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, 7th of June 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux, with the Global Domains Division of ICANN. Very quickly, a roll call of ICANN members we have on the call at this point.

I see Judy, Joyce, Mark, Roger, Steve, Theo. Am I missing anyone from the IRT?

Okay, a few reminders, a few usual reminders before we jump into our agenda and discussion today. Make sure your line is muted when you're not speaking. The meeting is recording and will be transcribed. For the purpose of the transcript, please don't forget to say your name when you speak. And finally, if at any time you'd like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect.

All right, so let's review our agenda today. As you might have seen on the mailing list, an hour or so ago, I shared a score card, which was suggested as an approach to keep track of our discussion regarding the transition from thin to thick. So we'll take a look at that, and I've sent a copy to you in case you would like to review the actual documents, [inaudible] at the Adobe Connect.

So we'll take a look at this score card, and then we'll continue our discussions of each of the tracks of the discussion of the transition, which will remain the focus of our meeting today. And we'll quickly look at next steps at the end of our meeting. Any questions, comments on the agenda?

Okay. I'm hearing none, nor seeing any hands raised. So let's take a look at the scorecard. I'm going to share a version here. So, first of all, let me say that this is a first approach to the scorecard, so please feel free to provide your input in terms of the form as well as the content. The idea of the scorecard is to help us for the, let me de-synchronize the document here so you can browse the document on the Adobe Connect if you like.

The purpose of this document is to help us keep track of our discussions, and clarify among all of the questions or other items we identify, ones that are open, the ones for which the discussions are ongoing, or the ones that are closed. So the card is explained here. What I have done is that I've taken the slide we had maintain [inaudible] now and put them into rows.

I've identified each of the items as closely as possible to the numbers we have been using already. As you can see, we have a new registration track. We differentiate the items we're tracking from the new registration track on the first page, and the registration track on the second page, and the following pages.

So, we're taking each of the question open items that arises, we then review the status. It's either open or closed, then we decide on either

what's agreed upon, what's closed, what's currently being discussed when it's ongoing, and [inaudible] means that we need to have a discussion.

Let me stop here to see if there are any questions in general with respect to the scorecard. And as a reminder for those that weren't us at the beginning of the call, this was shared on the mailing list so you can have access to the actual version of the working document of the scorecard. So Mark, please, go ahead.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. I want to thank you for doing this. I really hadn't had a chance to read through all of the details on this before the call, but before [inaudible] this is excellent. It's a great way to keep track of all of the items. I feel like we've had a lot of balls up in the air, so to speak, what items we're juggling, and you know, I think this will help us keep them straight and on track.

So thank you very much doing this. I think it's very helpful. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Mark, appreciated. Sarah?

Sorry, I'm getting confused here, Sarah is entering the room, she's not in the queue. And I see a comment by Roger in the chat, suggesting that we release all of the closed items at the bottom of the table, so we can certainly do that for sure, if that's helpful.

Right now, I started with a Word document, which I think is probably going to actually evolve towards an Excel file. So we'll see as we progress through the conversation.

Okay, so then let me re-synchronize the document here. And let's maybe start for, start reviewing each of those elements and see what discussion we need to have on each of them. So let's start with a new registration track. Number one, the milestones for the transition of new registration from thin to thick. So I've considered this one closed, it seems that we have these milestones around for quite some time now.

And so until somebody would like to reopen this, we'll just consider that this is the current agreed upon proposal, as far as milestones on the path to transition, new registration from thin to thick. Any comments, reactions, questions, on this one, number one? I see a check mark, thanks Roger. Mark as well, thanks. Okay.

Number two, timeline, estimate for the transition of those new registrations. Here, it's ongoing because we have a current proposal that's on the table, and explaining some more input in particular of Mark and registries in terms of a primary overview of system changes, which would allow [inaudible] of the timeline, and that's expected for next week, per our conversation last week.

And then that would be [inaudible] for registries and registrars to agree on a more detailed timeline. So that's still ongoing. Next step is next week. Any comments, questions? Now I want to note here in terms of substance that the current proposal that has been discussed is an

estimate of a timeline that we will be between 18 and 24 months, although for the transition new registration.

Any comments, questions on number two in the registration track? I'm not hearing any, not seeing any hands raised, so let's… Oh, I see Steve. Steve, yes please, go ahead.

