

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT on Tuesday, 19 July 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN. I see that we have from the IRT with us today Jody, Joyce, Steve, Theo. Am I missing anyone? Okay, I'm not hearing anyone nor seeing any activity in the Adobe Connect room. I see now that Frederic is joining us as well.

A few reminders before we jump into our agenda. (We're welcoming Marc as well here.) Please make sure your line is muted when you are 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 speak. Finally, any time you would like to get in the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

As far as our agenda today, we'll quickly go through rapid updates on the policy language for [CLND] as well as the notification of the GNSO per the Recommendation #3. Then we'll get to a substantive discussion of the transition implementation path. We'll be looking at the updated timeline per our discussion last week, which we shared on the mailing list as well as the scorecard.

Let me stop here a second and see if anybody has any comments or questions on the agenda. I'm not hearing any.

Okay, so let me start with the update. On the consistent labeling and display policy language, we've received feedback from [inaudible] members on the review we had requested. We're still working through

---

*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.*

---

that. Nothing is changing, so our target timeline is as we discussed last week. We will be getting back to the IRT we're hoping in the next few days on the mailing list. In any case, we'll have an opportunity to discuss again next week. That's about it for that update we wanted to provide before we start.

On the notification of the GNSO per the working group Recommendation #3, my understanding is that Verisign [inaudible] to share a draft of such a notification to the IRT, and my understanding is that this is in the work.

Let me just stop here and see if Marc would like to share any updates. Otherwise, we'll move on.

MARC ANDERSON:

Yes, Fabien. I'm still working on it internally and hope to have it ready to share with the rest of the IRT shortly.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. Any question or comments on those updates? Okay, I'm not hearing any questions, not seeing any hands raised.

So let's move on to discussing the transition from thin to thick. Regarding the timeline, as you may recall, this slide is the timeline we had discussed in Helsinki and which we discussed again last week on 12 July. My understanding of the discussion and after reading again the transcript to make sure is that the proposal is now the following. Let me switch it back and forth just to give you a sense of what has changed.

---

As you can see, the implementation timeline for registrars to transition new registrations and registrars to transition data for existing registrations has not changed. It's 12 months respective and 18 months. What changes is the start date of that timeframe which, in the case of the new registrations, is three months into the implementation when the registry has [released an] OT&E environment with the changes to the system.

Regarding the existing registrations, the 18 months start from the date registries have readied their systems in production. We've added a three-month window for registrars to prepare from the time the registry is able to provide an OT&E environment.

What I'd like to request from IRT members is that they confirm that this is also their understanding and, if there are any concerns, that we discuss them now before we proceed to our scorecard and try to [inaudible].

Let me stop here and let's listen to your questions and comments. Jody, please? Jody? Are you on mute? Jody, can you hear me? Okay, I see, Jody, that you're fixing the audio connection. Anybody else interested to comment?

I'd be interested to really understand if this can be our assumption moving forward for drafting a transition plan. That's quite important for us for that drafting effort. So I'd like to get out of this meeting a confirmation that this is the current assumption that we can work against or whether that needs to still be discussed. Theo?

---

THEO GEURTS: Hi. Yeah, this is from what I recall last week also, so that is looking fine actually. I think this is what we should be looking for, for the next couple of months. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Theo. I read from Jody that this is what you remember as well. That's correct. Okay. So we have Jody and Joyce also confirms this is correct. Any other comment?

THEO GEURTS: I've got a small one. Maybe we remember that we talked about the effective date when Verisign the registry would move to a thick WHOIS model and that I mentioned that any updates on the old data would already be created. So we're actually talking about backfill data already being migrated.

We had some back and forward back then, and I took this back to our team. I actually proposed it and I said, "Okay, we still need to make sure that we do not migrate the backfill data on August 1 when the new registrations are also [open]." We don't see any option how we can separate the old and the new. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. So, Theo, what you're saying is that, am I understanding correctly that you're seeing a potential challenge between deciding what is a new registration as opposed to what is an existing registration when the window is open? The window for the transition is open. Is that correct?

