
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick WHOIS IRT this Tuesday, May 31, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.

Let me start with quickly looking at who we have on the call from the IRT. I see Joyce, Marc, Roger, Sara, Theo. Am I missing anyone?

Okay, a few reminders before we jump into our agenda. 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 you speak. If at any time you would like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

Our agenda today is going to be the following. I suggest we reverse the order that we used last week and start with discussing the New Registrations Track then move on to continuing our discussion on the Existing Registrations Track and end with a few Updates. Any questions, comments on the agenda?

Hearing none, let's start with the New Registrations Track of the transition from thin to thick. I'm just jumping over this slide, which is our objectives slide that you should be familiar with by now.

Last week in our meeting, we discussed a bit the request for additional information on potential system changes by registries so that we could get into a discussion of potentially a more detailed timeline or at least get to a place where we have an estimate of the timeline which we can

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.

move forward with. The discussion last week added a few elements which are in red on this slide here.

I think that there was a confirmation by Marc that the registries could potentially confirm what would be the requirement that would apply to the systems with respect to the transition of new registrations, including if it is identical to the current requirements. There was also a discussion to reference the very same [LDK] that's currently available.

I would like just to point out that we have set an objective for registries and registrars on the IRT to agree on a detailed timeline by these dates, so I'd like for us to take a bit of time on this topic and try to see if from our participants today we can have a sense of whether we can refine a bit this timeline and move forward with it into drafting an implementation plan.

Let me stop here. If anybody would like to comment or propose any additional information there. I see Theo is checking, so agreeing with the [inaudible]. Theo, would you like to go ahead?

THEO GEURTS:

Yes, thank you, Fabien. I wasn't agreeing to anything. I was just fiddling with the buttons here. Anyway, regarding the detailed timeline, I've been checking with [the other] developers. We had some discussion about it, and the way we are looking at it we're talking about [inaudible] register for half a million .coms more or less and some .nets.

We are thinking in a best case scenario, we should be able to do this within four hours; in a worst case scenario, we are looking at 12 hours

here. It all depends a little bit on the scripting on our side because we have our data in a certain format in our database and we need to script that. But we don't see many issues there. But that is basically what we are thinking in a worst case scenario, 12 hours and half a million domain names.

That could give you a ballpark number there maybe. I mean, things will be completely different if you size up in the number of domain names, I guess. Things could be very different there. Then on the other side of the spectrum, if you look at the smaller registrars, we might hit some issues there that we do not anticipate in terms of their side of scripting. We have actually no idea of they have dedicated IT teams, etc.

So that's a little bit of my sense here. I'm talking about the transition from the thin to thick, migrating the grandfathered data.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So you were including existing registrations, is that correct?

THEO GEURTS: Yes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: You are including both existing and new registrations?

THEO GEURTS: We don't think there's any issue there with the new registrations. We just looked at the grandfathered, the existing registrations, that

migration. We will be concentrated on that for this moment. We don't have any issues with the new registrations. No, we don't see any issues there, so this is just the grandfathered domain names. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Theo. Thank you for sharing that perspective. It's interesting. Any other perspective to share on the timeline? I think we're trying to log down in a sense an estimate of the timeline we were currently trying to devise for the New Registration Track, but I think we'll soon come to a discussion of the Existing Registration Track timeline as well, so thanks, Theo.

Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. On the Next Steps, the first one – “Registries to provide overview of system changes, confirmation of applicable requirements with examples” – on that topic, I guess I'm a little unclear as to, is this something people are looking for Verisign to provide now as part of the IRT? Is it something that we're looking for to be included in the implementation plan? Or are we talking in terms of this would be a requirement for registries to provide that? For example, this is something we would certainly include as part of the 90-day notice, but I'm unclear if we're looking for more than that. So I guess that's a question for the rest of the IRT: what exactly is the expectation around that particular Next Step? Thank you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Would anybody like to share? Theo, yes, please?