STEVE: Yes, thank you. This is Steve. So this 12 to 18 months, presumably, when you have, once a detailed timeline is agreed that would become one number, right? So that it would be say 12 months, and then you would say the overall is 18 months.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, exactly, thank you Steve. I think that's being sent. Right now, we are tending a rough estimate, which the IRT was, got to at this point, but yes, we would seek to have a defined, stable, unique timeline, as opposed to a rough estimate of a range of times. Does that make sense?

STEVE: Yes, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Steve. Any other question or comment? So I believe, on this topic of the timeline of the transition for new registration, our key

milestone is next IRT meeting next week, once we've, we're going to hear back from Mark. Mark, is that still okay and on track for you?

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. I'm still working to meet next week for that, yes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, excellent. Thanks so much for your confirmation. All right, let's move on to the existing registration track. So, as I mentioned earlier, I try to stay as close as possible to the numbering we have used so far. You may remember we had a number of questions that emanated from discussions on the mailing list, which were moved into our slide. Under each of those key questions, we had five originally, went up to 67.

We had departure from each of those questions of additional discussion point, which are listed here as 1A, 1B, 1E, for instance. So the missing letters between B and E, were respond to what we had as C, D, which we strike on the slide. So I tried to remain coherent with our previous slides, so that in case you want to go back to the slide of our previous session, you can, [inaudible] and make sure that we've not missed anything.

That being said, so now maybe we can review of each of these, and discuss what, or any updates that IRT members would like to provide. So, number one, doc transfers. So here, this one is heading a few other sub-questions or items. We've been discussing options that would be provided by registries for a doc transfer of registration data. The base

proposal was that this been done through EPP, or in terms of bulk itself, but at least the channel would be open for continuing the transition of [inaudible] registrations.

There was a discussion of potential [inaudible] EPP connection for the needs of those that would like to submit high volumes in a short amount of time. So I think that's been addressed by Mark as part of the feedback we're expecting next week. And Mark can tell me if that's not the case. We also had a discussion, that's… I'm on number 1B. We had discussed potential alternative options, such as a file transfer option, which we haven't discussed in detail.

So that's why it's only a slide here as open as opposed to ongoing. And recently, Theo suggested we potentially discuss further an option revolving around data escrow, to complete, to achieve the transfer of data registration to doc. So let me stop here and see if anybody has any comments on any of those questions and open items related to the doc transfer.

Theo, go ahead.

THEO: Thank you Fabien. This is Theo. Yeah, regarding about 1E, I see some severe handicaps there. And I'm not sure if we actually want to dive into that one. I did suggest it, but I'm backtracking right now, unless people do want to go there, but I think we are opening a can of worms there, at least I assume there is going to be loads of work there to get the escrow providers to assist us.

And I think there needs to be modifications on there, and to even transmit to VeriSign there. So I'm not sure we want to go there, but that's my thought. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Theo. So I'm happy to remove the item, [inaudible] from the discussions on the mailing list earlier today, so again, I will remove this if nobody wants to explore this further. I think what you just mentioned is consistent with the feedback we got our belief from the meeting with the registrar stakeholder group back in Marrakech.

So that's why we had not further discussed it. But let me start sharing that. Roger, would you like to go ahead?

ROGER: Yeah, hi this is Roger. I just wanted to throw something on there. We may want to put in there, you know, some of the reasons why we don't think it's valid. Just in case if someone asks, we can say, hey this is the reasons we came up with. Instead of just removing it. I mean, we can remove it, but let's also tag it saying hey, this is why we removed it.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you very much Roger, that makes a lot of sense. Theo?

THEO: Yeah, this is Theo for the record. Yeah, I agree with Roger there. If people are going to ask questions, we just consider it, and we've got some reasons not to do it. Okay, thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So point well taken, and [inaudible] got in an [inaudible] of the scorecard. Okay. So let me just kind of get a sense of where we stand on the alternative option, the file transfer. So I think we had discussed that this would be confirmed and potentially defined by registries based on the validation rules we have.

                          So I would just like to get a sense of where we are on that one, and whether that's indeed an open item that we need to further discuss. And if anybody has any view as to how we should go about this discussion?

                          So that's 1B I'm talking about, let's see if anybody would like to contribute any thoughts to this one? Mark, please.

MARK: Thanks Fabien. This is Mark. One on item on the bulk transfer option or alternative, I guess, is there is really, at least to my mind, there is kind of two actions that need to be performed. You know, one is the sort of, you're calling it a book transfer, but it's really the book creation of contacts, right?