THEO GEURTS:

In my perspective, as soon as the registry moves to a thick WHOIS and as soon as some reseller starts to update the old backfill data, it will [inaudible] be created at the registry already. Then we are no longer talking about a migration because we are already doing it and there is no way stopping us. That was my sense from what I got from our development team.

From what I remember from the discussion last week, Marc pointed out that the registrars sort of had to separate that data, if I'm correct. So we had to make a separation between new registrations and the backfill data, the grandfathered data. I don't see a solution for that. I actually don't see an issue also, by the way. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Okay. My understanding of the conversation there was that this might be a registrar-per-registrar type of issue, depending on how the systems are implemented and how you proceed with those. What I take from what you said, Theo, is that this is not an issue, which is reassuring.

I see Jody in the queue. Jody, please go ahead. Jody, are you with us? Can you hear me? We can't hear you, Jody. Okay, Jody says, "Never mind," in the chat.

Okay. Theo, I understand what you refer to is not an issue, so can we continue and potentially, if there needs to be further discussion of that topic, we can take it offline potentially? Would that be okay?

---

THEO GEURTS: I don't see an issue. I'm just saying when the gates are open, it starts to migrate – old data, new data.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. I think that's consistent with our timeline right here, which shows that once registries update, registries will update their production systems to allow new thick WHOIS registration as well as the transition of existing registrations to thick WHOIS at the same time. That seems to be consistent with what you're saying.

We're getting [probably] from Jody's line.

Frederic, I see you mention we will also migrate in one phase. So, Frederic, does that mean you will do both at the same time, new and existing? Is that what you're saying? Okay.

Alright, any other questions or comments on the timeline? Hearing none, so let's move on to our scorecard and try to work through our various open items.

I'm displaying here the redline version that was shared on the mailing list yesterday. Let's start with this one here, number 2, the "timeline estimate for transition of new registrations from thin to thick." Can we close this one? I understand that from the conversation on the timeline, we seem to be in agreement right now on what was drawn on that slide. Anybody opposed to closing this item? Theo?

---

THEO GEURTS: I'm not opposed to closing it, but I do want to make – there should be a notice or a little piece of comment that there might be a shift in the timelines when there is [either a legal analysis] or there might be some data privacy issues popping up along the way as we go. So you can close it from my point of view, but maybe a comment is a good thing there. I don't know. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks for your comment. Okay, so we'll do that. We'll close and make a note that there are – so you mentioned legal issue. Sorry, I'm trying to catch up at the same time in my notes. Theo, can you repeat, please, just the [three] issues you talked about that may have an impact on the timeline?

THEO GEURTS: Sure. If the legal review shows any issues, then we might shift the timeline. And there might be some moving targets like other data privacy issues that we don't anticipate right now, and that might move the timeline also too. Joe Waldron made a comment about Russia back in Helsinki, and basically I've been talking to our team in Russia and we might have an issue there also. So we may not be able to migrate all the data at once. We might need to sort out some issues there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. I see that there's a question from Steve in the chat. "What is the legal review you are referring to? Individual companies?"

---

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, there might be some individual companies. We agreed that the analysis is up to the registrars, if I am correct, and registrars still need to make a little bit of an assessment there.

Like I said, after Helsinki I started talking to our Russian team because we have a Russian office there. So we have to comply with Russian law there because we have data stored locally there. We need to see if there's no issue when we're going to migrate it to the Verisign service. So we still need to do that analysis there and, depending on what comes out of there (which I have no idea about), we might run into issue. And I'm not sure if the current solutions that we have in place are adequate.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Okay, thank you, Theo. I see that Steve is typing, so let's see. Does that answer his question? Okay, so maybe while we wait for Steve's message in the chat, we'll close number 2 here of the New Registration Track.

Let's move on. At the bottom of our Existing Registration Track scorecard and go directly to the timeline there as well just to make sure we can assess what we can close here.

