, so I'll send this to the list as well as we go through it, so everybody can see what I'm referring to, I guess. My first comment was on the thick registration. I think that the description is accurate; I'm just not sure that it leads very easily to too many people. But I think that even if we leave this verbage in here, maybe it would benefit from being similar to what the thin registration says, just in reverse.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I haven't received your email yet, but you have a suggestion about the language, basically making it easier to read? I think that's what you're saying, right?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, I just think that for everybody that's deep into this, that they may understand what that's saying, but I think that people that are not in this every day won't get what that really means.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, okay. Do you happen to have it in a chat? Can you put it in –

ROGER CARNEY: No, I just sent it to the left – my comments for the day – and I didn't put any language in there. But I can try to come up with something.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so while you do that, shall we move on, then?

ROGER CARNEY: Please. Thank you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So Roger is working on some alternate language for the thick definition. While we do that, we have existing domain name, transition progress metrics. That shouldn't be a problem. Effective dates - we talked about this many times, and I don't think there is any issue. This is clear by now. Oh, I noticed one thing. We have to make this a capital letter to be consistent.

So for effective dates, we have two dates; and the registry operator only, the same language we talked about, and we're trying to make it easier for the registry operator. So let me hear from you guys. Do you have any suggestions?

2.1. The registry operator must deploy an EPT mechanism by 1 August 2017 for registrars to migrate registration data, for using domain names, to transition from thin to thick, for clarification. 2.2 –

Roger, did you want to speak again?

ROGER CARNEY: Sorry, that was an old hand, but yeah, actually. On 2.2, I thought we agreed that we would just take this out of the policy and this would be handled by the registry just working with the registrars, themselves.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, the details of the mechanism we said we were not going to discuss at the IRT meeting. But we said that if there is any registrar who would like this alternate mechanism and registry, you could provide it. Did we not agree to that? Mark, maybe you want to speak?

MARK ANDERSON: Hi, sorry, this is Mark. I joined late. I just got on; I'm not sure what we're talking about.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay, sorry. Okay. So, Roger, why don't you repeat your question?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. This is Roger. On section 2.2, it talks about the registry app where you have a need to provide a bulk transfer mechanism. I thought in our discussions, we were going to remove this as a policy requirement and it was just going to be handled by the registry and the registrar.

MARK ANDERSON: Yeah, this is Mark, and I think that's definitely one of the things that was discussed. Particularly, I think there was lack of agreement as to whether anybody needed the bulk transfer mechanism. I know everybody that – by everybody, I mean all the registrars we've spoken to or been involved with – I think indicate a preference for EPP, so we questioned whether there was a need to have it in there at all. But I think it was a topic that we've discussed quite a bit. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, and the way I recall it was that the IRT was getting into technical discussions on how that bulk registration would be handled, and I said, "I propose that the technical discussion happen outside of the IRT meeting." It was my understanding that the registry operator will provide such a mechanism; however, the registrar and registry work it out themselves. Am I wrong?

ROGER CARNEY: I think the one problem with that is what Mark said. By this statement in here, 2.3 says they have to create something, and so far, no one's even indicated that they would even use it. So to me, it seems like if no one here is requesting that, why would we put it in? Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

THEO GUERTS: Hi, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Okay, this is Theo, for the record, and I have quite a different recollection of this. I mean, we discussed this extensively on the registrar stakeholder private list, and there were actually registrars who came up with – and this is where the discussion goes off the rails here – that they were talking about doing the RDE deposit stuff and some other mechanisms. Jennifer Stanford also mentioned an alternative. And what we said back then; okay, there might be a few registrars – I am not one of them – but there might be a few registrars who would love an alternative mechanism. And what we basically said then was, “Okay, whatever that mechanism is going to be, it’s up to the registry to provide it.” That’s my recollection of the events. And I’m one of the people who brought it up on the registrar stakeholders. What we definitely agreed on is, it’s up to the registry and – I hope I’m not going to ruin Mark’s day – but that’s my recollection. The registry is up to it, and we are not going to wily-nilly in this IRT what that is going to be. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Theo. That was my understanding; that’s what is in here. Any other comments? Any more discussion on this? Go ahead, Roger. I think you have your hand up again?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, this is Roger. So should we change this to “may provide an alternate transfer” – I’d even remove “bulk” – an alternate transfer mechanism, and change “must” to “may”? Just with the fact that no one’s actually physically asked for it.

