FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT on Tuesday, the 12th of July, 2016. I see that with us, from the IRT, we have Jody, Joyce, Marc, Roger, Steve, and Theo. Am I missing anyone?

Okay, I'm not hearing anybody. A few reminders before we jump into our agenda and discussion today, make sure your line is muted when you are not speaking. This meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purposes 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.

On our agenda today, we'll discuss both aspects of our implementation, consistent labeling and display, where we'll take a look at the feedback we've received from the IRT on revised policy language. And we'll discuss the next steps. And we'll then discuss the transition from thin to thick, in particular, the discussion on the notification of the GNSO and the various open items on the implementation path scorecard.

Are there any comments/questions on the agenda?

Okay, hearing none. So let's proceed. Consistent labeling and display, so I believe we received the two main pieces of feedback so far. And I understand that there may be more coming from one IRT member, so we're looking forward to that. In the meantime, the feedback we've received was in relation to Item 9. And the difference between the URL that is requested to be displayed at the end of output by registries

compared to what's in the 2013 RAA. And the reason why there is this difference is that we're taking advantage of this policy to update terminology that is now obsolete in relation to the WHOIS Data Problem Reporting System that is now what's called the WHOIS Inaccuracy Complaint Form.

So we're introducing the difference, but for the better, we believe, because we do not want any requirement that refers to obsolete terminology. And with respect to the 2013 RAA, we hope to be able to update that requirement in the future, when possible.

So let me stop here and see if there is any comments/follow-up on that item.

Marc, I see your hand raised.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, Fabien, thank you. A third point. I have no objections or problems with that. Just might recommend or suggest making a note or something like that in the policy, explaining why the change. If one person had that question, I'm sure other people will. So I think it's a perfectly fair explanation that makes sense, so just making a note in the policy would be helpful, I'd think. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Point taken. Any additional comments/questions on that? If not, then let's move on to the second feedback. That was a discussion initiated in our meeting in the second IRT meeting in Helsinki, I believe. Yeah, it was, on the 30th of June. And it refers to our reference

EN

at the bottom of the policy language to the fact that registry operators for .com, .net, and .jobs would be subject to this policy only upon completion of the transition. So IRT members have had insight, some ambiguity in the language seems to be, are considering potential two policy effective dates for the transition from thin to thick: the one that refers to existing registrations and the one that refers to new registration. And there was a request that this be discussed in the IRT before defining the policy. So I believe now would be a good time, if anybody would like to comment on that aspect.

Marc, please.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Yeah, good point for clarification. My suggestion, I guess, would be to have the language written generically to describe once both effective dates have been met. It's really not possible for us to differentiate between the two. So really, the only clean way to do it is once both effective dates have been met. And I think we just want to have generic enough language. We set them up separately. We wanted to have separate tracks so that the delays of one would not impact the delays of the other. I'd just suggest rewrite it. We don't want to say once one has finished over the other. We want to say once both have been completed, that would be the effective date. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Marc. Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Fabien. So to this point, Marc, I was thinking that maybe better if we just say that the .com, .net, and .jobs are not subject to this policy, and there will be an upcoming policy, will define when that applies to them. I'm just thinking that if we start making assumptions about what the policy will say, and if we think it will be [today] the existing and new restrictions. But the fact is that's still not a final policy, and there may be changes to that approach.

So I'm thinking that more general language, saying just that those three in the list are not yet subject to the [CLD] language, and that a later comment policy will define the date, or dates, for that requirement, when that will apply to those gTLDs. Does that make any sense?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, Francisco. I put a checkmark in the meeting there. That's a real good point, very fair. I agree with that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, gentlemen. I see that Theo is agreeing to this as well. Okay. So this was the feedback we've received. I wonder if there is any specific points to be discussed. Let me bring the document to the screen and see if anybody would like to speak to any of the elements here of the policy language. Is there any comments? I see in the chat also that Roger was agreeing with Francisco and the discussion of the applicability of the policy to .com, .net, and .jobs. Any questions, comments, feedback on this revised policy document?

So as you may recall, we had 13 items, if I recall correctly, and effective date set for February 2017. Implementation notes referring to the advisory, providing an example of the output that's expected for this policy. And finally, a bit of background on the policy itself.