Number 7 was about the timelines. I believe here from previous discussions we had set some principles. There were some concerns expressed. I believe we are finding a way here. With the timeline that we had on the slide, there seemed to be an agreement on that. So I suggest we close this item as well and add the same note to this one as well that we just discussed with Theo to mention that there could be shifts due to potential challenges with data privacy issues as requested by Theo.



---

Anybody in disagreement with that idea? So we would be closing 7 here and rely on what we discussed in the timeline we presented earlier as well as the notes suggested by Theo. I see that Steve's typing. Yes?

[THEO GEURTS]: I think we can close this one [now], Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Steve, for your comments. So we'll close 7.

7a, we were talking about [inaudible] – yes? Is somebody – Theo, is this you?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. Just a little comment on Steve Metalitz' comment in the chat. Steve is completely right there. It has been taking forever, and that is actually causing issues now. Five years ago, the landscape was completely different than what it is now. So much stuff is going on legal-wise, and it is becoming incredibly hard. So that we have been waiting so long is actually might cause delays along the line due to this taking forever. Thanks. I just wanted to note that. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Steve and Theo. Regarding 7a, I believe we can close this one as well. This was a discussion to prepare or at least on the way to define a timeline we were talking about investigating possibilities to estimate system throughput for the specific situation of high-volume

---

registrars. I believe there has been no further discussion of that issue and that did not prevent us to agree on a timeline or on timeline assumptions, so I propose we close this one. Anybody opposed? Not hearing any opposition, not seeing anybody in the queue, so I will just close 7a as well.

7b, I believe this is still open. This is a discussion of how we need/can factor in the coordination of the numerous registrars that would be involved and try to avoid any bottlenecks, also provide incentive for registrants not to wait until the end of the 18-month window to transition their existing data.

I believe here this is still an open topic. We suggested that this be discussed with the community in Helsinki. I'm not sure this was the case or if we had any substantial feedback on that on how to coordinate the registrars. There's also the question to ICANN as to whether ICANN has any tools available to provide that incentive. So this is still something that we need to get back to the IRT on.

Any additional comments or discussion of this item that will remain open? I'm not seeing any reaction in the Adobe Connect. I'm not hearing anyone. So 7b will remain open.

Let me catch up here. So we said 7 and 7a would be closed. I see Frederic is providing some suggestion or comments on 7b. Frederic is weighing in on the suggestion that we find incentives to ensure that registrars not wait until the end of the timeline. Any suggestion? Any ideas of an incentive, Frederic? I see we have Theo in the queue, so let

---

me get to you, Theo, and then we'll see what Frederic suggests in the chat. Theo?

THEO GEURTS:

Thanks. Incentives can really, really work. What I have seen as a [DOS] registrar doing DNSSEC in conjunction with the [DOS] registry, they were promoting it heavily and that ensured a mass adoption for DNSSEC in the Netherlands. I think we got the highest amount of DNSSEC registrations worldwide.

That being said, however, if you look at a monetary incentive, if you look at the amount of domain names for .com and .net even if you do a very small incentive per domain name, it's going to cost a boatload of money. If you do a dollar, you're talking about \$140 million a year. ICANN hasn't got that kind of money, not even in the auction proceedings. But even if you do ten cents, you're still talking about \$14 million.

So I'm not sure if there's a monetary incentive there. If there's going to be some kind of incentive, I wish you guys a lot of luck there finding an incentive there. I don't think there's a monetary situation there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Theo, for sharing your analysis and thank you for your well wishes. I see Frederic is suggesting adding one year to the RRA if you do it early, for example. No audit for three years as another example.

---

Thank you for your suggestions. We need to get back to the [IRT] on that. Jody is [typing] a +1 on that one. Okay, so we'll leave 7b open.