                          So previously we had no contacts in the system, and we'll be opening it up to enable contacts. So there is sort of this bulk activity to create all of these contacts. And that's something that can be accomplished, we

EN

can create or define a file format, you know, and registrars would pass that, pass the raw files to us in that format. And then we would upload those contacts in bulk.

But that's really only half the activity. You know, the other half is then, okay, once you have these contacts created then there is sort of this second action to update the domain names. So here, we're talking about the back fill for existing registrations. Once we've got contacts created in the system, there is a second activity where the registrant, admin, and tech billing contacts would have to be associated with those existing domain names.

So, yeah, I guess I want to see if there are comments from registrars on that, like how, thoughts on how they would envision that happening, what they do just the bulk upload of contacts via file, and then do the domain name association over EPP. I know, you know, Roger and Jody have indicated a sort of preference for doing it, all of EPP but I guess I'm wondering what other thoughts are as far as the best way to handle those two separate but related activities. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Mark. Theo?

THEO: Thank you. This is Theo for the record. Just to answer Mark. At least for us, [inaudible] register, we want to do the contact, handle contact creation from [inaudible] so thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. And I think this alternative option was a hypothetical in case there was interest in other alternatives. So I'm wondering if there are, there isn't specific interest in the IRT for these alternatives, how we should approach this topic for registrars who are not present in this IRT?

So if anybody has any ideas or suggestions, it would probably be interesting to discuss. I guess we'll always have the option to include in the implementation plan only an EPP channel and see if two public comments, other party requests, consideration of other ways.

But let me stop here. Mark, I see that you have your hand up.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. Yeah, I guess, yeah I think… The registrars we have represented here have an EPP preference. But in my experience, there are, there will be a fairly large number of registrars that will request or require a bulk option. And I'm, you know, I think I'm perfectly happy if we read it more open-ended from an IRT perspective.

If we just say, you know, the registries will offer a mechanism for the bulk upload of contact data. I'd be… Certainly from my perspective, I'd be perfectly happy if we left that open-ended and leave it to the registries to define what the format is. I think we've already identified what the validation rules are, so obviously, it would be based on those validation rules. But if we left it up to the registries…

And also, you know, I'm kind of hoping that it's enough to just provide a bulk mechanism to upload contacts, and the second activity of associating existing registrations with those contacts can be done over

EPP. And certainly a bias, but from my perspective, that would be just fine. Thank you.

JOYCE: I have a question. Joyce.

                                Hello?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It looks like we lost Fabien here.

JOYCE: Okay, I thought I lost myself. [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: …Fabien is coming back on, please go ahead. Sorry about that.

JOYCE: I have a question for Mark, this is Joyce. [CROSSTALK] Yeah. Regarding the, create the contacts. I assume that all of the registrant contact, ending contact, billing contact, technical contact, they've already been created, right?

MARK: This is Mark. So do you mean by the end of the process? Or in order for one domain to be updated from thin to thick?

JOYCE: When you said the first that we upload or create all the contacts, so we need to create all of the registrant… I mean billing, the technical, we have to create all of them, right? [CROSSTALK] …we're ready to, okay. And then when we're ready to upload the domain names, then we… Which contact should we use to base on, that this domain name is associated with that contact?

Should we use the registrant contact?

MARK: You need all four of them. The registrant, admin, tech, and billing.

JOYCE: Okay. So in EPP when we upload a domain name, then we have specify the registrant, all the contacts that we uploaded, right?

MARK: Correct.

JOYCE: Okay. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you Joyce and Mark. So if we're done with the number one question on the bulk transfer, maybe we can move on our scorecard here. So I'm moving on to two, and 2A, those are related to the desire

to minimize the amount of code. I think we've closed those ones, agreeing that providing an EPP code task, we would be reusing as much as we can.

As far as the [inaudible] registry, okay. We've agreed that unless you wanted to reopen that item, we would keep it as closed, because it is addressed to what ICANN already provides in terms of [inaudible]. Let me stop here if anyone has any comments or questions.

Hearing none, moving to number three, the violation rules. So, so far we've been discussing… We've made a lot of progress there, and we've determined that for now, the proposal is that there will only be contact [inaudible] and also for validated by the registry systems to minimize impediment to the transition and ensure that all available data can be loaded into the registry system.

