
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh, good.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, so yeah, I've just gone through the earlier system, since, that we can listen to, getting it. Okay. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT on Tuesday, the 16th of August, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.

I see that from the IRT, today we have Jody, John McFadden, and Joyce, Roger, Theo. Am I missing anyone?

Okay. Not leaving out anybody. A reminder before we jump into our agenda today, 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, and finally, at any time, if you would like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

Before we get to our agenda today, a short announcement. From today on, Dennis Chang will be leading our IRT calls, and starting in September 1st, he will take over the meeting of IANA implementation. As I myself, will be transitioning into a new role at ICANN. You may already know

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.

Dennis from our meetings in Helsinki. I believe his expertise is project management, he has experience on large scale and complex project, and his humor, will certainly ensure that we'll deliver on our implementation.

And as far as I'm concerned, I will remain onboard until the end of the month, and I will certainly continue on following the implementation from afar, afterwards. So Dennis, the floor is yours.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Fabien. So let's just get started. I know that we have a lot of work to do, and we have a challenge ahead of us. And that challenge is to start the public comments on, in September. So, the agenda for today, is the open items that we want to cover, the open items on the scorecard 7D56 3F and 3G, and then we'll talk about the next steps. Next.

So, registrar coordination slash incentive, 7B item, was the first item on the agenda. Let's see. There was a challenge or a question request, for ICANN to think about a possible incentive. And there has been discussions on the email trail, about what to do in maybe motivating or measuring progress status on the transition of this large number.

So let me start off the discussion, if somebody... Is there anyone who wants to start the discussion here?

FABIEN BETERMIEUX:

Dennis, maybe... All right, I'll let Theo go.

THEO GEURTS: Thank you Dennis. This is Theo for the record. I don't think we have anything, we don't have any progress here. My last week [inaudible] was that Steve [inaudible] asked ICANN staff to explore some opportunities there. For the rest, we haven't made much progress there, I think. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien, did you want to speak?

FABIEN BETERMIEUX: Yeah. Do you mind coming back to the [inaudible]? I just wanted to say a few words with what on the mailing list. So I think there were a number of proposals discussed on the mailing list, including with a level of, a certain level of support, a notion that there could be reporting of progress of the transition per registrar, that will be provided by the registry to registrars and ICANN.

So that proposal seem to have gained real traction, and so it would be interesting to hear, if anybody on the call doesn't feel like this has gotten traction indeed. There were other measures that were discussed, but less conceptual. So for instance, Steve has proposed that, person [inaudible] transition domain per registrar would be published, and so that was, that would make some position of other IRT members.

There was instead a proposal that the overall percentage of completion per TLD, as opposed to registrar, be published, as a high level indicator

of the progress that has been made on the implementation. And finally, there was also a proposal that, in addition to that percentage, there could be other metrics to be shared publicly such as the number of domains at the beginning of the transition, number of create and deletes during a transition, and the number of domains with contact and in person completes.

So, it seems to me that we made progress over the last week. And we are in a place where, from the discussion that happened, as I can stop, I think we can, we get a sense that we could propose that the registry provides some reporting, and that part of that reporting could be published.

And so it would be interesting to hear from other IRT members if this is their understanding as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead Theo.

THEO GEURTS: Thank you Dennis. This is Theo for the record. We had some discussion back and forth, regarding the publishing of the progression there. And I think that is important that we should have that. But I think it should be involving the actors who are involved into this. I think it should be, we should have some progress to ICANN compliance.

Actually, all of the actors who are involved in this, and we should actually need to think how we're going to interpret the data there, or the progress, because at some point, we will look at the data, and

where are we going from there, based on that data. What does it say if only 40% has migrated at X date, or X percentage has migrated at X date, but is less than expected?

What are our expectations there? I mean, this can be easily interpreted very well the wrong way, or it could be a very useful tool. I'm not sure how we move about there. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien, did you want to speak again?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, I see John raising his hand. [CROSSTALK]

JOHN MCFADDEN: Sorry, I was trying to figure out how to do that. So, yeah, from our perspective, you know, we definitely don't want to have, you know, registrar specific data published, but I think having the overall percentage will be helpful. And then getting weekly reporting directly from a registrar to us and to ICANN, I think you guys are going to need that just to track all of the individual registrars.