Let me work our way back to the scorecard. Let's talk about 5 and 6 here. So 5, "How should inter-registrar transfers of registrations be handled in information is incorrect or incomplete?" I think there was discussion in Helsinki as what would be the validation rules that would apply. To transfer, it would require the creation of new contact when data is missing for this contact. Has any IRT member given some thought to this problem? It seems like the suggestion – Jody, let me let you speak. Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Can you guys hear me now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, we can hear you.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, thanks.

JODY KOLKER: Oh, thank God. I'm sorry about my problems earlier. It has been a little difficult. I guess when I look at this, at the end of 18 months – I can't remember what the end date is on this – but at the end of 18 months when all data has been moved (and we're expecting all data to be moved), every transfer that comes in we [shouldn't] be creating a new

---

domain name or new contacts for that so that we can manage those contacts for the registrar when we're gaining a new domain. Now I think we were talking about the 18 months in between. Is that right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: That's a good question, Jody. I'm not sure whether we're talking about only during the 18 months or after the 18 months, but maybe we should address both cases.

JODY KOLKER: Before the 18 months or before it's done, if a domain name is coming to GoDaddy and it has contacts on it at the registry and we're not quite ready for that, I haven't really thought that through on how that would work. It would be easy enough if it didn't have contacts on it and we were creating the contacts. That would take care of itself, right. It's only a problem when the contacts have been created at the registry and the domain gets transferred to GoDaddy and we're not quite ready for that yet to manage the contacts at the registry.

So what we would have is we would have two different sets of contacts. One at the registry and one at GoDaddy. Then when a customer goes to update their contacts, they would only be updated in the GoDaddy database but not at the registry. Am I explaining that right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: It makes sense to me, Jody. I see we have Marc entering the queue. Would you like to continue on the other [inaudible], or should we have the other weigh in our discussion?

JODY KOLKER: Marc can weigh in if he'd like to go ahead. Sure.

MARC ANDERSON: I think Jody outlined the problem use case pretty well. If you have a situation where the losing registrar in the transfer has already created contacts at the registry but the gaining registrar in the transfer is not yet prepared to manage contacts, then it has the potential to put the registrant in a bad situation where they might not be able to update their contact information at the registry. So, yeah, I think Jody outlined the problem use case quite well.

I was just going to raise another question related to that. We know domains can be transferred, but contacts can be transferred as well. My understanding though – and this is maybe for Jody and Theo – my understanding is that typically registrars don't transfer contacts. Rather, they create new contacts themselves. So if you're transferring a domain from one registrar to another and transferring the contacts with that, you'll create new contacts. Is that accurate? Or how would you handle that scenario? How does that impact the transition? Thank you.

JODY KOLKER: Marc, that's right. When a domain comes in to GoDaddy, we do not transfer any contacts. We have no logic written for that for any [inaudible] [gTLD that we support]. We automatically create new contacts for the registrant or for all four contacts. The reason for that is because the customer could [have had] those contacts delegated

---

---

domains, so the contacts may not be able to transfer to us because it's on multiple domains. And you wouldn't want to have contact [inaudible] associated with a domain at GoDaddy and a domain at [inaudible] or Member Solutions because who then updates the contact? That's why we've always created new contacts when we transfer the domain.

MARC ANDERSON:

Okay, thank you. That makes sense to me. That's pretty much in line with my understanding. If that's the common practice, I think that with that practice the transfers shouldn't be an issue after the migration period has occurred because even if the losing registrar has bad contact data, the gaining registrar will be creating new contact data. So the gaining registrar wouldn't be negatively impacted if the losing registrar is maintaining bad contact data. I think the only issue there is the scenario you outlined where you have registrars during the transition period that are in different states. I think that's my view of it. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Jody, would you like to speak to that one, or should we go to Theo?

JODY KOLKER:

Theo can go ahead. Sorry.

---

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Jody. I think my head is just going to explode here because am I hearing correctly now that we can end up in a situation that when we are looking at a transfer and there [viable] data at the registry that we can use for the transfer, that if we ask the registrant or our reseller to update the data at the current registrar, that the data cannot be updated? Is that what I just heard here the last couple of minutes, or did I just completely misunderstand here? Thanks.