THEO GEURTS: Yes. I'm thinking 90-days notification of system changes to the registrars, that is usually what's being done now by a lot of registries. In the last few months, we've seen a few times that it went wrong, without naming any TLDs here. But we noticed that certain registries moved certain TLDs to a different backend, so to speak to keep it simple here, and a day later [as in migration] those registries would issue emergency notices because registrars were still trying to connect to the wrong IP addresses. So maybe if we're going for that, maybe 90 days is maybe still a little bit on the short side, or we should have some acknowledgement that people are aware, registrars are aware. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. I think, Theo, in terms of the time that we provide for registrars to incorporate, we should probably take notice of the fact that we're currently considering a 12- to 18-month timeframe for registrars to complete the transition once they've been provided a 90-days notification. So it sounds like it still provides quite a bit of time for any registrar to incorporate those potential changes and implement them. I just wanted to point that out just in case.

To Marc's question, it seems to me that when we first discussed the timeline we have here on the slide, there was a notion that to decide whether 12 months would be enough or whether we need 18 months for registrars to complete a transition, that was dependent on an estimate of system changes as part of the definition of the

implementation plan. That might have come from either Roger or Jody. I can't remember precisely. But I wonder if that's still required, and if it isn't, then maybe it is sufficient for now to think about this information on system changes as part of the notification and we need now to decide whether we would want to go for 12 or 18 months as the timeframe for registrars to complete the transition.

Roger, please?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah, hi. I think I agree with where this came from. To Marc's point, him providing that data 90-days before the OT&E is available, again, until we get that information, the 12 or 18 months, however long that's going to take, we won't really be able to define until then. But I think that 90-day notice, I don't think that Verisign should go out of their way and try to do everything different now than they usually do it, so I think that's fair to just do it on their 90-day notice.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Roger. So, Roger, I understand that you would think it would be helpful to get an overview of those changes now so that we can as an IRT and staff determine whether we would want to go for 12 or 18 months, is that correct?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yes. I think that we're ballparking the date now and the amount of time it will take. Until we know the extent of the changes, I don't think that we can refine that date any more than we already have.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Let me ask you this, Marc, then: do you think you would be able to provide an overview of system changes, the extent of those changes, before we looked at timeline and in order to get there? Or should we right now go for 18 months as the timeline for implementation and then you would provide the exact estimate of system changes when you get to the implementation of the 90-day notification? Those are the two options I see really.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. We would certainly provide all of that information as part of the 90-day notification. I think we'll provide that either way. I think our feeling is that we have to provide that as part of our 90-day notice. As far as providing it ahead of time as part of the IRT exercise to help refine the timeline a little bit more, I can certainly do that. I'm thinking I would need at least two weeks to provide that though. I would also caveat that by saying this would be a preliminary overview of system changes and cage that saying the final notice will come as part of the 90-day notification. But I think if you gave me two weeks, I could provide at least a preliminary overview of what that notification would look like if that would help.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. I think it would certainly. I think two weeks would still work. We still have a month to get to a place where we think we have defined the implementation task and where we can start drafting the implementation plan, so I think that should give enough time for the IRT

to consider before the end of the month. So that to me sounds helpful, but let me see if others in the IRT would like to chip in. Would anybody like to confirm or share their thoughts on whether it would be workable to consider these preliminary system changes or overview of system changes by mid-June? Theo, please?

THEO GEURTS:

Thank you. Yes, let's just try to aim for that. Let's put a little dot on the horizon and move from there. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Great. Thanks, Theo. Alright, so if that works for you, Marc, let's do that. I think we'll be looking forward to the preliminary overview you can provide. Then that might be the point in time where we can discuss again the refinement of this timeline then. If this is agreeable to everybody and unless there is any objection, I suggest then we move on to discuss the Existing Registration Track of the transition from thin to thick. Let me pause here a second. Okay, not seeing any hand raised, not hearing anybody, moving on.