I'm not hearing anyone. I'm not seeing any hand raised. So then we can move on to our discussion of the transition from thin to thick. Let me get back to the slides here. Okay.

Oh, sorry, yes, and before we get to the transition, in terms of next steps, as we mentioned, we were expecting reviews from the IRT members by the end of last week. So please feel free, if you'd like to provide your comments. I note that, Marc, you're still working on submitting some omments, so we're certainly looking forward to that. And, please, if you'd like to discuss any of that now and you're able to, we can take the time.

We're still trying to meet the announcement date. We're aiming to announce the policy effective date at the end of the month for, as we mentioned, policy effective date of 1 February, 2017. We'd also like to – Theo, I see you have your hand raised. So let me get you, and we'll get to the [inaudible] on site.

Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Actually, I'm going to withdraw my question. Never mind. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Theo. So we are thinking of adding an element to this timeline, which would be in the policy, a reference to implementation that would be required from registries, not before the end of October, so that it would allow for the update of ICANN tools in relation to pre-delegation testing of new gTLDs, as well as WHOIS validation. So we're thinking we will be sharing – we might already be already, I'm not sure. We'd like to share that to the gTLD [tech] mailing list and see if that would cause any issue on the part of registries. I don't know if anyone here has comments about this, a reaction, comments?

Theo, yes, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Just a quick one. This is mostly registry stuff, so there's not many registries online here. So I'm not sure if we are in a position to comment on it. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thank you, Theo, definitely. And that's why we need to reach out to registries through the gTLD [tech] mailing list. But as a matter of form, we wanted to provide an opportunity for the IRT to potentially discuss this, as well.

Marc, would you like to go ahead? Sorry.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. From my perspective, I certainly have no issues or concerns with that. I don't imagine we would be in a position to implement before 31

October anyway. So at least from our perspective, that doesn't raise any concerns.

But I guess that does raise a related question, is would that be associated… RDAP versus WHOIS, being separate protocols, I don't think there's been any discussion about one replacing the other or any kind of sunset or transition period. So is that factored into or considered in this at all? Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Marc, you're correct. We haven't raised this issue with the community. Our thinking was, let's first get RDAP out and deployed, and then we can start having discussion with the community. We're thinking that, for example, we could use some data points to inform the [position]. You remember, the registries have a requirement to report the number of queries they receive in WHOIS. And for RDAP, the profile includes requirements to report queries on the RDAP service. The idea would be there to use those data points, which by the way are made public, and to define the point at which it makes sense to start talking about turning off [portfolio] service.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc?

EN

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. That makes sense. Thank you for clarifying. I guess I did have a follow-up question on that, and now I've completely drawn a blank. So my apologies. I'll raise it again if I think of it.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you. Francisco, I see you have your hand raised.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Oh, sorry, my mistake.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, I just wanted to make sure. All right. So then this is it for – Marc, did your question come back?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, it did. Sorry about that. So I guess this is for Francisco. So for a period of time where a registry is operating both protocols in parallel, so we've RDAP and WHOIS, would the PDP tester and the WHOIS validation tools, would they validate… I assume, you say the WHOIS validation tools, are you referring to the monitoring tools that ICANN has? I assume that's what that refers to. And I guess, my assumption, and I guess what I'm asking clarification on, is would the PDP tester and the ICANN validation be done against both systems? So for registries operating RDAP and WHOIS, would the PDP tester and ICANN validation tools validate both systems during that period of time? Thank you.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yeah, thank you for the question, Marc. Yeah, the idea is to… So we have a tool to check for WHOIS output that is used by Compliance and also in PDP. That's what is used to raise any issues doing PDT, etc. So for Compliance, on one basis. The idea is to take that tool and also create a similar tool for RDAP, which by the way we also intend to make publicly available, just like the WHOIS validation tool is. And the idea is to modify PDP to include testing for RDAP and for the updated WHOIS output. And just like we do with any updates, we would share then draft updated specs and request the committee to review those updates, any issue. That's the plan.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc and Francisco. All right, so if there aren't any other questions or comments on the revised policy language for consistent labeling and display, we can now move on to discussing the transition from thin to thick.

