



Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Meeting with the IRT | 24 May 2016

Agenda

- ⦿ **Transition from thin to thick** – Existing Registrations Track - **30 min.**
- ⦿ **Transition from thin to thick** – New Registrations Track - **20 min.**
- ⦿ **Updates – 5 min.**
 - Feedback on Consistent Labeling & Display Proposals (Due Wed. 18 May)
 - Proposal to bundle implementation of T&T and CL&D
 - Scheduling of Next Meetings

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 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 – 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/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 ?

Transition from thin to thick – Existing Registrations

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

IRT Discussion to date:

Validation parameters agreed upon (required data):

- Contact ID
- Auth ID

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)
- d) Impact of missing data on post-transition transfers (Theo)
- e) Concerns with post-migration impact of proposal (Marc)

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 transferring existing registrations

Pending further discussion:

- a) Dedicated EPP connections for parallel processing (Roger)
- b) Alternative option to be considered: Bulk upload of file with defined specification based on validation parameters resulting from Q3 (Roger, Jenifer, Marc) ?

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)

Pending further discussion:

- a) Uniformity of Registries SDK is desirable (Jennifer) which does not seem to be an issue (Marc)

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

Pending further discussion:

- a) When registries can accept new registrations, nothing prevents backfill of existing registrations (Marc)

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 ?**

[RDC] New and existing should be treated differently. Current rules (ICANN and Registry policies) should only apply to existing registration contacts once the contact update date is greater than the transition date, exception on transfers see below.

Question 6 – Is the potential impact of option 2 on future transfers of registration acceptable ?

[RDC] Yes, same experience as today, except that it should improve over time. There will be bad contacts on transfers and this should be allowed. This data will cleanse organically over time.

[JGore] Do not prohibit the transfer if data contact information is incorrect or not complete

[Theo G.] Concerns with [burden of data correction](#) falling upon the gaining Registrar.

[RDC] Existing registrations should be [grandfathered](#) (not required to meet today's ICANN/Registry policies) [until such time that these contacts are explicitly updated](#) post transition/transfer.

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

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 (target: April 2016)
 - Registries and registrars to agree on a detailed timeline (target: May 2016)

Consistent Labeling and Display (CL&D)

⦿ Question and Proposals for IRT Consideration

- Is the issue created by referencing the 2013 RAA in a Consensus Policy applicable to registries a matter of policy or implementation ?
- Referral of confusion issue (Registry vs. Registrar Expiration Date) to the RDS PDP
- Optional display of Reseller and Registrar Expiration Date (with mitigation if displayed)

⦿ Next Steps

- IRT to provide comments on above proposals **by Wed. 18 May**
- Staff to draft a revised CL&D implementation proposal for subsequent IRT review

Bundling of T&T Implementation with CL&D

- ⦿ Discussion of proposal with GNSO Council (12 May 2016)
- ⦿ Input by IRT members on mailing list, not supporting proposal or seeking more discussion
- ⦿ Discussion with contracted parties during the GDD Summit (19 May 2016)
- ⦿ Staff currently processing feedback received

Next IRT Meeting:

- ⦿ Currently envisioned for Tuesday 7 June 1800 UTC (3 weeks before ICANN 57 in Helsinki)



Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Meeting with the IRT | 24 May 2016