
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT, on Tuesday May the 24th, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN. Let me start with a quick roll call of IRT members.

I see we have Jodi, Joyce, Mark, [inaudible], Sara, and Theo with us. Am I missing anyone?

I'm not seeing anybody, so we probably have all members there, participating today. Just a quick reminder before we jump to our agenda in discussion today. Please make sure your line is muted when you're not speaking. I think we've been getting a bit of background noise from a line or two, so please make sure you're muted.

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, if you would like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

So let's move on to our agenda for today's call. We're suggesting that we spend quite a bit of time on discussing, continuing our discussion on the transition from thin to thick in both tracks, existing registration and new registration. So we've suggested here in approximate time, we'll adjust as needed. And we'll end our meeting with a few updates with respect to constantly being on display, prior discussion of the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

[inaudible], and the scheduling of our next meeting. Any comments, questions on the agenda?

Hearing none, so let's go back to our, let's continue our discussion on the transition from thin to thick. Here is a reminder of our objective. I just want to mention and remind everybody that we're trying to finalize our discussion of the implementation path by the next ICANN meeting, which is at the end of the month of June, a month from now pretty much.

We... Here is a reminder of what we have been discussing. Staff has introduced a proposal to consider a path of least resistance in referring to the transition of existing registration. This has been discussed for some time with the IRT now, and the discussion is now revolving around various questions listed here, and we will take them one and by one and find the status of where we are in each of them.

So, we started last week with question three, which is around what set of the audition planners should we aim for the transition of existing registration? My understanding is that the conversation reaches a point of agreement of IRT members around, only requiring contact ID and [inaudible], I apologize for the type right here. And this discussion and this sort of agreement is based on the principle that are listed here, which was part of the, which were part of the discussion, and that is making sure that the [inaudible] is the same before and after the transition, yet minimizing the validation to ensure that all available data today is loaded, including if it's incomplete.

And also the [inaudible] that if a field is not required under the [inaudible] by this move, it can be left blank. If anybody has questions and would like to get back to this discussion, we can bring up the documents, this additional document that we've been discussing.

I noted a few elements that were pending further discussion, and those are listed here. It was confirmation of post information type in the requirements for was instilled. And I believe Mark may be able to provide an update. There was a requirement, a discussion of the requirement for registrants to supply all available data that was concern [inaudible], that there were no, currently no requirements for registrar to supply what they had as opposed to what we see in the requirements.

There was a topic around whether there should be a larger effort to reach out to more registrars, in particular the stakeholder group, to gather input into this proposal. There were concerns around the impact of needing data on the post-transition transfer, and that's actually a subject of another of our question that we were not able to touch upon in the last calls. So we might want to take some time to get there.

And finally, there were concerns with some post mitigation negotiations on the impact of [inaudible]. So let me stop here, and see if anybody would like to address either one of the open discussion points, or would like to discuss the summary of our discussion last week.

So I'm stopping here, if anybody would like to get in the queue.

Theo, please.

THEO: Thank you Fabien, and this is Theo for the record. I actually have an observation or a question more or less. I mean, we're looking at these requirements here, and I think they are all rather specific, which is good. So I'm getting into a really detailed mode here so to speak. And my question is, I'm going to track back a little bit here. On one of the earlier calls, we dealt with what would happen with, when we are moving data, when it comes to data privacy concerns, or even legislation or laws that would affect it.

And what I'm trying to, my question here is, what is going to be the scope of our work here? I mean, we set like register who have to deal with these DPA laws themselves? Let's say the situation is a registrar wants to move the data to the United States, and then gets a no go from the government, and cannot migrate. Are we going to deal with those situations in our review here, or what are we going to do with such scenarios?

How far or how deep are we going to get with this IRT? Thank you. That's just the questions.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Theo for [inaudible] question. So I think we, that topic we discussed back when the memo was released, the legal review memo. And I think we left it at a state where registrars would conduct the analysis of their registration, and the potential obstacles that they may face, in either gather consent for the end user for transfer of their

registration information, or for the actual transfer of the registration information.