First item on this topic, as you may recall, the IRT, I believe, reached an agreement in Helsinki that Verisign would draft a notification to be sent to the GNSO in relation to emerging policy issues. Sorry for the typos here. I'm reproducing the text of the recommendation, but there seem to be some cut-and-paste issues there.

So the intent, is that correct, Marc, for Verisign to draft notification and circulate it with the IRT before it's sent to the GNSO? So I just wanted to note that and see if there is any updates or comments on that topic.

MARC ANDERSON: Fabien, can I go ahead?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sure, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: So, yes, Fabien, as you noted, Joe Waldron spoke on this at the Helsinki meeting and agreed to take a first crack at a draft. We do have a draft completed that we're reviewing internally. And I hope to be able to circulate it with the rest of the IRT later this week. Certainly, I think it would be reasonable to expect to have it completed by the next IRT meeting for discussion.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you for the update, Marc. So we're looking forward to the draft. Any questions, comments from other IRT members? Okay, so then we'll have that for our agenda next week.

So now we can move on to discussing open items. So as just a reminder, as you may recall, we discussed, in some detail, this timeline reflecting the discussion and our understanding of the discussion. There was a change to how we had understood the timeline of the existing

EN

registration and some concerns expressed by Steve Metalitz and Sylvia Vivanco during our meeting regarding the 18-month timeframe after six months' preparation for the existing registration track. So just wanted to note that, and we'll get to discussing that further.

I want to note also that we had two comments that we need to discuss, as well. And that's the perception from Joe, I believe, that the file-based transfer option for existing registration data will need some discussion. I think our understanding in that area was that it was in agreement that there would be two channels: the EPP one and the file-based one, to be defined. So I believe we may need to continue discussions on that.

And finally, there were also mentioned that transfers and how [by] different rules apply in case of transfers after completion of the transition, and that still needed to be discussed.

And finally, there were also two new elements. The first one was the classification of new validation rules for existing registration were also to apply to new registration during the transition period, the full transition period. And finally, there was a question of how creation of new registration would be handled when using existing contact data that may be missing data.

So let's see what's the IRT's preference. Should we address any of those that were specifically raised during the meeting? Should we go back to our scorecard and take them one-by-one? Does anyone have a preference or a topic in mind that they would like to discuss as a matter of priority?

THEO GEURTS: I've got no preference, Fabien. Go which way you like.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. So since there's no preference, let's go to the scorecard and let's take it from there.

Okay, so the updated scorecard was sent earlier, before this meeting, if you'd like to have a copy on your screen, if that's more practical for you. So let's take it here by order. So in terms of the new registration track, we're reaching a place, I believe, where the proposal that was presented in Helsinki, or at least the drawing of that timeline based on the discussion so far, indicated 12-month overall timeframe: six months for registries to update their systems and 12 months for registrars to prepare and then complete the transition. So this is what the scorecard reflects here.

Any comments? I don't recall any specific discussion of that timeframe, so it seemed to have gathered the unspoken consent of the IRT, or at least the IRT members that were present. Should we close this item? Is anybody opposed to closing this discussion on this item in our scorecard, number 2? It feels fairly stable for me at this point, based on our last couple meetings.

I see that, Marc, you're typing. I'll just wait for that.

MARC ANDERSON: Fabien, I figured instead of type, it may be easier to speak. I guess this is a question for Jody. I thought Jody raised a concern about this one, that registrars needed 12 months once the registries had completed their

work. I thought that was… And again, I'm trying to – I don't remember the specifics of this, but I thought Jody had a concern about that. So that's my question there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Jody?

JODY KOLKER: My concern was over the 18 months for existing transition from thin to thick. And if we could have 12 months after the registries update their registry systems, that'd be great. But six months, I'm wondering if these should end at the same time, between the new and existing registrations, if those transitions should be ending at the same time. Although 18 months to implement the transition just for new registrations, that would be a long time. But I'd be interested in what any other registrars think.

Theo?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Jody. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: I think it's a long time also. On the other hand, I'm not sure here, but maybe we should go back to the transcript. But I thought Jeff Eckhaus, from eNom, raised some points here as well. But I can't even recall what they were. But for everybody, at least that's my recollection of it,

everybody was sort of in agreement for these 18 months. And I saw no objections from any registrar on the table. And there were a few. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, were you talking about the 18 months for the transition of existing registrations or the 12 months for new registrations?