DENNIS CHANG: So this is the issue. If you say “may,” it’s optional altogether and later on, if the registrar requests it, then registry operators do not have to. Right?

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. I like what Steve put into the chat, then. “Must upon request.”

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, very good, very good. Okay, let me get to the chat. “Must upon request,” okay. That’s excellent. So if nobody requests, you don’t have to anything that is unnecessary; but if they do request it, this is what every operator must provide. Roger, are you up again, or is it Alan next?

ALAN GREENBERG: I’ll presume it’s Alan next.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Alan next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Don't we have to provide a deadline where the request must be made by?

MARK ANDERSON: I presume what we're talking about here is some sort of bulk import. You know, you provide all the stuff on a memory stick and we'll import it according to a certain format and we'll provide you an Excel spreadsheet, whatever, and we'll import it. It doesn't sound like it's going to be an onerous thing to build, but I think you need a deadline where it must be requested by.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. How do you guys feel? You are looking at the schedule, right? So let me ask Mark, when do you have to have this request by for it to be really effective? Now, they could start transitioning – we said 1 August they could start transferring, right? So how about if they say 1 May 2017? Does that work for you? Because if they make a request by 1 May, they have three months to work out some sort of a scheme, and they can start transferring in August, or even September, October, whatever you guys agree to.

MARK ANDERSON: This is Mark Anderson, for the record. I think that makes sense if you put language in there to that effect. By May 1st have the request in there, and have till August 1st to provide the response – I think that's reasonable. I think Roger and Steve's suggestions are on there. As I

recall the previous conversations, we don't want to build something if nobody's going to use it. I think this provides a nice compromise. If nobody wants to use it, nobody submits any requests, then that's not something we have to worry about; but if they do, there are timelines in there for that, so I think that makes sense. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. So I'll put that in there, 2.2. That's revised. Alan, did you want to speak again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please. I've missed a lot of these meetings recently, so forgive me if I'm asking a question that has an obvious answer. Based on what has been said so far, the majority of large registrars are going to be happy to use EPP. What we're looking at is something to catch the outliers. The outliers have a deadline of February 2019 to do the work. They're not going to even realize that they need something that they can't handle until much closer. So I think we're doing this bulking work – we're timing it to be ready at the wrong end of the process. But let me ask a related question. What happens if, by February 1, 2019, there are names that haven't been migrated?

DENNIS CHANG: Well, we thought of – out of [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: We could delete the names and the registrant suffers. Presumably that's not the right answer.

DENNIS CHANG: Isn't that really the same question as what happens if somebody's not following the policy?

ALAN GREENBERG: Exactly, but my point is, it's the outliers – the ones where the registrar is not paying any attention, where the registrar doesn't care, or whatever – that are going to be the problematic ones. And those are probably the ones where the bulk import without the registrar doing any work on their system to handle the EPP transfer are going to be the critical ones. And those are going to happen towards the end of the process, I think. So I think the dates we're looking at here may not serve the purpose.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, let's hear from –

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not my business, but it sounds like what's going to happen to me.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's hear from Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE 1: This is Steve. I was just going to say in response to Alan, at that point it becomes a compliance issue. February 2019, it's a compliance issue. I'm not disputing what Alan is saying about the fact that these requests are likely to come in late, but just to answer his question of what happens if they outlier registrar just sleeps through this whole process.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. Go ahead, Theo. Do you want to speak?

THEO GUERTS: Yes, thank you. This is Theo, for the record. Like Steve said, it becomes a compliance thing; but keep in mind, Alan, that we have built into this policy a sort of reporting mechanism that the registry reports back to ICANN I think on a monthly basis, or a weekly basis, I'm not sure. The registry is going to report back on the progress, so if at some point prior to the end date, we will have reporting mechanisms, or ICANN will have them, so they can act upon these reports and go, "Hey guys, are you ready for it?" Because we tried to tackle the issue of 2000+ registrars who need to get into compliance with this whole thing. So we've got this reporting mechanism to ensure that what you are expecting to happen actually will not happen. So it won't be at the end. We hope that by then, ICANN and the registry operator have a certain understanding of where it's going wrong, with whom, and which registrar. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Jody?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah. Joyce, I think the registry already has committed to provide, but they just have to work out how and what mechanism. So that's what the language says here, but what we are hearing is that no registrar has actually made a request yet, and therefore, we are putting this statement in that registry requests must be made by 1 May 2017.