We had three cite a discussion permit, actually four of them. And the first one is closed. As part of the conclusions, we arrived to. 3B, so this was a discussion of what were the requirements for registrars to supply all of the available data. And that was [inaudible] I believe who introduced that question. And we, in the last meeting, agreed that, or we got to a point where there is an agreement around the principle that input, the [inaudible] should be the same before and after transition.

So the same amount of [all of this?] information should be provided by registrars. And I believe Mark suggested that we include a note in the transition plan, that the validation rules that are proposed to be implemented by registry systems, are not meant to change any of the

contractual requirements that exist already with respect to the provision of contact data.

And so I think the only element that were potentially open were further discussion of incentive, or potential enforcement of those principles. So that's for 3B. Let me stop here, see if anybody has any comments or questions so far.

Can I maybe ask if Steve, that does address your [time]? Because I'm not sure if you were with us last week. Steve, yes, go ahead.

STEVE: Yes, thank you. Yeah, I was not with you last week. I just looked through the transcript, and I think those points under agreed, under 3B, address this. I'm not sure exactly what is pending sort of incentives or enforcement. I may have missed that in the transcript, so I'm not exactly clear on what is still open from your perspective.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Steve. I don't… You know, if I can remember, I believe nothing is open and we can close this question. I think we're happy to consider the discussion over there. I believe these were trailing topics that we may align to discuss around there, but again if nobody in the IOC believes we need further discussion there, we can close it.

So let's see if anybody would like to further discuss this, or if we can consider this one closed? Any comments? [CROSSTALK]

JOYCE:	Yeah, I don't think the registrant is going to pay any incentive to do that, so we should probably close this one. And if there is a deadline to go over everything, then after the deadline, if the registrar has not uploaded everything, then he just cannot go with this registration, this is there anymore. So there is a kind of urgency for there, for every registrar to do it as soon as possible.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Okay, thank you Joyce. Theo, I see you are in the queue.
THEO:	Yeah, thank you Fabien. This is Theo. I'm not sure we should close this one. I'm pretty sure there is not going to be an incentive here, meaning that it's going to cost millions. So that's out of the question there, but I'm not sure if we should close the discussion on it yet. There might be some ideas that we can float, that make it a little bit easier for everyone else.
	I will post something on the list next week regarding this topic. So I wouldn't close it yet. Thanks.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Okay. Thank you Theo. So we're looking forward to your input. I'm just taking note here, okay. So 3C, we have discussed the need to gather input from the larger groups, the larger stakeholder groups, registries and registrars on the finalized contact definition rules. So [Music]…
	We're hearing a bit of music from somebody here.

[Music]

I can't find this, okay. So, 3C, let me see if there is any comments there. So I believe we would want to suggest that potentially since yourself, Mark, and Theo, you were the main proponents of that gathering feedback, would be appropriate, but you carry the document that we discussed last week, in terms of the final rules that were proposed by the IRT to the respective stakeholder group.

Yes Mark?

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. Yeah, I certainly have no problem taking this back to the registry stakeholder group, and you know, providing an update and asking if they have comments or feedback on it. You know, as I mentioned before, I'm not sure that they will have comments, but I thought it was appropriate to give them the opportunity, at least, to comment and provide the update.

I think last week, though, we talked about, you know, maybe providing a little context if there is some kind of background paragraph or blurb that might go with that, if we have anything there that could be provided as well, that would be useful. But otherwise, yeah, you know, I'm perfectly willing to bring that to the registry stakeholder group and request there for comments. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Mark. Theo, would that be okay for you to carry that over to the registrar stakeholder group?

THEO: Yes, that would be fine. I just stepped away from the computer for a little bit.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you. So we'll just keep this one open until we hear, we're able to gather the feedback from the stakeholder groups. And then finally, 3B, I believe this is still open and the question relates to once the data is migrated, as far as the transition of [inaudible] registration, should new and [inaudible] registration be treated differently based on their creation date and applicable RAA?

So the current proposal there is that the minimum validation rules that we discussed apply to a certain point, until certain date, and after that date, the regular validation rule apply to any new or changed contact data.

And is this, yes Mark. Please go ahead.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. Yeah, so on this one, I guess the question was, should new and existing registrations be treated differently? I request and I guess recommend that, no they're not treated differently. I think that adds a level of complexity for registries and registrars, yeah, I don't think we want to tackle.

