FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Good morning, good afternoon, evening, everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT, on Tuesday, the 26th of July, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.
	We have with us from the IRT today Marc Anderson, Steve Metalitz and Theo Geurts.
	Am I missing anyone on the call? Not hearing anyone. A few reminders before we jump into our agenda: please make sure your line is muted when you're not speaking, the meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purposes of the transcript, please don't forget to say your name when you speak, and finally, if at any time you would like to get in the queue to speak, you can do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.
	Let's move on to the agenda for today's call. A quick update. I think we're going to spend too much time at, but the registry RDDS Consistent Labeling and Display Policy is about to be published. I understand it should be between now and an hour from now, so you should receive those notifications soon, and obviously, the policy will be added to the Consensus Policy page of the ICANN [inaudible] website, and the publication also is true for the [other] operational profile. So that should be there.
	Any question or comment? Okay, not hearing any, so we'll get to the transition from Thin to Thick and the discussion of the various open items. The ones that are open in particular, we'll get to that. Let me get back to the agenda here.

But before we get there, let's just talk quickly about next steps so that we allow as much time as we have for the discussion of the open items. In terms of next steps, we still have on our radar staff in the IRT to discuss the notification of the GNSO for Recommendation 3 of the working final report that VeriSign is currently drafting, and we are waiting for the draft for a discussion within the IRT.

We also have a pending discussion of a draft transition implementation plan, so that's what staff is drafting based on the discussion to date on the transition implementation path. Also, in order to allow for more time on staff's part to finalize the draft, we'll propose that we resume our meetings not next week, but the following week, so that's on the 12th of August, and on our weekly pace, as we've been practicing over the last few months.

So let me stop here, and before we get to the discussion of our various open items on the score card, if anybody has any questions or comments.

DENNIS CHANG: Steve is typing.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Steve. Our general target has been to start that discussion with you, the IRT, in August, so that we'd have a draft transition implementation plan ready for public comment in September, so hopefully before the next IRT meeting on the 12th, we'd be able to share

a first draft with the IRT and start the discussion on it. Does that answer your question, Steve?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I think it would be more clear when we look at the schedule slide with the announcement date and effective date.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, Dennis, the slide that we have here is just the timeline. That's really the timeline we've been discussing for the implementation of the transition. Actually, yes, I could have brought back our slide of the actual work to get there, but essentially, our timeline is discussing the implementation time in August, and releasing it for public comment in September.

Okay, if there isn't any other comment or question, let's get to the score card and the remaining open items, and see what progress we can make on these.

Okay, so I'm showing the clean version of our score card, taking into account the changes per our discussion last week, in which we've closed a majority of the items and we will only have now the remaining items open. Let me scroll to the first item we still have open, so that's speaking to the validation rules. Three actually was closed over the mailing list yesterday by Theo, so we'll just close that one, because I understand that Theo's concerns were covered. Is that correct, Theo?

THEO GEURTS: That is correct.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, perfect. 3F, length of fields for addresses. If I understand correctly, you're requesting that registries consider address field length to 255 characters, consistent with [EPP] standard, is that correct?

THEO GEURTS: That is correct.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, let's have a conversation on that one. Marc, is that something you can address right off the bat?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Fabien. I can't address that off the top of my head, I'm afraid, and on this one, I think we had an action item to discuss that within the mailing list, and maybe we dropped the ball a little bit on actually following through on that. So maybe I can just do a suggestion here, is rather than have this remain outstanding for between now and the next meeting, could I request that you provide a prompt in the mailing list to maybe remind Theo and I that we have this item as outstanding, and we can maybe try and address this over e-mail?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, makes sense, so we'll add that to the list of items that need to be addressed over the mailing list, because I think last week we had

mentioned that that would be the case of the inter-registrar transfer issues, so we'll certainly have the mailing list be active on those.

Okay, thanks, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Is that the same with 3G, the following one, regarding support of IDN e-mail addresses?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, same for both, I would tackle them both at the same time. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, so moving down the score card, items five and six, those are related to the – Theo, yes, I see you in the queue.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, thanks Fabien. Circling back really quick, I also mentioned a couple of other things, which are more suited to have the registry make a decision on that. How are we going to have the discussion with VeriSign [inaudible] have them in the – discuss the [IRT] because I don't think they belong in the IRT, but how do we sort of get that discussion going on with VeriSign? As I mentioned a couple of other things, which are not

groundbreaking or anything, but it would be nice to know if we are going to have a discussion with VeriSign, or if we're just going to see the decision there. Thanks. Any input is welcome. Well, not too long please. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. Marc, do you have any plans or ideas you could share? From our perspective, I believe our involvement would be limited to sharing a draft implementation plan that includes policy language that we would then submit for public comment, so I believe we'd leave that answer for VeriSign.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Theo, I'm sorry, I got a little lost in there. I'm not sure which items you're referring to specifically.