And the review memo listed a few options that were available in those situations. And so I think the scope of the discussions for the IRT to determine based on those conclusions, the necessary level of guidance that's needed as part of this implementation plan of the transition. So I hope that answers your question Theo.

THEO: So we are going to guide those registrars who will enter in such a scenario? I'm trying to see how far are we going to go with this IRT here, because there might be a situation where the registrar cannot transfer migrated data. And are we going to guide those registrars there with some kind of advice there in our review? What are we going to do in such a situation?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think, Theo, there were a few options listed such as, you know, seeking the use of the WHOIS conflict procedure with privacy laws. There was the notion of potentially using proxy and privacy services. There was the potential use of R-DAT redirection. So I think those are for, certainly the IRT to consider and as to include the [inaudible] to an implementation plan.

THEO: Excellent. That answers the question. That means that for our further work, we might also go pretty deep in our review there, in our advice

there. It's my opinion, a lot of operational issues, and I think if we go to that extent of advice, guidance, so to speak, we will, it will be a radical [inaudible] setting there, so to speak. But thank you very much.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Theo. And so yeah, I think the approach so far has been, you know, [inaudible] review does not intend to replace registrars' appreciation of what would apply to a given situation. So I think that's something to be considered as well.

THEO: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I see that Mark, you're in the queue.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. I think, you know, Theo and Fabien has covered what my comments would have been. I think I sort of just want to agree with what you both said. I think it would be good for the IRT to get into, you know, how to handle a situation where a registrar has conflict with local law, what is the procedure? Fabien, as you noted, there is a couple of recommendations and there is a couple of options that have been provided, but you know, I think it would be worth the IRT looking into this and providing guidance on how they should be handled.

I think we want to strive towards a consistent approach, and so I think there is, you know, there is a risk if the IRT doesn't get into this that we have an inconsistent handling of conflicts of privacy laws. So, yeah, I guess it sounds like that I'm just agreeing with what you and Theo have said. So thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Mark, and what I can do is take the action to remind everyone on the IRT, to the mailing list who are deliverables in that area, the [inaudible] memo, and planning to the IRT meeting where we discuss this at length. So that may be by the next, the next meeting we can put that discussion on the agenda and go from there.

So, Theo, Mark, and others, if you mind and if you agree, maybe we can take a note of that discussion and put that to the next meeting, and for now, keep our momentum on the plan or the path for the transition of a new registration. Would you agree to doing that?

THEO:

Sure.

MARK:

Yes, absolutely.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Okay, thanks. So on this question, pretty sure there would be [inaudible] set of [inaudible] primers. Do we want to provide any

update on any of those open discussion area? Are there any comments or questions on this summary? I'm asking this question because we also have a lot of other ground to cover, so at this stage, if nobody has any specific comment or update, maybe we can move on. Mark, I see you're in the queue.

MARK:

Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. Yeah, so I guess the first one, it has my name attached to it, confirmation of postal info type requirement. You know, there was some question, I was concerned that postal info type would need to be required still, and it really does, it would be considerable rework of our systems to make that field optional. It can be, you know, local, or it could be one or the other, but we really need to have one value there associated with each contact, and you know...

The way we've implemented contacts, it really depends on having one or the other. So we really need to have one value there, when we receive a contact. I guess if you go to the previous slide, we have the [inaudible] info and the contact ID, as required. I think we're, you know... Or I guess my request is that we also have postal info type, as required as well. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Mark. I see Roger agreeing to the proposal. Any comments, objections, questions? Okay. Not hearing any, so we will add the info type as a third required element for the transfer of registry and registration data, in terms of evaluation. So, unless anybody would like to discuss any of the other points, I suggest we move on. And I think

our remaining question will address at least D and E on this [inaudible] open areas for discussion.

But before we do that, Mark?

MARK:

Thank you Fabien. Sorry, one more on C there, gathering input from registrars. Theo and I spoke about this a little bit, and you know, I agree with Theo's point. I think it would be good to get input from registrars on this. So I think our goal should be to have a finalized document, you know, so the updated validation rules document, and we should have a finalized version of that.