So those two, you know, with the exception of publishing individual registrar data to the public, I think I'm fine with the second and third proposal.

DENNIS CHANG: Theo?

THEO GEURTS: This is Theo for the record. I'm going to agree there with John there. I think there is no harm in having a general progress bar, so to speak, to see where we're at. But at some point, we're going to have these reports, if you follow this line here. If we have these weekly reports, at what point is some party, some actor, going to do something?

Because, from my point of view, I have to do a legal review here. And that is going to cost me time. And at what point are we going to take action? When are we going to say, we are way behind with integration, what is the problem here? Is it a technical problem? Is it a legal problem? Where do we go from there? Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, this is Fabien speaking. So Theo, would it make sense that we use this reporting by the registry to the registrars and ICANN, to set a sort of intermediate, to track intermediate milestones we would set? So for instance, let's say six months into the transition, we would like to see that 25% of the registration per registrar transition, and then 12 months into it, 50%, etc.

Would that make sense to you? It seems that it would be a way to use that, those metrics to some use into ensuring that by the end of the implementation, all transition potentially are, all registrations are transitions.

DENNIS CHANG: Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. This is Theo for the record. Yeah, I think that is the path forward there, Fabien. I mean, we need a starting point anyways. I'm not sure if this is going to be very, if it's just going to work in real life, so to speak, or production, but yeah, I agree. We should move forward with that, with what you just suggested. I think that makes a lot of sense there.

And we'll just see how far we're going to get with that. But I think those are really good indicators on a 50%, and let the rest is lagging behind, that there is some check, why is there only 50%? Why you anticipated this? Maybe you should... I'm not sure if this is within the scope of the IRT, but come up with some kind of metrics, like, okay, if X amount hasn't been transferred prior to this date, like nine months after we started the migration, then something, some kind of alarm should go off, etc., etc.

What Roger pointed out in the chat there, that is a very good suggestion there, is to get a confirmation. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, thank you Theo.

So, is there sort of an agreement, in a general sense, that we should have some kind of reporting and measurement? And that it should be published for the public to see. And what we do exactly with that report, we haven't yet figured out, but it should provide some sort of an indication or incentive for people to act. Go ahead Jody.

JODY KOLKER: Hi. This is Jody for the record. I think we want to be very defined about what we release to the public, and what's not released to the public. I think that that's been a concern with all of the registrars. I just want to make sure that I'm saying that, that we're talking about displaying to the public is the percentage, just an overall percentage, but not an overall percentage by registrar.

DENNIS CHANG: Right, right. Fabien, did you want to take again?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I think it's Theo I saw Theo's hand, maybe?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead Theo.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, that is correct. This is Theo for the record. Dennis, just to piggy back on what you just said, like when we have these notifications, and we come to a point like we should act on this data, then what will happen next, I think, what will happen next, that is a really good question.

Like I said, there could be legal issues that we did not anticipated, which is outside of the scope, but that could be... Let's say if, in 2018, I'm not saying it will happen, but there could be a reality for certain registrars, that they simply cannot migrate the data without breaking the law. I'm not sure if that's going to happen, but I think it's a distinct possibility that you should recognize that fact.

Based on that, you should move forward with it. So how we're going to interpret the data, and what actions are going to be there, I'm not sure that we can address that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Right. I agree with you Theo. The, I can see us agreeing to measuring, by promising [inaudible] of certain type. I don't know whether we can do that. And also, I'm trying to separate very clearly, what we need to define before we start the public comment for the public comment. And then, what we actually write into the policy for an effective date, which compliance can enforce.

Any comments on the registries agreeing with the reporting? If we can make that a requirement?

The overall percentage? Do you think that would be the acceptable thing for all of these things? If we put it into a policy?

THEO GEURTS: This is Theo for the record. For a general progress percentage, I don't see any issues with it, but we're going to find out during the comment period anyways.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Go ahead Roger. Oh, Roger says plus one. Okay. Everybody agrees. It seems like we have a general agreement, that at least for the time being, we have a general, overall percentage.

So, with that, it's also during the transition period, I can post the report on a weekly or monthly basis, however we decide. And that will be useful for a lot of people. And I think it would also serve as some incentive to registrars as well.