JOYCE LIN: Oh, I didn't know that the registry already had a commitment. Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Yes. Theo, go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Nah, I'll let it slide.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Yeah, so there are two different – the policy is being worked out right now, and the language [inaudible], but I just want to follow up and say that we do have the whole time of implementation where we will be working to help or support, or whatever we need to do, we have a registrar service team at ICANN, who is also committed to follow up and try to implement this policy the best we can. We are all concerned about the possibility – addressing Alan's concern here – yes, we talked about that concern extensively. And we agreed that as far as a policy statement goes, this is really the best we can do.

Okay, next. 2.3. By 1 May 2017, the registry operator must provide all registrars in ICANN documentation reflecting the system changes necessary. So the nice thing about this is that the [inaudible] how the

EPP transfer will be done. So the registrar is aware of how it can be done. That was 2.3.

2.4. By 1 August 2017, the registry operator must support all contact operations as described in RFC 57-33. By 1 May 2018, the registry operator must require thick registration data upon receiving the [inaudible] for EPP. So this is the other side. So from 1 May, the registry operator must require thick registration.

2.6. They must accept all registration in conformance with 3.1, and we'll look at 3.1 just now. Let's see, somebody wants to speak. Go ahead, Mark.

MARK ANDERSON:

Thanks. This is Mark. Going back on section 2.3, a registry operator must provide to all registrars in ICANN documentation reflecting the system changes necessary to support the requirements of section 2.1 and 2.2. For 2.2, that would have to be modified if we're changing 2.2 to a "must upon request," right? So what we talked about is that you request it by May 1, and would provide it by 1 August. So that would have to be tweaked a little bit. And I guess I'm concerned by "must provide to all registrars an in ICANN documentation reflecting the system changes" – I guess I want to make sure expectations are met here. In 2.4, it talks about the system changes will support all contact operations in RFC 57-33. That's what the system changes will be, in that sense. So I guess I want to make sure what we're doing to meet section 2.3 meets expectations. And then a separate point altogether, but in 2.3 and I guess a couple of other places, you say "all registrars." And I

guess I'll ask for some parameters around what we mean by "all." "All" is kind of a broad term, and so I think we mean maybe "all ICANN-accredited registrars in good standing who have signed the registry-registrar agreement," or something to that effect. Having it there, just wide open with "all registrars" is maybe a little too broad for my liking. Thank you.

JOYCE LIN: Well, how can the registry know which registrar is not in good standing? Good standing would be a little bit too regular. Right?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's a good point, too.

MARK ANDERSON: ICANN notifies all registries of the status of registrars. That information is provided by ICANN and via updates.

JOYCE LIN: So then, you're going to prevent those registrars from uploading all their data? Wouldn't that defeat the purpose of – [CROSSTALK]

MARK ANDERSON: Joyce, what I'm looking for here is not – "all" is a very broad term. "All registrars" could be interpreted to mean "registrars that don't support .com at all," I mean, "registrars of ccTLDs or other TLDs altogether." So

I'm not looking to prevent anybody that has a legitimate need, but I'm just not comfortable with how broad "all" is.

JOYCE LIN: But the registry has all the registrar names and everything. If one registrar out there is asking, or where, or somewhere they don't support com, net, [inaudible] then the registry definitely knows that, don't they?

MARK ANDERSON: Yes, but the way the policy is written, we would have to notify all registrars, regardless.

DENNIS CHANG: So is this good enough? Mark, if we say all ICANN-accredited registrars? That's not good enough either, right?

JOYCE LIN: No. Then that would include those that do not support comnet, either. [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: That's right.

JOYCE LIN: [CROSSTALK] be limited to that. And you should put [inaudible] com, net, jobs accredited registrar.

DENNIS CHANG: Ah, okay. Registrars sponsoring domain names, registration in .com, .net, and .jobs.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: That's what Alan suggested. That's a good idea, okay. Let me try to write that in.

ALAN GREENBERG: The preamble – the scope of the policy already says that.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. That's another good point. What do you think, Mark? The scope clearly defines it right here, right?

JOYCE LIN: Well, then just put "irrelevant registrar."

DENNIS CHANG: I like that. Should we just simplify it by saying "relevant," are you – do you feel comfortable?

MARK ANDERSON: Applicable registrars?

DENNIS CHANG: Applicable.

JOYCE LIN: Okay.

US 1: Or just remove the word “all,” and just say “registrars,” and then it only applies to the registrars you’re talking to.