JODY KOLKER: I think you might have misunderstood that, Theo. I guess we were talking about the domain could transfer from a registrar that has full contact at the registry to one that does not have contacts at the registry.

I think I have a solution for this. I'm not going to say this is elegant because it does place more issues on the registry or more coding. So I don't think it's going to be well received, but I'm just going to say it. If a domain name transfers and it has contacts on the domain, there's no way for the registry to tell whether that registrant is actually creating contacts already. I'll take that back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JODY KOLKER: Yes. So what we would have – I think we're going to be in a funky state here, guys. If the registrar is not ready to have both contacts, there's going to be contacts at the registry and there's going to be contacts at



---

the registrar until the registrar transfers or has completed the migration and has created those contacts new at the registry. When a domain is transferred, Marc, at the registry – at Verisign – those contacts will still belong to the old registrar, is that correct?

MARC ANDERSON: Assuming the gaining registrar doesn't transfer the contacts then, yes, that is correct.

JODY KOLKER: Okay, if the gaining registrar doesn't transfer the contacts, when you would look up a domain name in WHOIS at the registry, would it still have the old contacts on the domain even though the contacts belong to another registrar and not the domain registrar?

MARC ANDERSON: I'm not sure. I think that is the case, but I'll have to double check.

JODY KOLKER: I guess we're kind of in a bind here because I believe the registry is going to show the contacts related to that domain name and knowing that it had been converted to thick, it's going to show the domain name and the four contacts that are connected to it. Whereas, the registrar of record has not changed those contacts yet. So if the customer comes in and changes the contacts at the registrar, the registrant is going to be considered whatever it is at the registrar, is that right? Or is it whatever

---

it is at the registry? Who is the legal owner? The contact at the registry or the contact at the registrar?

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry. What are you asking there?

JODY KOLKER: I'm trying to find a way around this then, but I'm with Theo. My head's going to explode.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody, we can't hear you very well. You sound quite far and muffled a bit.

JODY KOLKER: Okay, I'll come closer. Can you hear me good now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Slightly better, but not great yet.

JODY KOLKER: How about now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Worse.

---

JODY KOLKER: Worse? How about now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Better.

JODY KOLKER: Better? Okay. Alright. I guess I don't think I'm making any headway on this. I think we have an issue here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

JODY KOLKER: I don't think that we can turn off transfers because we're in the middle of this migration by saying that there's no way for the registry to tell whether the registrar is going to create contacts for that domain once it's transferred.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody, I see we have Francisco joining the discussion. I also see that we have a queue forming with Marc, Theo, and Francisco. How would you guys like to proceed through a discussion?

THEO GEURTS: I would like to make a suggestion actually that we mark this as a potential issue here and we think about this a little more and come back to a discussion next week and see if we have more data, unless

---

Francisco has a killer idea there, then by all means. But for now, I would just mark this discussion as a potential issue because I'm hearing things that will set off a lot of bells at ICANN Compliance if we are not able to transfer under certain conditions. Actually, we just need to look at this and see if we can have a path forward next week. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks, Theo. Should we go to Francisco? Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Fabien. I don't know if this is a clear idea, but it's at least an idea. One potential way out of this is for the gaining registrar if they are not able yet to manage contacts in the registry to at the same time they gain the transfer to remove the contacts on the registry so that you don't end up with stale contacts in the registry. I don't know. What do you guys think about that?

THEO GEURTS:

Well, my quick reaction would be I need to check with our development guys.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Jody? Marc? Any comments?

JODY KOLKER:

I'm not sure I understood what Francisco said there. Can you repeat it?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Sure. I was suggesting that if a registrar is not yet ready to manage contacts in the registry, one thing they could do if they are the gaining registrar in transfer when they accept the transfer, they immediately remove the contacts from the registry so that you don't have stale contacts in the registry. Does that make sense?