You know, I think this is what's sort of outlined in the comment section, is basically the proposal is that we have this minimal validation rules,

EN

and you can tell a certain day, and that would apply for both new and existing registrations. And after that day, regular validation rules apply, and that the regular validation rules apply across the board.

And sort of last week what we discussed was that the logical defined date, for the cut over date for that, is the end of the back fill period. Whatever we end up defining as the period of time for registrars to back fill existing registrations, once that period is complete, then the transition from the minimal validation rules to the standard validation rules would apply.

You know, I think we sort of ran short on time last week, but that was sort of what was thrown out there, and I think that makes sense, and I support that proposal. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Mark. And what you were speaking to was number seven here. So let me just jump here quickly to number seven at the bottom of the table here. Where in terms of the timeline, we discussed that the start date would be the announcement of the policy effective date, and the implementation fund, and the end date would likely be that cutoff date, which we talked about where regular validation rules would start to apply.

So, Krista, I see you're in the queue.

Krista: Thanks Fabien. Hi everybody, Krista [inaudible] from ICANN staff. And I missed the last IRT meeting as well, so apologies if I should, if this was

EN

discussed. I just want to make sure I understand that what we were just talking about, Mark and Fabien, was the minimum validation rules, and the different dates.

Are we saying, is what's being proposed, the minimum validation rules, I think, are that document that's been floating around, that's got a list of all of the data fields, and there is like a minimum of three fields that are being proposed as a minimum validation rule. So, based on that document, are you saying the data would be transferred for registration, minimally, those first three fields on whatever schedule gets set up, and that the rest of the data would have to be transferred by the end of the implementation period?

Sometime between, you know, when it's initiated but no later than the last day of the implementation period? Am I understanding that correctly?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, would somebody like to respond to that? Mark, yes, go ahead.

MARK: Thank you Fabien. This is Mark. I was hoping to put Fabien on the spot there, but [CROSSTALK] on that one. So I'll take a shot at it. So the minimum validation rules were proposed to make it easier for registrars to migrate their existing legacy data to the registries, to the registry system. How they get there and when they do it, is really up to them.

EN

And if Fabien, if you can jump back to the previous page there, I think yeah, item one there, bulk transfer. Registries… Sorry, I'm looking for the [inaudible] that Steve raised previously…

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: It's number 3B.

MARK: 3B, ah!   Thank you.   So 3B there, yeah, the validation rules, this minimum validation rules is just, was just proposed to aid registrars in back fill on this legacy data, and it's not meant to imply or mean any changes to the amount and type of data that they're required to collect and supply. You know, the idea here is to reduce the validation at the registry is doing, but not implying any changes otherwise. Does that help at all Krista?

KRISTA: I think so. I'm sorry Mark, I wasn't trying to put you on the spot, or anyone else.   I just wanted to make sure I was understanding the proposal. So because I have a follow-up question, if I am understanding the proposal, but… Is it…? They're transferring as much as they can, or are able to, based on their own sort of operational planning, and that data, some of it can come early on in the implementation cycle, and…

So is it possible, or is it possible that a registrar could transmit, transfer, I don't know how many fields there are. Let's say it's 30, I'll just pick a random number. They could transfer, initially transfer 10s of fields, and then by the end of the implementation cycle, the way that it would be,

this would be laid out is that it would be, there would be a date in a point of time where they would need to have transferred all 30 fields. That may come 10 at a time, it may come 30 at a time, it may come one at a time, it could be any of those things based on sort of the registrar's planning and operational implementation.

Is that an accurate understanding or no?

MARK: Krista, this is Mark again. I'll take a first stab at that and maybe some of the registrars on the call might want to correct me, but yeah. There is nothing in our plan that would prevent what you've described. That would certainly be possible, I think the intent of us to give registrars as much flexibility as possible during this time period to transfer all of this data.

So they may choose to do what you've described, but I don't think that's, yeah. That's the only way or necessarily the way we've envisioned doing it, but that certainly is possible with the proposal as it exists right now.

KRISTA: Okay, thank you for clarifying. And you made me think of a second follow-up question. My original follow-up question doesn't really apply now based on that. But the… You had mentioned validations at the registry level, based on the registry validations, and I'm not the most technical person so I apologize if this should be obvious to me.

But based on the registry validations, could it prevent data from being accepted? Like it would go back to the registrar and they would have to do something to the data and retransmit it? Or is that true or not true?