And my suggestion would be to request the registrar stakeholder group, and also the registry stakeholder group, to comment on that. I think providing them a copy and requesting that they distribute among their members, and solicit any feedback for that would be a reasonable step forward. You know, they may choose to comment or not to comment, but you know, I thought Theo made a good point about that, and it would be reasonable to send sort of the finalized version of our proposed validation rules, to those two groups requesting their feedback. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks Mark. And specifically, only those [audition?] rules, or are you also thinking sharing whatever we have available in terms of the implementation path that's being considered when discussing the IRT? [CROSSTALK] wanted to get a sense of, sorry. I just wanted to mention,

I'm kind of wondering where we want to feed that into our timeline, which is you know, to try to get to a finalized implementation path by the end of June. So I'm trying to get a sense of where you think that fits.

MARK:

Good question. I mean, I was really only thinking in terms of the validation rules, and sort of getting that in front of registries and registrars, you know, as soon as possible. Hopefully well ahead of the end of June, but you raise a good point. I guess I hadn't really considered the other aspects.

Theo, has his hand up. Maybe he has some thoughts there?

THEO:

Since Fabien dropped off the line, let me continue here. I'm actually thinking that we should exclude all of the other stuff at the moment, and just have this one question answered, what do we want to migrate? What do we think is required? And I think that is what we actually need, needs to be answered, and that has to come primarily, in my opinion, from the registrar group.

I mentioned this on the last call, there are some concerns there, adding some feedback from a registry group, because I need to see what they come back with, what is handy, but primarily the registrars. And I think requesting this through an official channel [inaudible], let's see where we end up. And if we get some consensus, maybe we still have to make a decision here.

So, we'll just figure it out. Is Fabien back on?

And he is not back.

Anybody else has some input?

FRANCISCO: This is Francisco from ICANN. Since like Fabien is...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He's dialing back in, I don't know whether he can hear us. [CROSSTALK]
Oh, hi.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Francisco, you raised your hand?

FRANCISCO: No, I was just filling in...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He was going to tell us your dialing in. You came back.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you guys for filling the blank in. I apologize for dropping the line.
It's actually my fault. I typed the wrong key. Instead of mute, I hung up.
So I apologize for that. So thank you Theo for your contribution there.

And so we'll try to give some thought to your suggestion that we involve alongside the registry and the registrars, and see where that comes.

So, should we...? Is there any other point you would like to discuss on question three? Should we move on to the other questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I don't know whether a decision has been made. I don't know if you heard it but, are you going to the registry and registrar stakeholders with the validation document only?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So I think that to me, that's an open question that we should probably give some thought to as staff, and come back with a proposal to the IRT at this point, so that we can move on in the discussion.

So if there isn't any objection, let me move on to question one. So we discussed this shortly [inaudible] in the last meeting. So the status of this is that there is an understanding that in terms of channels for doing the bulk day transfer, there will be of course, an [inaudible] option, which was intended from the start by the registry.

There has been a discussion of requests that are ETT, parallel ETT connections dedicated to that. And also, a request, an alternative option be considered, and that's potentially through a file, and that was suggested was potentially serving the needs of a specific registrar. So I think we have the discussion open there on the areas, that at least we have some [inaudible] that there will be an [easy?] way of doing the transfer.

Any comments, questions based on this topic?

Mark, go ahead.

MARK:

Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. Yeah, I think obviously there is going to be an EPP way to handle that. So you say a registrar provide an option to use EPP for bulk transfer. I mean, it's not really bulk, right? For EEP, you know, you're doing transactions for each one individually. So you know, it's not... I guess over EPP isn't the bulk option, or it's not necessarily accurate to say the bulk option, but you know, that is one option to perform the back fill data.

I think Roger's suggestion for a dedicated EPP connections for parallel processing is a good one. I hadn't thought about that. So I'll look into that option. The other one, option B, the alternative option to be considered, you know, bulk upload a file, you know, I guess my question is, how much detail should the IRT get into as far as that alternative? Do we just want to say it will be up to the registry to provide a bulk upload file option? Or do we, you know, based on the validation parameters? Or do we want to get into more detail than that?

And you know, I'm fine if we don't want to get into more details, and just leave it to the registry to provide that, but I'll guess I'll just throw that out there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Mark. Any opinion on that question from Mark? Roger?