Anymore comments on this item?

FABIEN BETEREMIEUX: Dennis, it's Fabien speaking.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

FABIEN BETEREMIEUX: I wonder if we should discuss the proposal on the post-transition. I think it was Roger that made this proposal, and I'm not sure, and they were discussed the extension on the mailing list, so I wonder if maybe Roger could kind of explain a little bit his proposal, and make sure that it's agreeable to other members on the IRT. In particular, I think we've received today a response on the second proposal, somebody proposing it.

I mean, it would be interesting, I think we discussed this a bit.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's do that. Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, this is Roger. So, you hit the easier one, I think, to Fabien's point here. A time of renewal, I was thinking, we could... VeriSign is setup to auto renew, but at the time of renewal, if there is a, if there is no contact [inaudible] to sign the domain, I'm suggesting that they do an auto delete instead of an auto renew.

And again, I caveat that with, going back to what Theo had mentioned on the possible concept of registrations. And Francisco and I have talked about this quite a bit. If that scenario does exist, for me, you know... If we're saying there is 140 million domains that have to be contacted to be added, but a registrar, for whatever reason, has identified to ICANN, to the registry, that hey, these million names, we legally can't send the contact data.

To me, that means that it's done. And we have to be able to account for that somehow. So I mean, you have to take this idea of no [inaudible] in context with that, because they could possibly exist.

JOYCE LIN: Hi, this is Joyce.

DENNIS CHANG: Joyce, go ahead.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah. Regarding the deletion on the expiration date, are you saying on the expiration date or is in the grace period? I would think that...

ROGER CARNEY: It's on the expiration date. [CROSSTALK]

JOYCE LIN: I think that would be too fast. I think that the registry should put in like a hold or something, that's kind of able to DNS resolving on the data expiration, and then at the end of the data grace period, which is 45 days, then they delete it. At least it gives the registrant some time to react, is that, it's a good, active domains.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, that's an interesting concept, Joyce. This is Roger. I think we should probably talk to VeriSign on that because that expiration date,

they're actually auto renewing it for another year, which we wouldn't them to do... And again, something we'd probably have to work out with VeriSign on those.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah. If it's deleted before the expiration period, the registrant will get refunded for that [inaudible] that they charged. So yeah, that's something we need to work out with the registry.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thanks Dennis. I just wanted to make the point that Roger just made, that we need to check with VeriSign in particular if we want a way to distinguish between registration that are thin because contacts were not provided, and registration that are thin because contacts could not be provided.

And so it seems to me that that would require some sort of flag on the registry side to be able to discriminate in between the two cases. So I actually want to have VeriSign involved in the discussion.

DENNIS CHANG: I guess VeriSign is not on the call today, huh?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I don't see Mark.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody, you have a comment?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. You know, after thinking about this auto deletion of domains, I agree with Joyce in the fact that it might be too soon to auto delete the domain when it expires. I like the idea of the server hold, but if from an operational perspective, I'm not sure how we can take the server hold off then. You know, would it be an automatic if the domains, if [inaudible] contacts are created, then VeriSign automatically moves the server hold, and auto renews the domain then at that time.

That might be a lot for the registry to do.

JOYCE LIN: Or maybe I missed, you said that there is a client hold that will disable the DNS, instead of the [CROSSTALK]... know that registry, registrar can change that, once the contact is updated. [CROSSTALK] ...yeah, if contact isn't updated and uploaded, then the registrar cannot change that. [Inaudible] yeah, client hold.

DENNIS CHANG: Client hold?

JOYCE LIN: Yeah, I think it's called client hold. That would disable the DNS.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

JOYCE LIN: And I think it would be a good idea, like a... We are talking about the post-transition, right? I'm assuming that all the registrar has been migrated to the Thick WHOIS. I think the registry could send the email out during the period to each registrar [inaudible] contacts, we're going to be on the expiration date. I mean, [inaudible] into the registrars [inaudible] account don't have the ID, contact ID, and will be deleted 45 days, by the end of the grace period.

So at least that gives the registrar a chance to look through that, and then [inaudible] can just do something about it.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Fabien, you're next.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry Daniel, that was an old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Jodi then.