Existing Registration, [inaudible] slide. This is a reminder of how we got to our current discussion. I've reshuffled a bit here the order of the questions by priority in a sense. So let me start with Question 3. That was the open question about what should be the minimal set of validation parameters. Our discussion last week I think brought the IRT to an agreement that we would proceed with only three required fields in the contact data. That is: Contact ID, Postal Info Type, and Auth Info.

Let me show here how that looks like on the validation rule document. Let me load this right now. As you may recall, Marc had shared with the group a document. We've reflected the changes here on this document. The lines in red are the fields that would be required as part of the transition from thin to thick of existing registration. As you can see, Contact ID, Postal Info Type, and then the Auth Info. Any comments or question on these rules? Anybody in disagreement with that way forward?

Okay, not hearing any opposition, not seeing any hand raised, let me come back to our slide deck. Roger, I see you're typing, and I'm having a little bit of an issue here with the Adobe Connect room. Okay, can everybody see the slides? It has been slow on my end. I just want to check. I see that Roger lost phone connection. Marc, you're seeing the slides. Thanks. Okay, so we'll be watching the chat for your communication, Roger. Sorry about your challenges with the phone line.

I just wanted to come back to this slide to mention here that as far as further discussion on this topic, we've struck the Postal Info Type discussion. That was [confirmed] by Marc last week. We struck the impact of missing data on post-transition transfers (that's D) because that's in our discussion regarding Question 5 and 6. That's the same for the E point here, concerns with post-migration impact of proposal.

So we're left with two open items for discussion in this area. Requirement for registrars to supply all available data. I think that was a request from Steve, which is related to intention that was discussed that the same amount of WHOIS information that is currently provided before this transition is provided after this transition so that despite the

minimum requirements, the minimum validation rules, the maximum available data is transferred. So I think Steve was pointing to the fact that there are currently no requirements for registrars to do that and so, I guess, was inquiring about that.

The second open item we have is the gathering of input from registrars. We discussed last week sharing the finalized validation rules with at least the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I think there was also discussion of the Registries Stakeholder Group. I wonder if that's applicable.

Let me stop here to see if anybody has comments or questions regarding these two open items. Marc, please?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. On the first one, the requirement for registrars to supply all available data, I think I mentioned this before so apologies if this is a duplication a little bit, but my feeling is what we're talking about is just the validation rules that the registry will provide. I don't think the intent and I don't think what we're trying to do as an IRT is to make any statement or changes on what registrars' requirements are. So by reducing the validation that the registries do, we're just trying to ease the transition and it's not our intent or we're not trying to change what the requirements are as far as what data needs to be supplied.

So I think just some kind of note in the final implementation plan about those validation rules and just a note that these validation rules are not meant to imply or meant to change the requirements for registrars to collect and supply specific data. I don't think there's really an action

item for B there other than to just reassure Steve that we're not changing those requirements. I feel like I got a little long-winded there.

On C though, I think Theo brought it up that we should, now that we've finalized or we have proposed final validation rules, we should take a crack or at least attempt to gather input from registrars, I think. Just what Theo said, there are over 2,000 registrars and we only have three or four represented here in the IRT regularly. So I think it would behoove us to circulate it among the registrars and at least give them further opportunity to contribute.

Also, I requested last week, I'd like to also share that with the Registry Stakeholder Group as well. They may or may not have any comments on that. In fact, I kind of wouldn't expect them to, but I think if we're socializing it with the registrars, it just makes sense to socialize it with the Registry Stakeholder Group as well. Thank you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks, Marc. And thanks for that reminder on the registry side. Theo, please?

THEO GEURTS:

Yes, just real quick, Fabien. It might be that the registrars don't have any input also or make an official comment as an SG, but at least we gave them the chance to weigh in to this. And that's that. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks, Theo. Can you, Theo, share your thinking as to how long we should provide for registrars to respond to our request for input, just to get a sense of how that fits into our timeline to close this discussion and draft our implementation plan?