ROGER: Yeah, hi. This is Roger. Yeah, I guess I'll agree with Mark here that I'm not sure that we have to define what that is. I mean, to me, this is really up to VeriSign to define, so I don't know that this group has to specify that. We can just say that the registry will provide that specification.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Thanks Roger for your contribution. And Mark also, we thank you for the clarification on the [inaudible] transfer. I think that [was highly?] inaccurate, and we'll rectify. Thanks. I see that Theo is agreeing to the suggestion that this may not be the place to discuss the details of that option, but I think we'll leave it up to the registry to define the requirements.

But what the IRT may do in the implementation [inaudible], to at least refer to that, confirm that there will be this option. I think that will probably be in the scope of the definition of the implementation fund. Theo, I see that you have your hand raised.

THEO: Yeah, a quick question. If we leave it up to the registry, does that also, we've got a market agreement for VeriSign. We've also got the other registry for dot [inaudible]. Do they have to weigh in on this, or is there some procedure here?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Theo. So for dot [jobs?] we have a representative of the registry operator participating in the IRT, at least as an observer, I believe. So I think there is a level of coordination between... And market, not to speak for your company, obviously, but my understanding is that there is a level of coordination between the registry operator and this registry service provider in that area.

And we can make sure and double check with the registry operator, but he's involved in this, and confirm those [inaudible] approaches. So is there any other question or comment with respect to the bulk transfer? We discussed shortly the objective to minimize the throwaway code. I think there is a recognition that there may be some, that may be unavailable.

I think there is an open question from Jennifer. I don't think she's here on the call today, with respect to uniformity of registry in the UK. So we'll keep that question, that point to discuss further. Unless anybody objects, let me move on to the other questions that remain open.

So question four, we synchronize a new and existing registration tracks. There has been, I understand an agreement that we should keep those tracks separated to mediate potential risk of dealing one due to the other, with an idea that we should focus on the registrations first. And so the timelines, I believe we'll get to that when we clarify timeline.

And also there was a comment by Mark that we'll be aware that once the registry allows for new registrations to be transferred to thick, there is nothing that prevents a registrar of using a channel to backfield a registration, that is transferring registration data. Maybe the difference

would be in this case that the validation rule that would apply would be those of new registrations. Please correct me if I'm wrong, Mark. So that is my understanding there.

MARK:

Yes, Fabien, this is Mark. And we wouldn't, you know, from a system perspective, we wouldn't have a way to differentiate sort of validation rules for new registrations versus the back fill of existing registrations. So whatever validation rules we decide on, we'd applied to both. But hopefully that answers your question.

Aside from that, you know, I agree with everything you said.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thanks Mark. I think that I was trying to say, in which you said more eloquently. Thank you. Any comments, questions on question four? If not, we have a separate question which we haven't touched in detail in our conversation on the mailing list, and those are related to how the data is treated once it's migrated.

So I think there were, those questions were questions by IRT members when we discussed the option to apply minimum validation rules to the transition of existing registrations. And so the question here were four, five, and six, were about what rules would apply to those existing registrations compared to new registrations.

And so there was discussion on the mailing list by Roger for question five, that new and existing registration should be treated differently. That current rules should only apply to existing registration contact.

When those contacts are updated, I understand, or when the contact is greater than the transition data. And so there was the exception of transfer, which is a topic for question six. And there, there was a concern with transfers of registration after the transition, where existing registrars may bear the burden of data collection, should the existing registration not contain complete data.

And so there was further discussion and a suggestion that there should be, instead of grandfathering of existing registration, with respect to current IDN registry policies. So let me stop here and see if anybody would like to ask questions or comments on those discussions that [inaudible] over the mailing list. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO: Yeah, thanks Fabien. This is Theo. When it comes to question six, my comment you can actually strike that one off the list. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thank you Theo. Certainly, I register that you [inaudible] concerning more so, you know, fine with adjusting the comment there. And so I think what we should determine, whether there is any concern around those two questions that remain, or whether we could close these questions and move on to discussing the other open items.

Does anybody have any additional input? Mark, please go ahead.