MARK: This is Mark again. I'm not sure I understand what you're asking, but the amount of validation the registry does to the data is pretty limited to start with. And we're, you know, we'll be relaxing what little validation we do have. There still is some validation that will be there, for example, like the phone number field still needs to be numbers.

So if a registrar tried to submit a phone number that was letters instead of numbers, then that would fail, for example. Does that help?

KRISTA: Yup, exactly. Thank you for interpreting my poorly formed question, but yeah, that was exactly it. Thank you so much, I appreciate it.

MARK: No worries.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, sorry it has taken me a bit of time to come off mute. So, we were talking about 3B, I just want to make sure here, 3B, the validation rules and how those minimum validation rules apply, ask only before the [inaudible] that back fill or transition of existing registration data, I want

EN

to make sure here whether we think this is still open or closed. So let me see if anybody has any [inaudible]… Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE: Yes, thank you. This is Steve. My question really has to do with, I'm seeing several different timelines here and defined dates, and I'm not very clear on how they all fit together. So in 3B, the minimum validation would apply to a defined date. Now that is not necessarily tied to the transfer of the data. I think that was the last exchange we just heard.

But how does that, how does that fit into the overall timeline that's in seven? [Inaudible] cut-off date after which regular validation… I mean, I'm trying to understand what we're talking about. It's the same type of time period that we are for the new registrations? The 18, 24 months? Or are we talking about some more limited period?

Just trying to understand what's the point at which the user of WHOIS data is going to be able to find all of this data validated at the registry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Steve. So let me share a bit of information from last week's meeting. We discussed, so I think, sorry if the language here is not clear, please excuse my French, that might be where it's coming from. The idea is indeed that three is coherent with seven, so the defined date would actually be the end date of seven, so that's the time where we call the transition of the existing data over that data being transitioned under those minimum validation rules.

I just want to show here on the table, we had seven in 7B, which is the elements are still open in the discussion of the timeline, before we're able to put a number in terms of how many months we think this will take. So my understanding of the current discussion of the ROT is that there are two tracks that are separate so far.

That separate timeline, we had the new registration track, that's the timeline we talked about earlier in our call, and we have a separate timeline for registration, which we're trying to get to. We're not quite there yet, we've not been able to discuss numbers in the IRT because of the two painting item that you see here.

So 7B, so I hope that clarifies the picture to you Steve.

STEVE: Yes, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you. So, if you allow me, I see we have 12 minutes left, so let's see… Can I get a sense of where people think we are on 3B and what we just discussed? Can we close this one or should it remain open? Let me see if people agree to closing this one? I don't see any checkmarks. Okay, so I'll take that as a [inaudible] open unless we decided to close.

Okay, moving on. Number four, should we aim to synchronize new and existing registration tracks? At this point, we've closed the discussion earlier in the month of May, because there was sort of an agreement that we should keep those two tracks separate to mitigate any cross-influence in terms of potential delay.

So I hope that also speaks to your question, Steve. I see a check mark from Roger, okay. So we'll leave that the way it is. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE: Sorry, I agreed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: All right, thanks. Okay so, moving on to five or six. So these two are items relating to the handling of inter-registrar transfer. So, the first one is how should inter-registrar transfer of registration be handled, if the information is incorrect or incomplete?

And so that speaks to a… So I assume, my understanding is that it's a registrar transfer of an existing registration, that would be incomplete either during the transition or after, and the proposal is not to prohibit that transfer. And I believe we were left at a place where we need some kind of confirmation from the registries.

And so the second element before I open it up, I just want to mention it. There was also this question of, how should we handle inter-registrar transfer during the transition where registrars gain registrars, and the original registrars are at different stages in the migration of the data from a think to thick?

So let me stop here and see if anyone has any comments on those two items.

Go ahead.

EN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Looking at six, I don't think there is an issue actually, but maybe I'm missing some information here. I'm not recalling a discussion at the moment, but I don't think there is an issue there, but [inaudible]…

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Maybe can I call onto Jodi, if he is with us, and Roger, yes, please, go ahead.

ROGER: Yeah, hi, this is Roger. I think Jodi's concern on it was… He was mostly concerned about getting the data from the registry or not, and I think you're right. I don't know if there is a problem, because we can always do what we do today, and get the data from the registrar instead.