THEO GEURTS: I think two weeks should be enough. I don't have any sense. Maybe Roger has some input on this or Sara regarding this matter. We're pretty busy [inaudible] right now, but I think two weeks is still a pretty good timeline. It isn't a very complex – well, it is actually a very complex matter – but my guess would be two weeks here.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks, Theo. Roger is typing and supporting what has been said so far. Just waiting here for Roger's contribution, and then I suggest we move on. "A week to two weeks and no more than 30 days." Okay, so we'll take that action and work with you to circulate what we have in terms of final proposed validation rules. And we'll determine how we accompany this in terms of background and explanation of the status of the discussion. Theo, yes, please?

THEO GEURTS: One more thing though. I would mainly focus on gathering the input for this and not ask any additional questions. I think we discussed last week, I don't know where we're at, at the moment, but I would just focus on this specific point and leave any other questions unattended. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, thanks, Theo. I think it was still a fairly open topic as to whether we would provide any other information. I wonder really how dry this can be and whether there isn't a minimum background to provide as to explain what this is and why we're requesting input on those specific validation rules. It seems to me that we need to provide a little bit of background and then, as you suggest, focus the request for input on those rules. Does that align with what you're thinking, Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, that sounds good.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: I think Fabien [is a smart guy]. I agree with what you both said as well. I would also just add the document you showed that has the IRT's proposed validation rules, you mentioned .com/.net specifically. I would suggest you drop the TLDs and just say it's proposed validation rules for the transition from thin to thick. It does apply to .com/.net, and .jobs, so rather than just calling out .com and .net, I would just suggest in the title you just limit it to proposed validation rules for transition from thin to thick. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Marc. I wanted to check again on the validation rules that were provided for .jobs. But then I can certainly take your word for it and certainly do that. I just, before doing that, I wanted to have a chance to check. But if you can confirm that we can do that, that's fine with me, for sure.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Yes, I would suggest what we've come up with, there were some slight differences between what was in the .com/.net ones and what was in the .jobs ones, although they were both written in the same format. But I would suggest that what we would define is the IRT's proposed validation rules for all registries transitioning from thin to thick and just frame it that way and give people the opportunity to comment or not comment from there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Marc. Okay, so I think we can close this topic, and we'll take the action to circulate that information, which we'll run by you before we do again. So unless anybody would like to make a comment – I'm getting a little bit of an echo. Okay, thanks. So unless anybody has any other comment or question on this slide, let's move to the next one.

JOYCE LIN: Fabien, I have a question.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, Joyce, please go ahead.

JOYCE LIN: When we uploaded the existing registration, only the Contact ID and Auth Info are required. What about the other fields that later on will be required? Have we had any discussion on that before at one of the meetings that I missed?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. I understand you're asking whether we've discussed the validation rules for new registration or for any registration once the migration of existing registrations is over, is that correct?

JOYCE LIN: No, I'm not worried about the new registrations. New registrations definitely will have all the required fields submitted, right? But I'm talking about the existing registrations when we migrated it to the registry at that time. Because we are trying to expedite the migration of all the existing registrations, so we eliminated as many fields as possible, right? Now it comes to only Contact ID and Auth Info. But then what about the other Address Info and everything that [registrars] eventually will require? Do they need to validate those too?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think we started discussing this as part of a subsequent question which we'll get to in a few minutes.

JOYCE LIN: Oh, okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: But I think the discussion there was the minimal validation rules would apply until a certain date after which any update to contact information of data that have been migrated would be subject to the regular validation rules and requirements. So we haven't discussed precisely the extent of those, but I assume that they would be similar to the validation rules that apply to new registration. But that might be a topic for those questions which we'll get to in a few minutes. Is that okay?

JOYCE LIN: Okay, great. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Before we get there, I just wanted to prioritize a bit the discussion on the timeline for the migration of existing registrations. We haven't had a chance to discuss this in much detail yet, so that's why I wanted to bring this up in order of addressing the questions.

What I gathered from last week is that we've had a discussion on those four points here. The first one is the fact that we need to determine this cut-off date after which we're not applying the minimum validation rules which we have been discussing so far. That to me is the actual cut-off date for the migration of existing registrations, I would think.