JODY KOLKER: It does make sense, but I don't think that's allowable from a registry database perspective because the contacts would be associated with that domain. I think that there would be some coding at the registry to be able to do that, and that would be something that I don't think that we would want the registry to do to allow somebody to remove the contacts from that. But I feel like I'm putting words in Marc's mouth, so I guess I'd like him to talk.

MARC ANDERSON: Fair enough, Jody. I guess I agree with Theo. I'd like to take this back and double check. I think that would be possible through the transition period. I think a gaining registrar that has not yet transitioned to thick that is transferring from a registrar that is already thick, I think from a technical standpoint that would definitely work. I don't think there's anything additional the registry would have to do.

The only negative I see offhand is that if the gaining registrar hasn't yet transitioned to thick, their systems might not yet be capable of supporting thick contact commands at all. So the limitation there might

---

be that the registrar just hasn't done the coding changes to their system at all, so they might not technically be ready to support that. But aside from that, off the top of my head I think Francisco's suggestion would work. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Can I maybe suggest that we have an interaction over the mailing list in the coming week before the next meeting so that we try to work out and confirm a solution to this issue? [inaudible] we're talking about the corner case sort of, so that's under number 6 on our scorecard of gaining registrars not being transitioned already. Does that make sense then? Is that workable for everyone? I'm not hearing anybody objecting to that, so I'm suggesting we do that. So we'll keep number 6 open, obviously.

It would be interesting also to confirm that the other way around, so if a gaining registrar has transitioned to thick its existing [audit] data and not the losing registrar, then confirm that's not an issue if it isn't. That's for 6, so I suggest we leave it open and take it to a discussion on the mailing list for next week.

Regarding number 5, I think this is another side of the question and that pertains to really after. My understanding is that this point was raised by Jordyn Buchanan in our meeting in Helsinki. This was in relation to what validation rules would apply to transfers requiring the creation of new contacts when data is missing for these contacts. I'm not exactly sure, actually, whether it was really after the transition or also during the transition. And I'm not sure we've addressed that in our discussion

---

currently. Let me see if there is any input on that specifically or if we need to also take that offline and work out to a mailing list exchange. Would anybody like to comment on number 5?

THEO GEURTS: No, we did need some clarification there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay.

JODY KOLKER: I agree. We should probably work that out over the mailing list also.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, excellent. Thank you, Jody and Theo. So number 5 and 6 will remain open. We'll work through those over the mailing list.

So now I'm going to the 3s, in particular 3c and 3d. Let me start with 3c. We gathered some input or at least we're trying to gather input from the Registry Stakeholder Group and Registrar Stakeholder Group on the validation rules. I believe we haven't received any update, so should we assume that we can move forward with the validation rules the way they are and close this item? Theo? Marc? Would you agree? Marc?

---

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Fabien. I actually thought we already agreed to close this one and that if any comments did pop up, we could reopen it. So, yeah, I'm in favor of closing this one and moving on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks. Sorry if I missed that in our notes and recordings. So we'll close that one. Okay, now 3d. This is probably a bit related to the discussion of the transfers. What's pending here is a discussion of once the transition is complete, any domain can be created with an existing contact object that has limited data. Standard validation rules would only apply to this domain when the contact data is updated.

I think here we're talking about post-transition. If a new domain is created for a contact object that already exists that has limited data per the transition [inaudible] registration I assume, we would apply the standard validation rules only if the contact is updated. Is that a correct assumption? Is that the understanding of the IRT here? I think I'm reopening this one because it was marked closed but with this pending notion. So I want to make sure that we all agree that this is correct. At least this reflects the discussion that happened in the IRT.

JODY KOLKER: Can you guys here me?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, absolutely.