THEO GEURTS: The 12 months for new registration, basically confirming what Jody just said.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Okay.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, were we talking about 12 months after the registry was done updating the registry system, or 12 months from the beginning of when they started?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think the drawing we made in parallel, because we assumed that there was an amount of preparation that was possible on the registrars' part before the registries were ready, so that's what we suggested. And I don't recall specific discussion in the meeting, and I can refer to the transcript. I don't recall specific discussion of that specific part. I do remember there was substantial discussion of the existing registration

EN

tracks and the 18-month window starting after the six-months' preparation.

So, Jody, please confirm. So I understand what you're saying, Jody, that at least as far as you're concerned, the overlap on the new registration track is okay.

JODY KOLKER: I don't know. I'd like to go back and look at that. Basically, the registry won't have it updated and production until July of 2017. That gives us six months to be done with new registrations. Now, I say yes, and one of the issues that I'd like to ask is, we're not expecting new – and I think that Marc as already covered this, but I just want to state it to make sure – that a new validation rule, or contact validation rules, would be relaxed up until the end of the existing registration transition, right? Because that does make a big difference.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, yeah, Marc is confirming in the chat, and that was my understanding from the meeting, as well.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. I guess, Marc, from your understanding, the registries to update the registry systems, the registry would not have anything in production until July or August 1st. Is that right?

MARC ANDERSON: Jody, yes. Yeah, and based on this timeline, on August 1st we would enable the system to accept contact commands; so create, update, delete contacts. And at that point, that would enable both activities. That would enable you to optionally add the thick data for new registrations, and also at that point you could start the backfill of contact information for existing registrations. That would be the key milestone right there, is the enabling of thick on the registry.

JODY KOLKER: Now, would that be in OT&E then, Marc? When do you think that you would have that in OT&E, the enabling of thick registrations? On February 1st, or would that be sometime before that, or sometime after that?

MARC ANDERSON: Before. So we would do that 90 days earlier. So again, looking at this, that would be roughly May 1st, based on this timeline.

JODY KOLKER: Okay. So we wouldn't be able to even hit OT&E until May 1st for that?

MARC ANDERSON: Correct.

JODY KOLKER: And in order to have a full 12 months, from my perspective, we'd need to start that 12 months on May 1st, because we wouldn't be able to test

anything or make sure that we have the implementation right until May 1st. And if we're going to be given 12 months, it should really be started when it's in OT&E so that we can start getting the systems ready, so that we can test it, if we're looking for 12 months.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you for the discussion, Jody and Marc. Steve, I see you're in the queue.

STEVE METALITZ: I had a couple of questions; three, I think. The first question is, what is supposed to be happening between now and when this chart that's on the screen now begins? We're talking about this system not going into production for 13 months from now. So what happens in the next seven months? Is the registry not doing anything during that period?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So let me – sorry, Steve, I was going to answer the first one. Would you like to state your –

STEVE METALITZ: No, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thanks. So from our perspective, the reason why this timeline starts on February 1st is because until then, from now until then, we still need to draft the policy language and implementation plan that we

EN

would then submit for public comment. And potentially, after the outcome of public comments, revise the language and publish it. So we've planned those, about, five to six months to doing that. Does that make sense?

STEVE METALITZ: Yes. Okay, thank you for clarifying that. My second question goes to this question of validation. So assuming that this chart remains in effect – obviously what Jody suggested might shift that second bar over a little bit, but just looking at this one – so after February 2018, from the perspective of a WHOIS user, the WHOIS user would be able to access thick WHOIS data from the registry, from Verisign, on new registrations going forward. But that data would not have been validated, or would have only been minimally validated, on the two or three data points that we've discussed before. Is my understanding correct on that? So thick WHOIS data would be available on new registrations from these three Verisign registries, but that data would not have been validated, except on those two or three points. Is that right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, Steve, I might leave this to Marc, but that's my understanding. So, Marc, do you confirm?