But I'll leave that for everyone to discuss, so let me just open it up here for this bullet here, anybody who would like to contribute to that. The

answer to me seems clear here that the cut-off date would coincide with the end of the timeline for migration of existing registrations. Is that a correct assumption? Is this a common understanding or an understanding in line with other IRT members' understanding? Okay, Theo, thanks for your confirmation. If nobody objects to that, we'll just move on with that understanding.

Then we had a topic of discussion which was the potential need for a way to estimate the throughput of the system on contact creation because I believe this was seen as a key parameter to determine how long we would need for registrars to migrate their existing registrations. I think Jody or Roger had shared that, for GoDaddy, there would need to be about 160 million creations of contact. So there was a concern that until we can estimate what the system will accept in terms of throughput, we would not be able to determine precisely what should be the timeline.

Let me stop here and see if anybody would like to share further thoughts on this. Theo, please, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yes, thank you. Basically, we were discussing this earlier this week on Monday morning. Basically, what is says there is the question that we are asking here. We need an estimate there. Also, we talked a little about connections. Maybe Marc can weigh in on this. Do we get more connections regarding this matter, or how are we looking at this? Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yes, we did discuss that in reference to another open question about the actual migration of data, on that topic, and wondering whether there would be dedicated EPP connection. That was an open topic. Marc, would you be able to share some input on that at this point?

MARC ANDERSON:

I can try. I guess I don't have a lot of answers at this point. On the way to estimate throughput on contact creation, I guess we've talked about two methods: EPP or bulk. If somebody were to provide us an input file of contacts they wanted created and we imported them directly into the system, that would have one timeline. But as far as estimating throughput on contact creation, especially if we're talking about the creation of 160+ million contacts, that's a fairly challenging question to answer.

I guess I should also point out though that, for most registrars – that's really 2,000+ registrars – most of them, the volume isn't high enough for it to be particularly concerning. There are really only a dozen or so registrars that have high enough volume that we do have to have some concern about the throughput in order to make sure the system continues to operate in a stable manner.

So I guess that's not a very definitive answer for any of those things. I need a little bit more time to come up with the more thorough responses to that. But I think those are all good questions that we need to have addressed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc, for the input, and may I ask whether you think you would be able to provide a first sense of an answer in two weeks with the overview system changes. Would that be enough for you to provide a [first approach] for that?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, absolutely. That seems reasonable.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Great, thanks. It seems to me that since you've made a distinction between a certain subset of registrars that might need quite a substantial throughput compared to others, I wonder whether that might be a [inaudible] the implementation plan. I'm not exactly sure that would be of a level that should be in the policy implementation plan, but it might be something to be considered in the registries' implementation plan. So I just wanted to share that in case that might be helpful.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, that's a good point. I think an action item for me would be to provide what that cut-off point is. Maybe below a certain threshold it's a non-issue, above a certain threshold there may be additional considerations that need to be made. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Great. Thanks a lot, Marc. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, just a quick question for Marc. I'm getting into the specifics on a really technical level here, but from my recollection [inaudible] there are two different types of connections with Verisign. There is some [inaudible] EPP server you could connect to and there are literally no limits so to speak, and there is what are just classified as the regular connection but there are connection policies that are applying there. I'm wondering if you will hit any issues there with those policies. I'm hoping I'm making some sense here. Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, thank you, Theo. Yes, you're essentially correct there. We have two connection pools, one of which as you described is essentially designed for bulk or batch activity, specifically around the registrars competing for deleting domains, but it could be used for, for example, the bulk creation of contacts. So, yes, you're essentially correct. There are restrictions in one, the other one is designed to be a little wider open to facilitate the throughput of a large number of bulk commands. So I certainly envision something similar for the [back fill] of these contacts. Does that answer your question?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks a lot. Thank you, Theo, and thank you, Marc. I think that's quite helpful. So then let's move on to the next one. We had need to factor in

coordination of 2,000+ registrars, including potential non-responsiveness. That speaks more to the coordination of the overall implementation and migration. I think that's an important factor for us to consider in designing the implementation plan, whether there should be a .org style organization in terms of groups of registrars or whether that should be more open, any registrar can come at any time. I think it would be useful if anybody has any ideas there or experience so that it can inform our definition of the implementation plan.