MARK: Thank you. This is Mark. Can I ask Roger to explain his comment a little bit? I'm not sure I followed exactly what he is suggesting there, on question number five. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Roger, are you still with us?

ROGER: Yeah, this is Roger. So I guess my response to five was similar to the other responses here, is I think that current registrations, and I say this later, maybe more clear, should be grandfathered so that until they're actually implicitly updated, or explicitly updated, they aren't, you know, they don't have to follow the current validation rules.

Does that make sense? When we do push something over, not until they're updated would they actually have to fall into the new rules.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Mark?

MARK: Thank you Fabien. It's Mark. I guess... I'm trying to think as far as, you know, what's practical there? And I guess I'm wondering, you know, sort of our proposal so far is to go with these minimalist validation rules. And we could implement that for a period of time, and then maybe after a certain date, we implement you know, so there is the previous,

my original proposal for validation rules. I guess, is that what you're talking about Roger? As far as like having...?

ROGER: Yeah. I think that's right, Mark. I think that the issue is the data that's already sitting there in your database. So you know, those 100 million records that you have, only when they're updated, would the new rules apply. So, even if you said, yeah, okay, for six months, we're going to allow this, but even after that six months, you know, there is going to be a large number of contacts that you know won't pass current validation.

MARK: Right.

ROGER: And my proposal is, that's okay. Leave those alone until they're actually updated. And then once they're updated... Does that make sense?

MARK: Okay. Yeah. I got you now, thanks. I was a little slow on the uptake there. Yeah, I mean, then based on that, my suggestion would be we say, we finalize there are minimal validation rules, and then you know, we say, okay, these minimal validation rules will be in effect until, and then we pick an appropriate time on the calendar, and then say, you know, from this point forward, you know, these other validation rules would apply.

And then any new or, you know, any new contacts or modifications to existing contacts would use those other validation rules. Would that work?

ROGER: This is Roger. That's what I was thinking as well, Mark. With the exception of transfer data, how would we handle that if we're getting old data from a registrar, you know, past this date, whatever that date is. If we received a transfer request, or received old data from the old registrar, you know, until we actually physically do an update to those, I mean I would like to see those be accepted as well.

MARK: Yeah, fair enough. I would, that's a good question. I'll have to think about that. I'm not sure offhand how that would work. I want to say that it would not be a problem. That it would go through fine, but I'm not positive. I would have to double check on that.

ROGER: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you Mark and Roger for the discussion, and thanks to Mark for taking the action. I think we'll do some [inaudible] here checking back. If there isn't any other comment on question five and six, I would like to jump, a new question I'm adding here, question seven, which is with respect to timeline that we should consider for transferring new

gTLD registrations. So Mark, you touched upon potentially setting deadlines for different rules to apply. Can I ask, we go through a little bit of the same exercise we had with respect to new registration and try to throw out, given what we are currently considering as [inaudible]. What would be a first approach of a timeline under which those registration should be transferred under those validation [planners?]?

I hope you can throw some numbers out there so that we can have a sense of what should be an assumption at this stage.

So I don't mean to put anybody on the spot, but I would be interested to have everyone's gut feeling on that. So Theo, I see you're checking with your [inaudible], would you mind sharing your perspective?

THEO:

Yeah, I don't mind sharing some perspective here. This is Theo for the transcript. I don't have a timeline there for you, but I'm sort of wondering, we are going to set up a stage where there are going to be OT accounts. Would that...? Are we going to set up these OT accounts before we go...? We're also, I can assume that we are going to setup these OT accounts prior to the migration, that is the only logical step there.

But how in the timeline is the setting up of the OT accounts effecting the timeline there? I'm trying to sort of think here when we are going to set up these OT account, because that might give us an indication for the timeline itself, if that makes any sense what I'm saying right now. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Theo. May I ask Roger?

ROGER: Yeah, and I suppose maybe just following up a little to Theo. Yeah, I think that would be somewhat important, to get a realistic timeline on the, you know, we're looking at, you know, maybe 160 plus million contacts that we're going to have to create in... Honestly, that's, we can estimate that, but you know, without actually getting in and hitting the system and seeing how long that process is going to take. And see what kind of, you know, getting back to my suggestion on the dedicated connections, what kind of [through put?] we can get on them.