JODI KOLKER: Yeah. I wish VeriSign was on. I'm not sure that VeriSign could automatically put a client hold on it, put client hold status on a domain since it's a registrar function. So I think we would need VeriSign to stand in or to comment on that. I mean, I like the idea of taking the domain out of the zone, basically, so it doesn't resolve. And the expiration date, but what we're talking about then is that, if the registrar doesn't do anything with the domain, they weren't expecting the registry to delete the domain name after 45 days.

I mean, Roger and Joyce, is that kind of your understanding too?

DENNIS CHANG: Roger, do you want to...? Joyce, do you want to respond?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, this is Roger. Yeah, I mean, that's what I was thinking. And again, I mean, all of these are going to be hypothetical until VeriSign can tell us what's possible.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's do this. Let's take this discussion back to the email, and see if we can get a clear reading from VeriSign, and perhaps that will tell us what to do. But this is, we were talking about this is, after post-transition. So that means that it's from the date of policy effective date, right? So everything should be transitioned by then, so this rule is the new policy and it should work forever, basically.

Jody? Do you have a comment?

JODY KOLKER: Oh, yeah, I meant to take that down, but I guess I am just thinking about it a little bit more. You know, I guess, after the post-transition, after we're supposedly supposed to all be done, if we're trying to get these domain names to be moved, I mean, would it be worthwhile to put them on hold, you know, 30 days after, no matter when the expiration day is?

I don't know. I'm just throwing that out there. I don't know how I feel about that. I'm just curious what everybody else thinks. It kind of puts the registrar on alert, you know, that you've had two years to do this, now it has got to be done or the domains are going to stop resolving. And you know, I mean, there is a way to gain the system here, if you renew your domain name, or the domains are renewed, you know, for 10 years, then you wouldn't have to worry for putting contacts on it for 10 years.

And I don't know how adamant we want to be about that. I guess I'm just throwing that out for discussion. Like I said, I don't know how I feel about it. I'm curious on anyone else's comments.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Theo next.

THEO GEURTS: Okay. Thank you Dennis. I think we should actually take this back to VeriSign, take it back to the list, and I suggest we are very cautious on what we are doing here. I give some good stuff, that if I'm thinking

ahead a little bit, there could be some issues down the road, so let's be cautious here. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. John?

JOHN MCFADDEN: Yeah. So I think I'll second what Jody is saying, to the extent that our dating event really isn't the expiration date of the domain, the dating event is the, you know, whatever deadline we've set, or has been set by ICANN, for getting the contacts added. So yeah, I think using the expiration would just be confusing for a lot of people, plus it has the moving target, whereas if we're trying to incentive a registrar to get those contacts on there, they could, whatever fixed deadline is out there, then they could work towards that deadline.

JOYCE LIN: Yeah, I think that's a good idea too. This is Joyce.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Okay, so there seems to be details to work out, but I feel like it would be much more effective and to the point, if we have VeriSign or a registry involved in the discussion. Let's do that. The next item, this revocation of accreditation in case of lack of progress or remaining thin registration. Roger, you brought this up? Is this the same...?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And again, I know there has been a few emails on this in the list. You know, again, taken into account what Theo brought up earlier, you know, there may be reasons to have thin registration, but with that knowledge, you know, after basically two years, and when you look at the validation that VeriSign is going to require us to create contacts, there really is no validation on this.

It's creating an ID basically. So, I don't really see how you cannot, I guess, follow those fairly simple rules, and end up with registrations that don't have a void on them, at the end of two years. But I'll let others talk to why they think that that's not a good idea.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. John, you have a comment on this?

JOHN MCFADDEN: Sorry, I just left that up. My apologies.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Answer to Roger's question, I wonder if there could be confusion about the proposal around the fact that you're talking about how [inaudible] that is creating contacts, contacts that would fit the limited validation rules, as opposed to creating full contact that has all of the data. Could there be confusion coming from there, Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: That's a good point to make, is you know, drawing that line. I'm basically talking about the transition. Why aren't there any reason to have any domains at the end of transition, not have any [inaudible]? I just can't think of, well you know, those reasons. And maybe there are some, and I just don't know what they are.

DENNIS CHANG: So, one clarification, this is Dennis, is that if there is no [roid?] and it's basically from the point of the policy effective date, is that something that we have to actually put into the policy language of revocation? Or does it fall under the category of, they should be in compliance anyway, to have the [roids], so we don't need to have another policy language here?