DENNIS CHANG: There you go. I like that even better. How do you like that, Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: I’d prefer “applicable registrars.”

JOYCE LIN: “Applicable” is good.

DENNIS CHANG: “Applicable” is good. Okay, let me try that. Let’s hear from Steve. Steve has his hand raised.

STEVE 1: I'm sorry, yes. This is Steve. One other way to handle this would simply be to make "registrar" a defined term and say "registrar" means "Oh, I can't accredit registrars who sponsor registrations in .com, .net, or .jobs. And then it would apply throughout the document.

DENNIS CHANG: I see. What do you think? Anybody else? "Applicable" is fine, Alan says.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah, I like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I hesitate to define the term "registrar." Then people may want us to define "registry," and then we're going down that road. So if everybody's okay with "applicable registrars," then I think this statement is good and we can move on. Is that okay?

Yeah, redefining a common term to mean something different...okay, Steve says okay. So let's continue. Alan had a good point; that was what was bothering me a little bit, too. Alright, let's continue with 2.4, 2.5, 2.6...so 2.7 is where we were having some discussion before. This is the duration between August 2017 and 1 February 2019. So this duration – let me go back to our timeline – there's a big duration here, 18-month duration. This is when the transition happens, called transfer of data. So registry operators shall provide transition progress metrics to each registrar. So each registrar knows how they're doing, and then also the registrar operator shall provide to ICANN or transition progress

metrics for all registrars. So that was the discussion before, and let's see. Mark has his hand up. Go ahead.

MARK ANDERSON:

Thank you, Dennis. This is Mark. So on that, to find the reports – there are two reports. Basically, a percentage – total number of domains managed, and a percentage that have been migrated. I guess my question is around the timing here, that those will be delivered. The policy language asks that they be delivered every Friday by, basically, midnight UTC. But it doesn't say what the report interval would be. So the reports define our snapshot reports, right, so they're only valid at the moment those reports were generated. And so 2.7 and 2.8 don't define what that period will be. So would it be "as of," "between," "by" Friday, midnight UTC? Would it be "as of" the previous Friday? I guess I'm looking for the "as of" time there.

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, what do you think you can do? What's reasonable for you? Because you're the one who has to spit this out every Friday, right? [CROSSTALK]

MARK ANDERSON:

Right, and that's kind of where I'm concerned. Yeah, it's 140 million records that have to be processed here, so it's not – it'll take some time, I guess, which is why I'm concerned on this. If everybody's expecting a report by midnight on Friday that's up-to-date as of midnight by Friday, that's not realistic. I'm not sure what is realistic on there, but there definitely needs to be some amount of buffer in there for generating those reports.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. Well, it makes sense then – let’s see – Theo. Go ahead, Theo. You have a suggestion?

THEO GUERTS: Thanks, Dennis. And this is Theo, for the record. I shouldn’t meddle into the affairs of ICANN on what kind of coffee you put in the coffee machines, but this language – yeah, I’m making a joke – so this language suggests, “Okay, these are the tasks of the registry operator.” It doesn’t say anything about what ICANN is going to do with it, and I assume it will be all okey-dokey. But I am not sure – my concern is, do you guys even have the bandwidth to organize this? Is it going to end up in some drawer? There is zero commitment from ICANN’s side in this policy. And I’m not sure if it needs to be there; I’m just raising the question here. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Francisco, go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thanks. Regarding what Mark was saying and I was thinking, there is [inaudible], and the agreement gives them 24 hours to submit the [inaudible]. So perhaps that’s what we should consider for this case.

DENNIS CHANG: As much as we can, I'd like to stay consistent with what people are already familiar with. Joyce, you have a comment? Go ahead, Joyce.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah. Regarding the report of the metrics that the registry is required to send every Friday – I thought that we are going to ask for – well, not we are going to ask for – I think the registry was assigned just a tiny slot for each registrar to upload their data, right? And during that period, I think that the registry was provided [inaudible] two weeks, or something. And including those periods and those registrars, they should get a report on their success rate, or percentage, or everything – instead of asking the registry to resend that report every Friday to everybody, it just doesn't make sense. It should be only those registrars that during a certain period, that week, those five days that they are allocated that time slot to upload their data. Only those who [inaudible] Friday.

DENNIS CHANG: Hmm. Go ahead, Steve. You have a comment?