It will be a pretty rough estimate, and we can come up with one probably.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Roger. Theo, would you like to follow-up?

THEO: Yeah. Just a couple of more points. I just want to piggyback on what Roger just said. As soon as we have a little sense there how fast things are going with a couple of registrars, see how fast they can migrate the data on an OT account. We also have to ask ourselves questions, how we're going to deal with maybe the logistics of coordinating this? Because that should be also factored into the timeline.

I mean, we're talking about 2,000 plus registrars, which is a boat load of registrars. So the coordination there, that if we have a sense there how much time we can get everybody engaged, get ready to do something, that gives us also an indication of a timeline. If it turns out that 30% of the registrars are completely non-responsive for whatever reason, that would delay the timeline there for the existing registrations in my opinion.

So that is something to also factor in. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Theo. Anybody like to share additional comments? I'm looking at your name in the list, Mark, and I don't mean to put you on the spot, but if you had any, to be interested to share your perspective as well. And I'd be also curious to kind of determine how long we would need to get to the estimate that Roger was suggesting we could get to.

I think that's a core element to get to the implementation plan that we are trying to get to by the end of July. And so, yeah, would be interested to hear any additional improvement on that.

MARK:

Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. I can try a little bit. I mean, I guess to Theo's first question, as far as [inaudible], any changes we do in production, we would have to make the change in OT [inaudible], you know, a minimum of 30 days prior to production. So whatever changes we're making, you know, in production with, you would have at least 30 days prior, you know, prior in [inaudible].

You know, but I think what you're hearing from, from Roger and Theo, is that, you know, it might be awful hard to estimate how much time is needed until you actually get in and start making the changes.

You know, the contacts, and it's not simple. You know, each registration requires four contacts. And the contacts are created separately and later, there is another transaction where those contacts are associated with a registration. To be fair, one contact can be associated with multiple domains, so there is the potential at least for some use, but you know, I guess, I think the point from Roger and Theo is it's awfully hard to estimate that until you get in and start doing it.

But also, Theo's point, I think is a valid one. Some registrars are going to be more proactive than others. As Theo pointed out, we have over 2,000 separate registrars that the register comment domains. So each of them are going to have their own timelines that need to be coordinated. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks Mark. And thank you all for reading those studies, because I believe some of those would qualify in terms of setting the parameters of the implementation plan. So I believe it's crucial that we've identified those and we can be discussing them. Jodi, would you like to go ahead?

JODI:

Yeah, this is Jodi, just for the record. When you're talking a timeline there, are you talking about when we are going to start, or when we're

going to end? Or the whole transition? I guess, to Roger's, and Theo's, and Mark's point, it depends on how fast we're going to be able to do this and send the contacts in. If registered, it will be 160 million contacts potentially that need to be created for just Go Daddy.

And that's just going to take a lot of time. And then one of my other questions is too is, how do we handle transfers? Let's say we're handling a domain name from... I guess the registrars have to have to think about that, if they have this implemented, was it creating a context where they don't, and where they're transferring it from has contact implemented already or not.

I think it would be easier if the registrar actually has the contacts coded, that's being transferred into, because then they could just create those, you know, replace those contacts. But if you're transferring a domain name from a registrar that has the contacts attached to the domain, and it's being transferred to a registrar that doesn't have that completed yet, I'm wondering how that's going to work basically.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Jodi. So to answer your first question, I think, from an implementation plan definition perspective, I think we want to be able to set a mandate of some kind, you know, a potential milestone in the process should there be some indication of coordination of principles coordination with specific milestones. I think those would, it would probably notify those in the implementation plan.

So certainly, we're looking at a mandate more than start date, because the start will be set by the pace which we define the plan and we release it for public comment, etc. So that's your first question.

To the second one, I think, we would probably want to address this topic, and you know, knowledge [go and try this?] and I'll let other members maybe comment to that. I think, you know, that's a topic you put on the table and we want to keep track of and include as much as we can. Theo?