That's the question. Anyone? Compliance, maybe? Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: This is Theo for the record. I'm actually going to give an on the spot answer here, because I'm answering on the spot, and stuff can be extremely complex here. And this looks like a very complex one. So I think we should take this one to the list, and I would definitely want to bring this back to my team, if [inaudible], because I don't have an answer. Okay, thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. Yes. Okay, Roger has raised his hand.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. This is Roger. Again, there is some verbiage that ICANN always uses about, you know, being a good actor and putting your best effort forward, and again, I think I mentioned that on, you know, the suggestion is, yeah, even post-transition, if a registrar needed that extra time for whatever reason, or needed extra help, and they're actually attempting to do those things, you know, ICANN compliance has usually been pretty good with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Okay, so we won't close this out, but will continue via email. And we'll have to get a reading from our friends in compliance too. Roger, is this an old hand or do you want to speak again?

ROGER CARNEY: Sorry, old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Shall we move on to the next topic then? This is in regard to inter-registrar transfers. This item is item six on our scorecard. This is the case where the gaining registrar is still thin, and not ready to enter the thick. So what do we do there? Gaining registrar can remove contacts upon accepting the transfer? That's Francisco's proposal. And context of transfer domain should be removed automatically by the registry. That's Jodi's proposal.

So let's talk about that first. Any comments? Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah. This is Theo. I just brought that up again like a week ago, or two weeks ago, I'm not sure, because we were looking at an issue that was sort of exploding in my head back then, because of the sheer complexity, but it looks like the proposal from Francisco, and in addition, the comments from [inaudible] there, that we are looking at situation that a disputed, I'm still cautious about how, in fact, we're going to deal with certain aspects of IRTPC.

I for one, have not looked into that. I mean, I've already had my head exploded for the policy itself. And I try to bring this into a scenario where we are looking at, in a migration process there. But I think that should be noted that IRTPC can be a little bit of a showstopper at some point there, at least if we don't think about it.

So maybe we should put it in some side note there, that we should circle back on this. From what Francisco and Jody have been proposing, that is technically a way forward there. We just need to be sure that VeriSign does support it. I'm not sure if they can do it. So that's two points there that we need to check.

Check with VeriSign, and check if IRTPC can be in some kind of show stopper there. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. I think Theo brings up a good point that, about IRTPC. I mean, generally I think, when a registrar transfers a domain name from a thick registry, at least this is what happens here, in our registrar, is that the contacts that are coming in, we copy those contacts into our database. We then create new contact [droids?] for that domain, and then we update the [roids] or we create new contacts, and then we update the [roids] from the previous losing registrar contacts, to our new [roids] that we've just created with the same customer information that was on the domain when it transferred.

I guess what I'm having a tough time with here is that, you know, it appears that with IRTPC, we can't remove the contacts from the, at the registry. I mean, because that's basically changing the contact, if I'm not mistaken. The other issue that I have is that, who is the authoritative contact for the domain? Where are those stored at? Are those stored at the registry or the registrar? And I think that's an open question, unless we've got enough lawyers in the room to answer.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's see, Jody? Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks Dennis. So, just coming back, after listening [inaudible], brings up more good points. What we could do, when we are looking at maybe possible issue for ITPC, is I mean, we have some rules that are, make sure that we have some real [inaudible], who is going to make it more relaxed during recommendations? What we could do, a big step but I'm not sure if we are within scope there, that we could eliminate

ITPC policy, no, element is a bad word here, that a sort of excluded that when the scenario pops up, that ITPC does not apply. Is that maybe a path forward here?

I know it's a big leap, and I'm not sure of the consequences there, but maybe it's a path forward. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Any more comments?

JODY KOLKER: This is Jody again, Dennis. You know, as a part of a transfer, as an operational part of the transfer, when the domain is transferred, we don't ever change the contacts on the domain, unless the customer asks us to, unless the registrant does. We accept whatever contacts are that come in. So if I'm coming from a thick, let's say, from a thick registrar to a thin registrar, I would expect that the thin registrar would have the same contacts that the thick registrar had, because they're supposed to be scraping the WHOIS, putting that contact information into their database, and that's the way it's supposed to work.