It's just, I think that he was concerned, if we started transferring, someone had the data or someone really didn't have the data to registry, how would we get the data? And I think that the answer to that is we just fall back to what we do today.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: [Inaudible] you go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm recalling the discussion now, and I recall the discussion with the [inaudible] and yeah, basically just what Roger just said. I mean if

we can pull the data from the registry, then we just pull it from the registrar, or vice versa. So yeah, I think we can close this one.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, that sounds good to me, unless anybody has any other opinion. Roger, is this an old hand, new hand?

ROGER: Sorry, old.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks, Roger for this retelling of Jodi's name here. Mark, yes, you go ahead.

MARK: Thank you. This is Mark. This interested me in a while, you know, it feels like that there might be a corner case in there, you know, thinking it through a sort of forced scenarios. If neither registrar has migrated from thin to think yet, and then the transfer occurs after today. If both registrars have transitioned, then it should, then the transfer should occur just like any other transfer.

So I think, the other two scenarios, if the gaining registrar is thick, but the losing registrar is not, right? Then is there any kind of issue there that has to be accounted for? I think what Roger and sorry, what Roger and Theo have stated is there shouldn't be because they can still go to the, the losing registrar and get that data, right?

The other scenario though, I'm wondering about, is what if the losing registrar has transitioned to thick, but the gaining registrar has not yet, is there any kind of issue there that could occur? Where the gaining registrar, you know, later tries to do their transition to thick, but they're not, they haven't yet got in all of the data.

I guess, again, this is more major, Roger and Theo, if you can help me think through that whole scenario, but are there any kind of corner cases there that should be concerning? Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, yes, you go ahead.

THEO: Yeah, maybe there is an idea to, yeah. Maybe it's an idea mark that if you put those corner places on the email list, perhaps then we just maybe have some few scenarios, and then we, or at least I will check back with our development guys and see if they still see any issues there. Is that an idea to move forward here? Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks Theo for offering that. Mark, does that work for you?

MARK: Sure, fair enough, sounds good.

EN

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, excellent. Thank you all. So I'll just keep this one as open. Joyce, please.

JOYCE: [Inaudible] …over, that everybody migrated [inaudible] before that…

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce, sorry to interrupt. You're breaking up. Do you mind starting over?

JOYCE: Okay. Maybe this issue can be resolved, that everybody just keeps their [inaudible] open, until [inaudible]… So then when you, any registrar try to get the [inaudible] registrant information still go to the same registrar [inaudible] get that. So everybody keeps the WHOIS open until the [inaudible] everybody moved over.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you Joyce for that suggestion. Any comments, reaction on that suggestion? Theo, yes, go ahead.

THEO: Yeah, I think we just, well we're going back to the other suggestion that we just put a few scenarios on the list, and if what Joyce is suggesting fits right in there, then we might already be looking at a solution there, but maybe not, but thanks for the suggestion, Joyce. I guess we'll look into it.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thanks Joyce and Theo. So let's have that discussion on the mailing list then, and we'll mark this number six as ongoing, accordingly.

Before we, so three minutes left, let me just mention that as far as seven, 7A, 7B, I think here we're waiting on 7A from Mark related to potential way to estimate system protocol, actually have information in that realm so that we can potentially discuss details and timeline.

And I want to refer to a discussion we had last week as far as whether there should be any sort of management of the 2,000 plus registrars during the window of transition, whether there should be any measure to group those registrars or not. And I think the current proposal by Mark is that the window, a single window be open for registrars to come to the registry system and transfer their data.

I think we mentioned, we discussed potential issues with [inaudible] and towards the end of that closure of migration window… So I just wanted to mention discussion there, and see if anybody had any comments or follow-up there.

Theo, Joyce, is this a new hand or an old hand?

JOYCE: Old hand. Sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Theo?

THEO: Thanks. This is Theo for the record. Yeah, I think Mark's proposal is the way to go there, and we just need to flesh it out and get some detail in there, and there are several routes there to take, so to speak, to get a more managing factor into it. But we need to discuss that in one of the upcoming calls. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you Theo. Any other comments, questions? Seeing none, hearing none, so I'll try to share this updated scorecard on the mailing list as soon as possible so that it can also serve the discussion to be had. I just want to go back to the slides just to very quickly get to our last slide here. I mention that we're working on the [inaudible] and display, revision of the implementation proposal which we'll get to you when ready.

And our IRT meeting will be next week at the same time, 18:00 UTC on Tuesday, the 14th of June. Thank you all so much for your time today, and we looking forward to your engagement on the mailing list.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]