STEVE 1: Yeah, this is Steve. Just a couple of thoughts on this. One is, I don't think we actually – I may have missed it – but I don't think we ever talked about how frequent these reports would be. So if there's a lot of friction involved in creating these reports, maybe they could be monthly instead of weekly. After all, we're talking about an 18-month period, here.

DENNIS CHANG: Right.

STEVE 1: Second, I see Mark's point about what's in effect the effective date of the snapshot. And you could just leave that up to the registry operator and just have them state what it is. You could put that in the definition of transition progress metrics, just to say including it tells you what stuff it has to include, and stating the date as date and time as to which the report refers, or something like that. So long as it's disclosed – you know, it's in there.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

STEVE 1: So I don't know – maybe there are ways to ease the burden on the registry operator here, a little bit.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. Right. Yeah, I was kind of thinking the same thing. Mark? Do you have a feel for how you want to handle this? If we leave it up to you, you can define your snapshot?

MARK ANDERSON: Yeah, this is Mark. Steve makes a couple of really good points. I agree on both points. We would probably run them serially anyway, so leaving flexibility to the registrar as to when the report was generated,

that would certainly make it easier, remove some of the complexities there. So long as we're doing it on a regular interval, I think that would meet the intent, at least. So yeah, I agree with what Steve said. Both good points.

DENNIS CHANG: Did you have further comments, Steve?

STEVE 1: No, I'm sorry, that was the old hand. I suggested monthly, but –

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. And I was just going to clarify with Mark, is that what you were agreeing with, Mark? You would rather have monthly than weekly?

MARK ANDERSON: Yeah, both points with leaving the time and the duration. If monthly is fine for registrars – I see Alan made a point – monthly would be fine for the first part of the period. I think that maybe makes sense if we have a first-of-the-month type of report. Yeah, that makes sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's try this. First day of the month at – does that work? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to be clear – even if we say it’s monthly, that doesn’t preclude them from doing it weekly or bi-weekly when we’re coming down to the crunch dates?

DENNIS CHANG: That’s true.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean, clearly it’s going to be to everyone’s advantage if ICANN knows who the registrars are that have not complied early. So it may well be to everyone’s advantage to do it oftener later, but I’m not sure we need to mandate it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

MARK ANDERSON: This is Mark again. If we put the language as “shall provide at least,” or “at minimum” every month, just leave it open that it could be provided more often – yeah, “at minimum.” That works.

JOYCE LIN: And I think –

DENNIS CHANG: Francis – go ahead, Joyce. I think you want to speak.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah. If a registrar finishes uploading, I think this should allow the registrar to email, verify and say, “Hey. Please let us know. Because we’re from outside and – ” [inaudible] – everything for every month, you know? And a small registrar like that can finish in two hours, so we’ll just want to get it over with. And then [inaudible], you guys can check it and go, “Okay,” instead of waiting until the first of the next month. That’s just my request. [CROSSTALK]

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Theo, did you want to speak again?

THEO GEURTS: Yes. Thanks. This is Theo, for the record. Alan made a comment about crunch time, which triggered something, and I’ll come on back to the bandwidth – whether I can, again – it is very likely that there will be a lot of registrars waiting up at the end of the period at least as long as there’s no active approach from ICANN. And I’m not going to tell you how you’re going to run things over there, Dennis, but you should maybe talk with your colleagues there, and go, “Hey guys, how are we going to handle 1500 registrars in the last month?” Because somebody’s got to think and mail them. At first, there will be certain registrars who will start right out of the gate. Those will be, I assume, the registrar stakeholder group members. They know about this, so they will go – you will see progression there. Speaking for myself, personally, you won’t see any activity on my part for the next six months. So you’re going to have skewed-up metrics there that

something could signal anything. But like Alan said, crunch time usually means a lot of stuff is happening at the [inaudible] of the end. And like I said, mailing 1500 [inaudible], calling them, faxing them, I'm not sure what you guys are going to do, but it's going to be a boatload of work. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Yeah. Understood. Yeah. So the one thing that I said earlier to the team here is that we recognize the work ahead in implementing the policy, but then, we have to get on with the policy definition and put the policy in place, so we can actually start something. Trying to figure out how we are going handle every situation and what if the outliers, or what if somebody doesn't do something – that is really a policy or project execution phase that we have to manage together. And I'm hoping that all of you will help us do that. And our registrar services team is – with them, we have engaged among managers who have relationships with each registrar, who have committed to help us [inaudible].

Back to Joyce. Did you want to speak?