Maybe there isn't a problem here at all with deleting those contacts, because those contacts are deleted at the registry, the new contacts at the registrar should be the same as what they were at the old registrar, or at the losing registrar, I should say. I'm wondering if anybody can poke a hole in that scenario.

JOYCE LIN: If I can... This is Joyce. Is anybody ahead of me?

DENNIS CHANG: No. Go ahead, Joyce.

JOYCE LIN: Okay. [Inaudible], it's just really special, [inaudible]. Our experiences, we really cannot just get a hold of the [inaudible], or even the [inaudible] domain name, okay? That [inaudible] doesn't [inaudible]. So what we do is decline when they wanted to transfer a domain to us, they definitely already have an account with us, and the account with us, so they can successfully transfer, but we have to [inaudible] to see the contact email, because we have no way to send it.

The authorization email, confirmation email to the registrant. And what happened was, after the transfer was successful, the client just had to update, log back into his account with us and update it, before they can do anything. So that's how, you know, one registry that we had to deal with. And maybe, you know, they can apply to other registry too.

[CROSSTALK]

...very hard to get the WHOIS from the public WHOIS database, and then plug it into your database, and so you know, whatever your customers, they created a contact at your website, that's what you use to [inaudible] code is correct, the name will be transferred. And enter that, and then he can update that contact, I think.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Go ahead.

JOHN MCFADDEN: Yeah, this is John. The case that I'm thinking about is in the case of an acquired or purchased domain name. So, if the, you know, if the losing registrar does have them, is a thick registrar at that time, those contacts, probably by definition, are going to change as soon as they come into our count. And if we're not ready to the thick WHOIS provider, we're going to definitely want to have those contacts removed.

So I would think that this scenario of removing them automatically at the registry would be the safest bet, I just don't know, again, if VeriSign can do that from a practical standpoint.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Seems like another topic where we need the registries to be involved to make it efficient.

Okay. So, as we're talking about this, I would like... We want to sort of keep in mind that all this discussion has to sum up to a policy language. So it's either a policy language that we're going to put into our new policy, consensus policy. Or it's going to be a implementation note that will be helpful to a contracted party that the people would have to implement these policies.

So I just wanted to remind you, that's what I'm thinking about when I'm listening to this. Next item, we have... Do we have someone else wanting to talk? We have a comment?

Is there someone?

No, then we're... The validation rule. Let's talk about the validation rule. So, what should we do? What validation rule should apply to transfer requiring the creation of new contact data that's missing for these contact? We lack validation rule, until all domains have been updated to have contacts in the registries. That's from Jody.

Everybody agree with this sentiment? Can I hear from you? Let's see, go ahead, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I think Theo had his hand up before me.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: I took it down. I'm in agreement with Jody. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Anybody else opposed to this idea?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is Fabien. I was going to suggest whether Jody could add some color to it, in particular, speak to the motion that we, that the registry would keep those relaxed validation rules for a long time, and that that

might affect the creation of new registrations as well. And so, I'm concerned with the impact of that proposal. But Jody [inaudible].

I don't know if you hear me, Jody, I was wondering if you could add a bit of color to your proposal here on the slide. The relaxed validation rules should apply to domains have been updated, to have contacts at the registry. I'm a bit concerned that this would also, be the case for new registration, and that would for a long time. So [it is a bit] concerning post-transition.

JODY KOLKER:

This is Jody. Yeah, the reason I proposed that was due to the transfers that could be coming in, that have bad contact data, that have not been updated yet. So, I mean, if that continues to go on for two months, and we continue to try and bring domain names in, and they don't have good contact data, and then we're supposed to try, the registrar is supposed to try to create those contacts, they won't be able to with the data that's in the WHOIS, basically.

And that's my concern for that. I know that when you create the contact at the registry, yeah, we could still wind up with poor contact data during that time, until all of the transfers, not all of the transfers, but all of the registrations have thick contacts. Right? I understand that that's a liability, but at the same time, it would be really, it's going to be tough on registrars if they're transferring domain names and they don't have the necessary contact information on there.

And you know, as a point of reference, that's what we saw for dot ORG, for a long time, after the registry, registrations were completed, we still

had bad contact data in there. I'm sorry. When transfers were done after we supposedly had completed all of that turning on the thick registries or thick contacts, you could still see some back contact data in there.