---

JODY KOLKER: I think that's a good rule there. That would work for us. Validation would occur on new contacts, is that correct? If a new contact is created after the transition?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: It seems to me that this speaks to an existing contact. So there would not be a creation of a new contact. It would be the association of an existing contact object to a new domain, and that contact object would have limited data. So standard validation rules would only apply when there would be an update to that contact data, not necessarily when the domain would be created. Does that make sense?

JODY KOLKER: Yes, that makes sense to me. But when we create a new contact, the new validation rules would be applied to that new contact after the existing registrations or after the [inaudible] update from the existing registrations, is that correct?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, my understanding is that that's correct.

JODY KOLKER: Okay. Alright, yeah, I'm good with this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I see we have Marc and Theo in the queue. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I'm just agreeing. What's there matches my understanding. Once the transition is completed, if any contacts were created that have limited data, those contacts could be reused for new domains. There's just no way to go through and retroactively validate those. Those will be, in essence, grandfathered into this system. But new creates and updates, the new rules would apply or I guess what we're calling the standard validation rules would apply. So, yeah, I guess just a long way of saying I agree.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Just to confirm this, if there is missing data in an old contact and you register a new domain name, you need to have the full set of data according to [WHOIS] [inaudible] specification in the RRA 2013. So you will have to deliver all the data anyway. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. Okay, so we'll make that clarification, Theo. Close 3d. we already closed 3c. And I believe this leaves us with the discussion of the bulk transfer, 1a and 1b. 1a is about what EPP connections would actually be used by registrars to transfer existing registration data, and 1b is about any alternative option to EPP. We have 10 minutes left. Let's see if we can make progress and determine where we are on those two.

---

Let's start with EPP. I think we're left with a situation where the registries are proposing the use of [some Verisign's batch pool] EPP connection. Is that correct? The batch pool, not necessarily the standard pool. There were concerns from registrars that that may have impact on the registrars' systems. However, Verisign expected that this would only be a matter of changing IP addresses because the rules that the API between those two [sets] of connections is the same, the same functionality. Let me stop here. Theo?

THEO GEURTS:

I sort of disagree with the assumption there. I looked into this some more and, yes, if we want to do it really quick and dirty, we can actually change the IP addresses really quick. But if we want to do it properly because we have multiple back ends, we just do not have one the one back end. We have multiple back ends with [the node] system, if we want to do it properly, we're going to require actually more time to do this.

Maybe this is just a specific situation that only exists at [inaudible] register. I don't know. But, yes, we can do it really quickly, but like I said, it's quick and dirty and our developers would rather want to not do it quick and dirty and do it properly. And then it's just going to be a lot more implementation time for us. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks, Theo.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Hi, can I get into the queue?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS CHANG: Hey, everyone. I missed the meeting last week. I was on holidays. But in Helsinki when we had our meeting, we had it a couple of times, I remember making the point that we are not going to try to design this as a team at the IRT level, but we are going to leave it to the registries and registrars to work it out themselves because it doesn't really concern policy.

The policy announcement and the public comment that we want to receive is not in this detail anyway, right? So once we agree on the policy, we should move on if there are no policy implementation discussions. This is way too detailed of a level for the IRT to be discussing. Am I correct in understanding that?

THEO GEURTS: I think that's a fair assumption.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, so if nobody objects, then we can close 1a and leave it for subsequent discussion between the registries and registrars to sort out. I see we have Jody in the queue. Jody, would you like to speak?

---

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. I guess the point is moot if we're just going to talk to the registry about this, it's not worth wasting our time here. We'll just talk to Verisign. I guess Theo and I can talk to him separately.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Let me just make sure. I think in Helsinki there was a discussion that the alternative option to EPP, so for [inaudible] file-based transfer, was also still pending. I'm not sure that there was an agreement that there should be an alternative. It was my understanding that the IRT discussion thus far was that there should be one. And in Helsinki, my understanding was that there was discussion that this was still not agreed upon that there should be an alternative. So let me just clarify here whether 1b is still a topic that should be discussed. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: From my recollection, this is all up to the registries now and we can close it for now if I'm correct until the registry comes up with an alternative solution or method. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Theo. So we'll do that. We'll close 1b as well and leave it to subsequent discussions from the registries and the registrars. Marc, yes please?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Fabien. I agree with what Dennis said and what Jody and Theo said as well. But I think for ICANN staff when you're drafting the policy

---

language, you'll have to put something in there. So my suggestion would be something along the lines of "the registry shall" – trying to use the "must" and "may" and "shall" language and what not – I guess "the registry must offer an EPP mechanism for the backfill and transition of data."