Let me stop here and see if anybody has any input at this stage. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. I got pretty strongly opinioned feedback that we should not try and create windows, I think, as it were like what was done on the .org transition. The feedback I got from some people involved in that was that did not go well. Trying to coordinate the number of registrars we had then into those brackets or windows didn't work all that well, and we have exponentially more registrars today. Trying to coordinate that is just not practical, so we should leave it wide open. I think with a 12- to 18-month window, that should give enough of an opportunity to spread things out. Although I guess there's always the risk of everybody waiting until the last minute, but I guess I just wanted to share that I got pretty strong feedback that putting people into windows didn't work well for .org. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes. I'll circle back to what Marc just said. How do you envision this then? Maybe my perception is a little bit off here, but from what I just gathered is we leave it wide open is in the sense like we leave this up to Verisign to coordinate it in that time window of 18 months and the IRT isn't going to touch this. Is that right? Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc, would you like to respond?

MARC ANDERSON: I'm not sure I understand what you mean. My thinking is that we just have this 12- to 18-month window where registrars are required to transition from thin to thick, and they're free to do so at any point during that window, whatever their schedule and timeline, whatever is appropriate for them. My thinking was that we don't need to get more involved as far as creating – I think Fabien brought up the concept, and I understood that in .org they tried to schedule certain registrars to go during certain times. For instance, weeks 1-3, 40 registrars would transition during that week, and during week 4-6, other registrars would go. They tried to create these windows with registrars going at different times, and that did not work well. That was just the feedback I was given. Does that help at all?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, in the sense that is a pretty good example of now how to do it. If it was not working with .org, then we definitely should not follow that

path. I'm still a little bit curious about just leaving it open. I don't see the action neither from the registries nor for the registrars if something is open. I mean, where's the enabler in this? It sounds a little bit too open for me, but maybe I'm just not getting the open part here. I don't see how we can get things going there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo.

JOYCE LIN: I've got a question for Marc.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, go ahead, Joyce, please.

JOYCE LIN: Yes, same line of the question for Marc. I don't remember how our guys did it when we uploaded all the .org, it has been so many years. Marc, do you know what kind of problems .org had when they put the windows for certain registrars in this window [for us and not a certain registrar]? [We've got to know] exactly what kind of problems that they had so that we can compare if the open window for everybody, just do it whenever you are ready, what might have some kind of problems arise which the .org method that didn't have. I would think that if they had problems, then you're thinking about an open feel for everybody might have other kinds of problems. So I think it's probably worth it to find out exactly what kind of problems that .org had before.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Joyce and Theo. I guess Theo first. [Honestly], first I agree with Theo. Leaving it wide open reduces the driver. It comes with its own risk, and I alluded to that. You run the risk of everybody waiting until the very last minute and then running into unexpected problems or getting swamped at the end. So fair concern, and I don't know that I have an answer to that.

Then, Joyce, I was not involved in the .org transition, so my information is second- and third-hand at best. But I understand that the windows were too small. Trying to fit registrars into those specific windows was difficult. Some were ready; some were not. Then the number of requests from registrars for specific windows – some wanting to go sooner, some wanting to go later – and just trying to facilitate getting that number of registrars into those windows and doing their transition activities during those specific windows was challenging. I don't know the exact number of registrars [inaudible] then, but I know it was considerably smaller than the number that exists today. So I think it was, again second- and third-hand feedback that I received, but the feedback was that from a practical perspective it was really just unreasonable to try and fit that number of registrars into specific windows where they would perform their migration activities.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you. Go ahead, Joyce.