THEO:

Thanks Fabien, this is Theo. Jodi just made some excellent points there, and this is where we get into the nuts and bolts, so to speak. And this is a very, very important, I mean, while Jodi was pushing out these points that he made, I was thinking like, yeah, okay, are we going to have a different set of OT accounts? Are we going to use the existing OT accounts?

Are we going to use the data that we have in our existing OT account? Are we communicating with the OT account of VeriSign? Or do we actually want to copy all of the existing data that we have on production to the OT account? I mean, these are all of these little basic questions which are very important, and we need, in my opinion, address that all, and we need to come up with a way to address that. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yes, thanks Theo. And so I think as a step in IRT, we need to determine what is appropriate to be in the scope of the implementation plan and

what should be, you know, details that are part of the registrar operators plan. So thanks for mentioning it. And I think we need to get to defining what goes in the implementation plan, and what...?

Just a quick time check here, we only have 10 minutes left. I didn't want to interrupt this discussion, but let me check if we can move on maybe to take a quick look at the state of our discussion on the new registration track. Anyone opposed to doing that? Any additional comments on what we just discussed?

Hearing none, not seeing any objections, so similar to the new registration, that pretty much has been the status of our discussion since Marrakech. I just want to note here that we have the two next steps here that we should pursue. The first one being whether we need any additional perspective on the system changes of the registry, within the registries would implement the transition registration.

That we can refine the timeline and get a detailed timeline, which would make into the implementation plans. So let me ask a quick question and let's try to spend a few minutes here before moving on to the updates. Can ICANN members provide a sense of what is needed for us to get to that stage of discussing a more detailed timeline? Or in a sense, refining this estimate of 18 to 24 months timeline we have currently on the new registration track?

Mark, please go ahead.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. It's Mark. Just a minor correction. Current timeline estimates, your third bullet, 90 days notification of system changes to registries, should be to registrars there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks.

MARK: No problem. And then on next steps, your first bullet there, registries to provide overview of system changes, and behind there, April 2016. Can I ask, what additional information do registrars need there? Registrars an overview of system changes. I mean, beyond the minimum validation rules? You know, I think our [RSPK's?] are already available, which has the ID PP commands for that.

So I guess I am looking for a little guidance as far as what additional information registrars would need there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks Mark. And I think my recollection is that was a, again I don't mean to put anybody in the spot, but I think that that question was raised by either [inaudible] or Jodi, Marrakech in our meeting where there was a sense that before we can actually discuss in more details about the actual timeline, put together 12 to 18 months for registrars to complete the third bullet point under our plan there, we would need more details about what the registries time would be.

And that might actually speak to the definition rules that would apply to new registration, which would be another set of validation rules. But I'll let others speak and make sure that they provide the details there.

[Inaudible]....

JOYCE: Fabien, this is Joyce. Can I ask a question [CROSSTALK] VeriSign?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce, please let me, I think Jodi was in the queue, and we'll come...

JOYCE: I'm sorry, sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks. Jodi?

JODI: That's all right. All I was going to say to Mark was we would just need formal notification of what's happening to the system. Basically when it's going to be updated in the OT and in the environment, and then what specifically is being updated. Like you can now fit in, this is a new domain command that you have to use with the four contact. We're all pretty familiar with all of this work, would it be good to have those examples from VeriSign to say, this is how our implementation work, even if it's exactly like everybody else's, it's...

You know, from Go Daddy's point of view, it's just good to see those examples so we're not guessing at what it is, even though it might be exactly like everybody else's EPP.

MARK: That's smart, fair enough. We can provide that, not a problem.

JODI: And then those... There was just one more thing that I wanted to add too here. I don't know that we talked about this. I might be a little out of line or out of sequence in how this is, but when we cut over to required thick contacts for new registrations, and maybe we've discussed this before, but is there any way we can have, I want to say, a trial period before that?

So like if thick new registrations are required in production on May 1st, it would be nice to be able to allow that like on April 1st, allow us to start registering domain names with thick contacts, just to make sure that our systems are ready, so that when they are required, we don't start failing registrations if we've got something screwed up on May 1st.

MARK: This is Mark again. I think with our proposal you, the first 90 day notice of system changes to optional thick, at that point you would be able to do that.