MARC ANDERSON: The validation rule, when you say, "validated," the validation rules that Verisign performs are very basic and have absolutely nothing to do with the accuracy of the data. It's simply basic contextual validations. So like

all thick registries, the registrars are ultimately responsible for the accuracy and the validity of that. That doesn't change. All we're doing in this scenario is we're relaxing some of those contextual validations to ease the transition for registrars that have large amounts of legacy data to transition. So their obligations to the accuracy of the data still always apply. And that's not something Verisign, as a registry operator, has any real control over. Does that help answer the question?

STEVE METALITZ: Yeah, it does. Thank you. And my last question is again, looking at this chart, assuming that it goes forward in this form, so a registration that comes in – a .com or .net or .jobs registration – that the registrar takes in January of 2018, they would have the option of whether to pass the thick WHOIS data onto the registry by treating it as a new registration, or they could not do that and then, as of February 2018, it would be an existing registration and they wouldn't have to pass that along for another year. Is that accurate?

In other words, registrations that come in during the period between the diamond, when registry production system is in – between that and the end of the bar, below it, those could be treated as new registrations, or they could just pass the thin when we send the thin data, and treat them as existing registrations in 2018. Is that correct, or am I missing something here?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Would anybody on the IRT like to share their perspective on that topic? I don't think we've discussed it specifically, so I think that's an interesting question. I see we have Theo and Jody in the queue.
	Theo, I believe that might have been for another topic?
THEO GEURTS:	Yeah. Yes. But if we want to explore it, sure, I'll wait.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Okay, thanks. Jody?
JODY KOLKER:	Sure. To Steve's point, yeah, if it was registered on the day before the 12 months for new registration required, then it would be seen as an existing registration, and then that data wouldn't be required to be sent until the end of the 18-month period. If we're going to read this to the letter of the law, yeah, that would be it. But from a perspective of development, I would expect that registrars wouldn't have those – or new registrations would be sending in thick WHOIS data at least a few weeks before then, I would hope, in case there are any problems. That's kind of a drop-dead date. But as a developer, we would want to have that out there so that we could debug any issues well before the end of that 12-month period. But being forced to have it before then is a little tough.

STEVE METALITZ:	Okay. That's helpful. I appreciate that that's a drop-dead date and you have the option to do it before then, once the first diamond is passed. I get that. Thank you.
JODY KOLKER:	Yeah. We would want to start having that as soon as possible so that we could definitely start debugging issues in the systems. I'm not sure how other registrars feel about that. But obviously, we have to work it into our development roadmaps, which could be more than a year out in advance, and then be ready for surprises.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Thank you, Steve and Jody. Theo?
THEO GEURTS:	Thanks. I'm actually very supportive of what Jody just said. We are sort of in the same boat. Actually, this is a question for Marc, because this triggers me. If Verisign switches to a thick WHOIS in August and is accepting the create of contacts, I'm just wondering here, maybe this is an edge case or maybe I'm not understanding it correct. But if one of our resellers decides to do an update on, ballpark number, 50K domain names, then he would start to create 50,000 contacts into the system already. And we would be already sort of migrating the backfill of our data already. Is that correct? Can that happen? Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: Theo, I'm not sure I follow. But based on this timeline, August 1st, at that point we would enable all contact functionality in the system. So you'd be able to create contacts, modify contacts, and delete contacts. They're the registry objects in the system. And so at that point, if you had a reseller that wanted to update contacts or create new contacts, they would be able to any time after that August 1st date. Does that answer your question? I'm not sure I followed it.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. And if that happens and he is performing that update on the old legacy or backfill data, then we would be actually migrating from that point. Am I correct? I mean, if a reseller does the update, we are basically creating all these contacts and we are basically migrating already on August, right?

MARC ANDERSON: I guess that would be one of the challenges for you, really, during the transition period. How do you manage the in-between state? It sounds like what you're describing is very similar to the challenge of transfers, when you have a transfer between registrants that have and have not completed the transition. It sounds like a fairly similar use case. After August 1st, what happens if you have a reseller updating contact information that has been backfilled, and what happens when you have a reseller updating contact information that has not been backfilled? Yeah, I think that's one of the challenges for you, really, to figure out how you're going to manage that transition period.