JOYCE LIN: I would think that if you have solicited the registrars, said, “Okay, when you are ready, just let us know,” and after OT&E testing that registrars ready then can send you an e-mail or fill out a form from your website or something that we are ready. Then you would be able to know how many registrars are ready the first week, the second week or something, and you can, “Okay, go ahead,” just do it right now. So you would get a pretty good idea how many registrars that are ready, and then you decide from there either open up free-for-all or fill up the window. Something like that. Okay. That’s just my thinking.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. Thank you for sharing in the discussion. I also see a comment made by Theo in the chat. “How about an early bird promotion for early migrating registrars?” Actually, I was going to go there and ask whether [inaudible] members could think of incentives that could exist for registrars to envision the migration sooner rather than later. But I guess that could be for a subsequent discussion as well because I want to be conscious of time here. Theo, yes, please? Go ahead, and let’s draw a line under yourself on that topic.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, real quick here. Even though I made a suggestion with a smile there, I’m pretty serious about it. If you look at the DNSSEC and the [inaudible] registry, they used the stick method there. They gave us 28 cents discount, and almost the entire [.nl] zone is signed now for DNSSEC. So just thinking out loud here, but it does work there. So if the

registry could do something there, maybe we should do something there also. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Okay, keep that discussion going on the next meeting, and in the meantime if anybody would like, that's certainly open for discussion on the mailing list until we get to the next meeting.

I just want to note that we have a last point here which was discussion regarding what should be in the policy implementation plan and what should be a part of the registries' plan that's shared with the registrars. So that's maybe not specific to the timeline, but that applies to any of our discussion. So I don't think that's per se an action item here or a topic to close but more of a reminder that in our discussion we probably need to make a call of what goes into the policy implementation and what goes into the [document] or plan that the registries will share with its registrars.

Unless there is any objection, we have three minutes left. Marc, yes, please?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. Just real quick there. As we're getting to some of the finer details on this, I think this is an important point that we should keep in mind. What are the items that should go into the actual implementation plan versus maybe things at a high level? We talked about this last week around what we define for bulk access, bulk upload of contact data. I think what we decided is from an implementation plan

level we just say the registry will provide a method and the registry will define what that method is based on the validation rules we provided. I thought that was a good approach, and I just ask that we be conscious of that as we start dealing with some of these “Devil-in-the-details” type items. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. Let me just browse through the slides that we won't have the time to discuss in detail today but that will be available on the website on the community wiki right after the meeting and which we can either discuss on the mailing list or in next week's meeting.

I've merged Questions 5 and 6 which are about the type of rules that should apply to the registrations that are transitioned, once the existing registrations and once they're migrated, as well as the handling of transfers and the complexity around that.

Let me just jump ahead here. The other question was what you mentioned, Marc. What is going to be set up for the bulk transfer for the migration of the actual data?

How can we minimize the amount of “throw away code”? I think we've pretty much closed that topic, so just maybe a bit of discussion to see if Jennifer wants to provide some details here so that we can have [inaudible] that.

Question 4, synchronization of new and existing registration tracks, I think we've pretty much closed this one, but I'll let you [appreciate] if you can review the slides.

I just want to get here to the Updates very quickly. Consistent Labeling and Display. The ball is in our court right now to draft and share revised Consistent Labeling and Display implementation proposal for the IRT review.

Regarding the Translation and Transliteration policy implementation, as you may have seen on the mailing list earlier today, we've shared the call for volunteers that we've issued for a separate IRT on this subject and a separate implementation. I just wanted to note that.

Finally, for our next IRT meetings, here is the list of our next meetings. We've suggested last week that we would go for a weekly pace until Helsinki. I see in the chat that there is a bit of [traffic] regarding the timeslot for the Helsinki meeting. We don't have that information yet, but we'll share it with the IRT as soon as we have it. Until then, we'll just be meeting again each Tuesday at 18:00 UTC like today.

Let me stop here and see anybody has any final comments, questions, remarks. Hearing none, thank you so much again for your time and participation. Please feel free to share any questions or subsequent comments on the mailing list, and we'll be in touch regarding the various actions that are on our side, and we'll be talking to you next week. Thank you again for your time today, and have a nice end of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]