But then on the bulk transfer, I'd suggest the registry may offer an alternative, a file-based transfer alternative, and word it somewhere along those lines. Just leave it to registries and registrars to work out the technical details of that, but in the policy I'd suggest drafting it something along those lines. Does that make sense? Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yes, thank you, Marc. Any additional comments on that topic or anything else on our scorecard? Because I believe we've covered it all, so I think we've made good progress. We're getting to a place where only a few of those remain open, and we should be able to start discussing about the implementation plan soon. Let me stop here and see if anybody has any comment. We have one minute left. Any questions? Any requests for next week's agenda or for subsequent discussion on the mailing list this week before our next meeting next week?

THEO GEURTS:

Just a quick comment here. We still need to look into the contacts and the language character sets that can be used. I made a comment on that earlier on, on the list. We need to go back to that one. I haven't heard anything detailed about that, and it is really important.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, Theo, can you say that again. I missed the start of your comment.

THEO GEURTS: We still need to look at the contacts, which languages are all supported. We need a complete support there because there are many languages involved there and there have been no restrictions whatsoever for this registry. So we need to make sure that they don't exist or pop up in the future. That's all. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. Is this a concern on the registry side by any chance?

THEO GEURTS: It's a registry thing.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, you guys, [inaudible] Marc, is there anything you can share on that topic?

MARC ANDERSON: I'm not sure offhand. I'm looking at the validation rules. All it says is UTF8 or a subset of UTF8 that can be represented in 7-bit ASCII. To be honest, I'm not really strong in that area, so I don't know if that means more to you, Theo, than it does to me. But that's just what I'm seeing on there.

THEO GEURTS: I think that's actually not enough. It was one of the comments of one of our developers, but I'll also go back to him tomorrow and I'll get back to you guys if it's enough or not enough.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Theo, are you asking basically – and I don't think you're concerned about the language. I think you're concerned about the script, is that right?

THEO GEURTS: Yes.

JODY KOLKER: Okay, so it's the script that we're worried about. So if we're going to send in a script, it's something that [inaudible] Unicode, we'll have to send it in as a localized contact, not as an internationalized. I think that's what you're asking. And, Marc, does Verisign support both international and localized contacts then, or will they at that time?



---

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. Remember, one of the postal info type fields is “LOC” or “INT”? So you need to declare that in the contact create time. But to your point, it’s not actually the language. It’s what script or what character set is supported that matters. I think I don’t have all the details, or I think I just don’t have the level of detail that Theo is looking for.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, I think Theo is looking for – and probably for me too – if somebody puts in a smiley face for their first name, will Verisign allow that to be registered as a contact?

MARC ANDERSON: Right, yeah. Yeah, we’re saying the same thing, and I don’t have the answer to that offhand. I’ll have to follow up.

JODY KOLKER: Okay. Alright.

THEO GEURTS: That is very important there because you’ve got all these registrars who have been doing it for years, at least we have. Okay, we’ll take it up on the list later on next week.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, excellent. Thank you, Jody, Marc, and Theo, for the discussion. I think then we can probably end our meeting here. If anybody would like to raise another topic, we’re past our time. Okay, let’s take it from here.

---

Thank you again for attending the meeting today and for your participation. We will provide an updated scorecard and help with the discussion on the item 5 and the transfers on the mailing list in addition to your discussion, Theo, of the scripts. Thank you again, and we will be in touch very soon. Have a nice day. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**