THEO GEURTS: Well, they were related – yes, it was specified in the e-mail specification that certain characters are allowed within the e-mail address, and a couple of signs like the plus sign, which is fairly much used by Google to tag it, but there are also symbols in it that if you use it as a registry, our experience is that we had some issues with them. Most registries don't allow those characters so to speak, and, well, it would be nice to know how you guys are going to get forward with it.

It's actually basically outside of this discussion. They were just some pointers from our Development Team – well, to your Development

Team at VeriSign. I'm just curious how we'll go about this. We can completely do this on the list, by the way.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Theo. That got me to the right place. Yes, I did see that and look at it. Yes, I agree this doesn't really need to be in the IRT discussion about the policy, but I'm happy to follow up and get an answer for you on those items. So I'll do that, and I'll respond to your e-mail, so if anybody else is following and is interested in the answer, they can see it as well.

THEO GEURTS: Okay, thanks, [inaudible].

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Marc. Going to item five and six, we're going into registrar transfer. In one case, we're [assuming] discussion of how we would handle the creation of new contacts when the data is missing for those contacts. I'm not sure that the conversation last week was completed on those, and that's in the context of transfers. And item six is about those corner cases where when registrars losing and gaining a transfer, may be at different stages of transition. So I wonder if anybody on the call has given any thoughts or has additional input on those topics, and if not, then we'll take those to the mailing list as well. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: A couple of points there. I didn't discuss it, so I don't have a status on that, but that is – I did think about it some more, and this is I think quite important. It's going to hit on an operational level, very hard, and most of the cases from my experience when you are talking about edge – what used to be an edge case can have far reaching consequences. We don't have the time to go through them all, but I think it is important, and I would suggest – well, there are not many registrars on the call, but it would be interesting to get a few of those edge cases on the list and see if we can go from there.

I will certainly do that in the week or weeks to come, because like I said, if it hits on an operational level, the consequences could be far reaching. Mostly it's stuff that you don't even realize until you're very close to implementation, and then you go "Okay, we made a wrong decision there." We can never rule them out, but it is definitely something you want to send some time on. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks, Theo. We look forward to your discussion, hopefully input by other registrars on that subject, definitely. Anybody would like to comment on those?

DENNIS CHANG: I just have one request. When you do have your e-mail discussion, please do one topic per e-mail, so we can track them separately.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, that is a good suggestion. Thanks. Okay, so then moving on down to 7B. 7B is the item related to the coordination of the 2000+ registrars that need to complete the migration as part of the transition of the [inaudible] registration. We are still planning to provide some input that has been requested from us in terms of whether ICANN have any tools we could use to encourage registrars to not take the full 18 months to complete the transition, so that's an action on us in which we hope to provide input with the implementation plan. Anybody have any specific input on that one?

DENNIS CHANG: I have a question about that. When we say tools, are we talking about technical tools that ICANN may have already or could develop, and then provide to registry and registrars so they can use it to transfer data? Is that what we're talking about? Is that the request?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Dennis, my understanding is that in reference to any means they'd have. Let's see if Steve would like to provide additional input, because I believe this point was coming from him in particular. Again, my understanding is that it was a generic reference to any sort of incentive we could provide. There wasn't any specification of technical elements.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, it totally depends how you want to get registrars – "motivated" is maybe not the right word – prioritize their data migration is perhaps a better word. You want to get the attention somehow like, "Okay, this is

going on. If you do it maybe this quick within about that time limit, there is maybe some incentive to be gained there." It's basically some brainstorming there from my perspective, speaking as a [inaudible] register, we always have a very full backlog, and it's just a matter of prioritizing. And if we need to change our schedule, that's always very problematic, though sometimes there are registries like ccTLD registries who want something done and they have an incentive for it, and that's basically how we implemented DNSSEC.

We didn't have it on our radar, there was not much demand for it from the customers, and then the Dutch registry wanted to prioritize it and wanted to get the egg or chicken discussion out of the way, and this order subsidized the DNSSEC for .nl, and basically for us they actually subsidized DNSSEC for about every registry we offer that supports it, so it got really high on our prioritization at least. It went almost straight to the top floor, so to speak.