JODI: Oh, there it is. Yeah, I'm sorry.

MARK: So you'll be able to do that for the entire, you know, 12 to 18 month period, and then only then after the second 90 day notification, you know only then would it be required thick. And again, we would do, we would make that change in [inaudible], at least 30 days before that. So [inaudible] would immediately, you know, if there are any surprises there, hopefully we would be caught in [inaudible].

JODI: Yeah. Apparently I'm skipping right from the first bullet to the sixth bullet and forgetting everything between. My apologies, guys.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Jodi and Mark. Joyce, you had a question?

JOYCE: Yeah, I'm just, my question to Mark, regarding the SPK and EPP change. You mentioned that what when you're going to have the system change, would you...? Are you going to release those SPK and EPP when you release the system change to all of the registrars? Or are they already available, the SPK and the EPP?

MARK: Thank you Joyce. This is Mark. The EPP SPK, you know, is already available. We actually have a single EPP SPK on our website that

includes the thick information. So you can get that today. I think Roger suggested that we send sort of before and after examples as part of our 90 day notification. That's something we often do for changes of this magnitude, so we can absolutely do that as well, but anybody can take a look at our EPP SPK today and see how our system would work once the transition to thick goes.

JOYCE: I didn't know that, that they're already available. So maybe you should notification to all of the registrars and announce that they are available. And that's my first comment, and then I have a question.

So there is not going to be any more changes on the [inaudible] EPP? Are those final version before they put action thick, action becomes available?

MARK: Joyce, this is Mark again. You know, never say never in case there is... It's certainly possible there will be changes, but you know, I would make changes only as necessary, and certainly we look to minimize changes, certainly, impactful changes of this nature. But never say never there.

JOYCE: Okay, then that's great. If there is going to be any changes, I don't care, I know that there is a need for the changes, but that will be great if VeriSign can send email to notify every registrar of the changes, so that would be great. Because I, you know, recently we experienced some error for stating the domain names, because the info domain, VeriSign

had changed a little bit. We never, the last 10 some years, we never had problems, but the last months, all of the sudden we had a problem.

And you know, we took a look at the error message and everything, and found out that the EPP had been changed on the info domain. So we had to modify that, and said wait a minute, we never received a notification of a change. When was that changed? And so on and so forth. So maybe VeriSign can provide a better communication between your changes to the registrar, then they would make it much easier for us to change.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you Joyce. Sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but we have one minute left and I would like to go through the next slide. So thanks for your comments. So I understand that in each area, there will be communications or at least, in the IRP, and then we'll determine what makes it into the implementation plan as far as treatment communicate to notify, etc.

So, in terms of updates, very quickly, I just wanted to be very conscious of your time, under consistently being in display, we have been expecting coming from the IRT, we have received some [inaudible] require more time, if not, then we'll proceed with the input that we've received so far.

Regarding the bundling of the [inaudible]... Francisco, would you like to provide the update?

FRANCISCO: Sure. Thank you Fabien. So, some of you may have been in the GD Summit last week, I think we can conclude that there is not strong support on the IDM. So we're thinking on dropping the suggestion to the IRP and GSO Council. And we are in the process of preparing formal communication to vote. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And so if there is any comment or question on this topic, I would like to get to the next IRT meetings, currently based on our plan that was suggested, we would meet in two weeks. That would be 7th of June. Considering the amount of topics we've raised and have yet to discuss, I'm wondering whether we would want to meet next week, and potentially every week to Helsinki.

Can I get a sense of what people think? Anybody objecting to the idea of meeting next week, and having only a week notice for the meeting? Looking for, I see check marks, green, green, no objection. Please speak up if that's not working out for you. I see check marks. Great, so I'm suggesting we meet again next week. Thank you all for confirming your availability and willingness to participate. We appreciate your time and contributions.

So let me stop here. If anybody would like to comment or ask any questions on this topic, if not, we will schedule our next meeting next Tuesday, same time, and we will be following up with the IRT on the action items that we've discussed today. Thank you so much again for your time and participation, and we look forward continuing our

discussion over the mailing list in the next week, or our next IRT meeting. Thank you so much. Have a nice day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]