JOYCE LIN:

Yeah. I – hold on, let me see. Have we come to how we're going to upload the data from the registrars? Is the registry going to fill out something like a Doodle poll so we can sign up? And then, someone take a look, see if [inaudible], or are they going to just assign us – “Hey, you're going to do this one [inaudible]. Have we come to this kind of discussion or agreement yet?

DENNIS CHANG: No. And Joyce, I don't expect us to be discussing that at the IRT at this time. Maybe later, but we do have to focus on the policy language first.

JOYCE LIN: Oh. Okay. So we don't have the [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: There's going to be a lot of detailed technical discussion and protocols, and [inaudible] that we will have to work out together. And hopefully, just between registry and registrars, and I don't know how much ICANN will play a part in it; but of course, we would be happy to facilitate that discussion if you guys ask us to.

JOYCE LIN: Okay. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Sure, Joyce. So for now – and as Theo says, I'm going to go ahead and check with my colleagues – but for now, I'm going to assume that we're okay with this. Whoops, that's not what I wanted to do. Undo. So basically, what I was trying to do was make it consistent, so there aren't two different time periods or two different kind of reports. Try to make it easy for Mark and his team for recording. Francisco? Go ahead, Francisco. Is this okay?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Dennis. I was suggesting something else slightly different. I think we need to [inaudible] valid point about how much time is baseline going to have to produce the reports? I mean, each of you is suggesting 24 hours; baseline can tell us if they need more, and basing this on what requirements most of the [baseline] already have regarding [inaudible] they have 24 hours to produce the escrow [inaudible] reports. That involves [inaudible], of course. So you can see it in the language that I am proposing, and the chart. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, let's see. Let me try this. So I'm going to put it in here for now – between 1 August 2017 and 1 February 2019. Registry operator shall provide transition prog to each registrar that consists of data that reflects the state of the registry at the end of the month, UTC. Every first day of the month, by 23-957. So you're saying, the data should consist of the end-of-the-month data, right?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: I think that's the meaning. Yeah. Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you, Dennis. This is Mark. I think 24 hours is probably a reasonable assumption; if it's not, I'll come back. As far as – Francisco added two text. As of 0:00 UTC, and his second blurb, you took out the

0:00 UTC and put at the end of the month, and I guess – I appreciate – I think it was Alan or Steve or somebody had suggested leaving it up to the registry more as far as the “as of.” Because like I said, it’s a very costly operation to be able to do it as of midnight UTC for every single registrar. So if at midnight UTC, we start running the reports and provide the “as of” time stamp, when the report was actually generated, that to us is a considerably less costly operation. So if there’s not a need to have it as of exactly midnight UTC, I would like to not have that as a requirement, because it is rather costly to be able to provide that as of midnight for 2,000+ registrars. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Understood. Comments? Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m going to speak as one of the people who has been pushing for Thick Whois for a long time.

DENNIS CHANG: Please do.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the world is going to be a better place for it, but it’s a pain in the butt to do, and I don’t think we should impose rules on the registry which add no real added value to it. So if they do it at about the first of the month and timestamp it when it was actually done, I think that’s absolutely fine.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Alan, for your – Francisco, do you see any requirements that we must have by-the-end-of-the-month data, or you're okay if they have the 29th or the 20th based on the situation that they have?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: For this particular reporting, I don't think it's a big deal, but my point was that this is a regular requirement for all that are reporting – sorry, carrying a specific baseline is a regular requirement for other reporting requirements. So I thought it was not much to ask for their reports to be based on that, since the registry really has to have this sort of mechanism. But for this specific case, I don't think it's a big deal.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you, Francisco. Yeah, I like consistency, but if everybody agrees, if the report has a date on it, it will not matter, okay. You have to drop off, you have to drop off, okay – that's the top of the hour. You're right. Oh my gosh, time goes so fast. You know, we'll have to pick this up again on our next weekend. Steve, and thank you everyone for coming. Sorry for losing track of the time; we got so involved in the process here. What I'll do is, I'll update this to the version that we have agreed upon so far, and I'll redistribute it, and we'll pick it up next week – same time, same period. Also, please watch out for the calendar invite or the IRT invite; there's been some issue going on. But again, same time is our scheduled meeting. Let me just go to it. So we didn't have time for the other ones...here. So, next week, same time.

Everybody okay with this? We're going to have to conclude. It is top of the hour, like Steve says. Other comments?

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]