That's just what we were discussing, brainstorming in the last two weeks. I hope that gives some color to it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm trying to see if it's a policy item or it's an implementation support item after the policy is announced. I'm trying to separate that, get that clarity in my mind.

THEO GEURTS: I do not have the answer there. We were looking at it, I brought it forward that "How do you organize 2000 registrars to pay attention?"

And that's sort of how we kicked off the discussion there. And basically, nobody has a really good answer to it, though I think everybody sort of acknowledges that getting 2000 registrars or more ready to migrate might be challenging. That was sort of the background of that, and like I said, nobody has an answer, and I'm not sure if it's policy or IRT. I cannot even make that distinction myself. Maybe you would have a distinction if you had a solution or an answer. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: I see, okay, let us think about it here, the implementation at ICANN. It's unclear to me how we would build a policy that would have incentives in it. We can certainly develop tools and vehicles to facilitate easier transfer as ICANN as a third party between the two entities, but our tool is really the policy announcement and the policy publication. And just like we're doing today, we're making the announcement, we're sending the legal notice. I think that's our role, and whether the [Board] of 2000 registrars adheres to that is really their business, and they signed up to be a registrar.

So that's sort of where I'm coming from. Let me think more deeply about this and maybe talk to some people who used a similar incentive plan or not.

As far as the auction proceeds, I just want to make sure it's very clear that as how we spend the auction proceeds, there is already a working group I believe, and it's their charter to come back with proposals, so if somebody wants to go ahead and provide input to that working group,

please do so, but I don't think that [inaudible] as ICANN staff, it's proper for us to be providing the how to use that auction proceeds.

So I just want to make sure that the ICANN staff will not be doing that, and it's up to the IRT members or the community members to provide that feedback. Go ahead, Theo.

THEO GEURTS: I completely understand and it makes a lot of sense. And maybe this is something for ICANN staff, for you guys to think of. Maybe you can shoot it down already when I propose it. These PDPs, are they being translated in the six UN languages when they are sent out?

DENNIS CHANG: I don't know. Are you talking about the PDP? You said PDP. Are you talking about –

THEO GEURTS: PDP, like this one. At some point, it's going to the registrars, and from what I usually hear –

DENNIS CHANG: Are you talking about the Auction Proceeds Working Group, or are you talking about the –

THEO GEURTS: No, let me explain.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

THEO GEURTS: At a certain point, this becomes a PDP which registrars need to comply
                         with. Usually, ICANN sends it out. Usually, to my knowledge, it is only in
                         English. I heard back from registrars that they would like a translation,
                         that they would like the announcement in their own language, that they
                         would like the PDP in their own language, because that usually catches
                         their attention more. Just an idea there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, are you talking about the actual consensus policy that becomes a
                         contractual requirement?

THEO GEURTS: Yes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: That page actually is translated in, I believe, at least the six UN
                         languages, plus a few of them. So I think that's the case right now if you
                         check the consensus policy page at ICANN.

THEO GEURTS: Okay, well, it was just an idea. If it's already there, I didn't pay attention.
                         Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien, I think take it away. Next item.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Actually, we're done with our open items. You may have noticed that we've added the transition implementation plan's timeline to the score card, because that reflects the discussion when we close that on those [various] items, so that's just for everybody to note. And so we've covered our score card and agenda for today, unless anybody has any questions or comments that they'd like to discuss.

I see that Steve may be providing some input in the chat. He did, so I'm reading Steve's input: "Is there a target date for draft letter to GNSO that VeriSign is drafting?" Let me see. Marc, do you have any ETA on the draft notification to the GNSO?

MARC ANDERSON: Fabien, thank you. Honestly, I was hoping they'd have it ready for the IRT meeting two weeks ago, but it's going through a few more internal revisions than I expected before providing it to the IRT, so frankly, I'm embarrassed that I don't have it ready yet, and I'll do everything I can do have it ready for the next IRT meeting on the 12th.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Any additional questions or topics? I think unless anyone would like to put forward a topic for discussion related to the

transition [inaudible] to our next steps, maybe we can just call this meeting over and give back everyone 20 minutes of their time.

Steve, I see you're typing in the chat. You seem to be agreeing to that proposition. Alright, so then let's close the meeting for today. I see Theo is in agreement.

Thank you again for attending today, we will be in touch through the mailing list, we'll reactivate those items that need further discussion among the IRT mailing list, and we will send the invitation for our meeting scheduled in August. Thank you again for taking the time.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Have a nice end of your day.

THEO GEURTS: Have a good one.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]