I guess, that's why I'm saying that we should wait until everybody has a thick contact data, and then turn on the stricter contact validation.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Jody, I have a two thought question. This is Fabien speaking. The first one is, so if I understand correctly, this is really only for transfers after the transition is complete. So ideally the registry could apply to the [inaudible] two specific [inaudible] the contact of those transfers somehow. That would work. That would be enough. Correct?

JODY KOLKER:

Could you say that again Fabien? I'm sorry.

FABIEN BETERMIEUX:

So, what you are suggesting, the use case you are presenting is, specifically for transfers after the deadline for the transition to thick. And so those [inaudible] need only apply to those [inaudible], not necessarily to all registration, correct?

JODY KOLKER:

It would only apply, well... It's going to apply to all new contacts that are created.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And that's the challenge, because then you know, how do we ensure that regular contact are provided with the amount of required thick data.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, it's a challenge. I guess what I'm saying is until we can, until all 149 domains are completed, or have thick contacts on them, it will be difficult for registrars to create new contacts, if they don't have good contact data on them. If those domains haven't been...

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody, one more follow-up question. Fabien speaking again. So let's, assuming you're the gain registrar, you're gaining those registration, transferred registration, the validation rules allow you to create a contact with missing data. How long do you need to fix that missing data?

JODY KOLKER: You're bringing up a good point Fabien. Once the data is in the thick registry, or all contacts have been created, and there is still poor quality, when that domain name transfers, it's going to be up to the gaining registrar to ensure that they have good data in there, because they won't be able to use the data that was on the domain when it was transferred.

Registrars are still going to be kind of out of hand, or in a bad situation, basically, of trying to create domain names with the same contact information that was on the domain. It will have to be corrected.
[CROSSTALK]

FABIEN BETEREMIEUX: Sorry, go ahead Jodi.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, I'm not sure if there is much of an argument to stand on with this. Because no matter, no matter if you turn the contact validation rules on, you know the day of post-transition, you know, there is still going to be a lot of bias contact data out there, and when that domain transfers, it will be up to the registrar of record, the gaining registrar, to fill in that data to make sure that it passes the validation rules.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I agree with that, what you just said. I'm looking at the timeline and trying to see what we do before February 1st, 2019, is going to be different than how we treat things after 2019, February 1st, when the policy is in effect.

We have three minutes left, I think [CROSSTALK]... Go ahead.

JOYCE LIN: This is Joyce. Yeah. The registry does not [prohibit] you from creating a new contact when the domain is transferred. So what I'm saying is, if

the domain transfers from A to B, the B doesn't necessarily have to use the contact ID from A. You can create a new one, or update to make it a new one. I don't think the registry could [inaudible] say hey, sorry, the contact ID you have to use this one. Right?

JODY KOLKER:

True, but if there is IRTPC on this, then you've got a contact that old registrant, and the new registrant, and have them agree to it before you can create those contacts, or update those contacts at the registry. I'm not sure how valid that is, so.

JOYCE LIN:

Because I know that we are incoming transfer, but that [inaudible] whatever, you know, on the transfer to us, as long as the [EPP?] code is correct that it goes through, and then the updated [inaudible] knew that they updated, and [inaudible] sorry, you don't have the correct ID, contact ID.

It's automatically created a new ID, and the whole ID from the previous [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK] yeah.

JODY KOLKER:

So Joyce, yes, do you change the contacts...? And I'm not talking about the contact [roids], but I'm talking about the actual contacts addresses on the registrants, when a transfer comes through?

JOYCE LIN: Well the transfer... The transfer, you only required to send an email to the email address on the registrant on any contact. You don't really check every address, do you?

JODY KOLKER: No, I'm not saying this. Why don't we come back to this? [CROSSTALK]

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we're out of time here. So again, I think we have another meeting next week and another meeting the following week. So, we'll continue the discussion and see if we can wrap all of these up. I think we can before we go for public comment in September. I'm hopeful that we can still meet our goal. Any final comments before we say goodbye?

Okay, then, see you next week [CROSSTALK] continue our discussion online in the emails. Thank you everyone, bye.

[Music]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]