THEO GEURTS: Okay. I see a challenge here. I need to go back to our developers. But I'm just kind of wondering how… Obviously, from your answer I gather that you, as a registry operator, cannot make a distinction between old and new, so we have to make the distinction somewhere. That's kind of an interesting challenge there. Okay. I didn't think of this. I'll go back to the developers. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo and Marc. So, Jody, I see you're in the queue. Is that on this topic?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, I guess. On the point that you're talking about, Theo, I think it's up to your system on whether you want to, if a reseller is updating the contacts in your system, if you want to send those to the registry or not, depending on if they have been already migrated to Verisign or to the registry. I think it's really up to you. I'm just echoing what Marc said. We would have the same problem. We would have to decide, if a reseller is updating those contacts, if we want to send them during this 18-month period or if we want to wait until we're doing them themselves by updating all of those for that reseller at the same time. I think that the system is going to have to keep track of which domains have been updated with existing contacts and then decide, when the reseller is updating those contacts, whether those should be sent to the registry or whether it should wait for your batch process to get done adding them to the registry. That's how I'm looking at it, anyway. It might be a different set of glasses, but that's how I see it.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, and to that point – well, no, I'm not going to speculate. But I'm foreseeing technical issues with contact handles, perhaps, and duplication. But I'll leave that for another session. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo, for the discussion. So this makes me think, unless there is any other comments on the timeline, this makes me think that maybe it should be time for discussing the issue that was raised related to transfers and/or creating new domains that we use existing contact.

So, Jody, I see you're in the queue. Is this a new hand?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. I don't know if we finished this conversation or not, but I just wanted to address, are we moving this 12 months then to start when the registry has the information or the updates into OT&E for the contacts, for adding contacts to the registry?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you for clarifying, Jody, and getting us to clarify. Are there any IT members thinking, having specific ideas about this? It seems to me, as a first approach, that if we move the 12 month by three month, we might want to have some kind of milestone here in the plan to explain why. So add a diamond maybe on it. Any thoughts here?

Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, maybe I'm circling back to something that's been discussed earlier. I want to go back to the OTE. In this timeline we are discussing now, the OTE would be available to us in May, if I'm correct. If I'm not correct, please interrupt me right now.

I don't hear any objections. So if May, then you have a OTE testing phase of three months, though you can also use some of the other time. But I find three months, from a development perspective, extremely short. But that could be me. Maybe Marc has some input there. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, Marc, go ahead. Oh, Jody?

JODY KOLKER: So, Theo, when you say three months, do you mean three months for the registry to develop that and put it into OT&E?

THEO GEURTS: My understanding was that the OTE would be available in May for the registrars.

JODY KOLKER: Right. And then the registrars would have 12 months after that to ensure that they get the registration transition completed. It'll be required 12 months after May of 2017. So it would be required in May 2018. But then the registrars would have 12 months to develop it?

EN

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, that's what I was aiming at. Yeah, okay. Now it's okay. Thanks.

JODY KOLKER: From my understanding, the registrars wouldn't be required to have it done until 12 months after the OT&E, and it's still optional up until that point. But the first time that you can optionally send in the existing contacts would be in, according to this, August 1st. Is that right? Or July 1st, sorry. Or, no, is it August 1st?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I think that's my understanding, really. And I just wanted to check what I had gone quickly here. The star and the rectangle here reflect what you're thinking. So the star is meant to represent the start of OT&E by registries, and the rectangle is mean to be the 12-month window sliding to there. Is that what you're thinking, Jody?

JODY KOLKER: That's what I was thinking. I just wanted Theo's comments on that, if he thought that maybe the 12 months should start after, at the end of the six months, or if it could start when OT&E is alive.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I'm just trying to gather my thoughts here. I find this timeline a little confusing, actually, to be very honest. Maybe it's just a cultural thing here. Thanks. But I get it now.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. So any objection to such a change or such an update of the timeline for new registrations? So there would be a shift by three months of the 12-month window. So what that would mean, due to the entry into effective OT&E phase, starting May 1st of 2017, and that would cause the policy effective date for new registration to slide by three months, to 1st of May, 2018. I see that Marc doesn't have any objection or issues.

Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So on that same venue as everyone is saying, they're agreeing with this change, on that same venue of thought, I was thinking, should we do something similar for the transition of existing registrations and move the 18-months' figure to start in May also? That's the question.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Any reaction? I'm trying to catch up here and reflect that on the timeline. Let me try to do that. So, Francisco, you're thinking that there would be an [inaudible] milestone here, and it'd be the 18 months would start from there. Is that what you're thinking, Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Any reaction, comments from anyone? [inaudible] said that he would support having both tiers start in May 2017, the way it's displayed here in black on the diagram.

Jody?

JODY KOLKER: You know, the transition could start there, the development of that, but I would still want that 18 months, to be able to do the full transition. Even if we started on that day, August 1st, 2017, I would still want 18 months to be able to get all these domains transferred over. I'm not in favor of shortening the time that we're actually doing the transition. If you move this three months ahead, that means there's only 15 months then for the transition of existing registrations. And I'd really like to have 18 months on there. So that doesn't mean that I'm not going to start until 15 months into it. It's just having that cushion and knowing that if we have something that goes horribly wrong, we have that amount of time to complete it. You have to remember, we're talking about 140 million names.

THEO GEURTS: Are you muted, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, sorry. Sorry. Thank you, to you. So I was trying to talk with Jody to request whether this is what he's thinking. So we extend 18 months to 21 months, starting on May 1st, or we create a new step, which is

testing, for three months before the 18 months for actual transition part.

What's your thinking, Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Either one is fine, as long as the end date is still 18 months from the day that it is live in production, to do the existing registrations. You could call that three months a testing period, and that's fine. I don't know if all registrars will actually use that to develop. Maybe they would; maybe they wouldn't. But being able to have this much time, I think, is needed to get all of these registrations over there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Jody. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I'm just agreeing here with Jody. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thanks, Theo. Any other comments from IRT members? Steve, in particular, would that make sense to you? So adding this OT&E period, synchronized with the new registration as one, and still keeping the policy effective date to 1st February, 2019?

Steve, please?

STEVE METALITZ:	I don't really care what you call that three-month period. You're now talking about, it seems to me, a 21-month period. Unless during the OTE period, is it possible to actually submit the data? Or is that only after the diamond is reached?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	So my understanding – and please correct me, Jody and Marc – would be that you can only actually submit data to the registries for display in the WHOIS systems when the registries have updated their systems in production, their production system. So that would be August 1st.

Jody?

JODY KOLKER:	Yeah, any data that we would transmit during that time would only be on the OT&E systems. So it would only be for testing purposes. The actual moving contacts for existing registrations wouldn't start happening, at the very earliest, on August 1st, when the registry updates the system.

STEVE METALITZ:	Okay, thanks. That's helpful. The question this raises in my mind is what incentives can I provide for registrars to do this faster than 18 months? I know there's a discussion right now on the registry agreement and amendments about what would be the basis for fee reductions, and so forth. I just don't know if ICANN has any tools that would be available to encourage registrars not to take the full 18 months. So I guess I'm asking that question. I'm not sure that this group is necessarily the

people situated to answer that. Maybe that's a question for the registrar liaison.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Steve. I think incentive has been discussed or referred to before in our conversations in relation specifically to the transition of existing registration and making sure that not all registration [inaudible]. And I see all that definitely still is an open question. As far as tools that ICANN has, we need to get back to the group on that. I don't think that we've identified any at this point.

Theo, I see you're in the queue.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, thanks. Actually, that's a good question from Steve there. I don't actually see there's any room in the current budget there. But if we could use some of the auction proceedings, I'm all good. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you for the suggestion, Theo. Any other comments? I think we're making progress on the discussion of the timeline. So I'll update our scorecard in that respect. And we'll circulate this with the modification that's suggested here.

We're at the one minute to the end. Francisco, you referred to a discussion on the mailing list in relation to [TND] and RDAP by Roger. Should we get to that before we end our meeting?

THEO GEURTS: I don't think we have time.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay.

THEO GEURTS: I guess I'll follow up with Roger just to understand better what the issue [inaudible]. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Okay, excellent. So let's just stop here for today. Thank you again got your time, taking time and participating in our meeting today. We will share this revised timeline. We'll be looking forward to additional feedback on the revised consistent labeling and display policy language. We'll also be looking forward to Verisign's draft of its proposed notification to the GNSO related to Recommendation number 3. And we will have you back, if you would like, next week, same time. Thank you again. See you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]