
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the Thick Whois IRT. And today is May 10, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux with the Global Domains Division of ICANN. Let me start with a quick roll call. I see with have Amr, Joyce, Marc, Roger, Sarah, even Theo from the IRT present for this. Am I missing anyone that would join on the phone bridge? Tim, not hearing anyone.

So two reminders before we jump into our agenda discussion today to make sure your line is muted when you are not speaking. This meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purposes of transcript, please don't forget to state your name when you speak. And finally, if at any time, you would like to join the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

So our agenda today, as we discussed on the mailing list, our intention today is really to focus as much as we can on the transition from thin to thick and try to further the discussion in both areas of this registration track and the new registration track. Pulling up on some [inaudible] that happened on the list in the last few days, the budget.

And then we'll just provide a quick update of consistent labeling and display. I understand that Steve made a suggestion that he has made on the previous call so we'll get to that at the end of our call and make sure we have enough time to discuss that.

Any comments or questions on the agenda today?

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.

Hearing none, so let's jump into our first agenda topic. I'm hearing a little bit of echo. I'm not sure where it's coming from. Will you please make sure your lines are muted? Okay, that seems to be resolved.

So let's move on to our discussion of the transition from thin to thick. So here, a quick reminder for those that may not have been on our last call or would be listening to the recording later, this is to remind everyone that we are discussing an implementation [path] for the transition from thin to thick that would have two parallel tracks, potentially each with their own timelines: the new registration track which would deal with new registration in the dot-com and the dot-TLD and another track which would be for existing registration.

We are working against timeline assumptions for the [inaudible] of an implementation plan that are here on these slides. So we would share the implementation plan for public comment in the fall and we would target a policy effective date announcement in January 2017. And we discussed in the last meeting that our target is to transform this path that we are currently discussing into a plan by August 2016.

Barry, I see you have a question? Oh no, sorry. Apologies, Barry is joining the meeting.

Okay, so let's start with existing registration because this is the area where we had the most discussion recently on the mailing list. So I'd like to start with that. I'm not going to go over this slide again, just to mention that our discussion is following up on those exchanges regarding options that have been proposed for the implementation of the condition of the existing registrations.

We are at a stage where there were a number of open questions. A majority of IRT members supported an option with the least possible validation of data during the transition and the registry. And I believe this was Marc, in particular, who suggested that we should consider some kind of middle ground between those two options with data validation and without data validation.

So let me move on to the open questions and load here. So those are the open questions that we had from the earlier conversation on the mailing list and our last meeting. I have compiled the contributions that we've received up until today on the mailing list. Let me load this so that we can take them one by one and have a focused discussion on each of these.

I would like to mention here that this could be the structure of a potential scorecard. We still need to finalize that piece and see how we can support and assist the progression of the discussion in the next few meetings. But let's now get into the substance.

In terms of the first open question with respect to the transition of the existing data, there was a question as to how it would be organized and what would be the nature of the data transfer that we would consider which we refer to as [bold] transfer with minimum validation of the data.

And we received two comments on the mailing list here, one from Roger Carney who suggested that we should have two registrars, should have two options for transferring the data, a file option and a dedicated

EPP connection option. And Jennifer, I believe, reinforced the notion that the file option should have the defined specification.

So let me stop here and see if there is any additional information, those commenters would like to share or if there are any questions or additional contributions from other IRT members. I'm not hearing anyone, not seeing hands raised so maybe let me –

Theo? Yes, please?

THEO GEURTS:

Yes. Thank you, Fabien. I'm in support of what Roger put on the list there and I added a little comment there that we need to make sure that multi-byte characters are being supported or non-ASCII. And if that's the case, then I think they're all good to go there. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Oh yes. Thanks, Theo. So I realize that I copied your comments in the wrong [inaudible] side. Thank you for correcting that.

THEO GEURTS:

No worries.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Maybe, are there any potential objections to having two options? Is this agreeable to everyone on the IRT to consider offering two options for registrars who transfer their data?

Maybe let me ask one additional question and that is, who would bear the work of defining the specification of the five formats? Would there be an expectation that the registry that would define the specification? Roger, please?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, not to put Marc on the spot or anything, but yeah, I would think that since they're going to be doing the import of their data, that they should probably be the ones defining the spec for the file.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. I don't know if we have Marc. I believe I saw Marc. Yes. Marc, do you have any contribution on this subject? Yes, please. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Can I ask that maybe we adjust the order a little bit? Item number three is should there be a minimum set of validation parameters and I think if we can come to agreement on what the validation parameters will be, then I'd have a much easier time answering item number one. The question is file options should have a defined specification, i.e. format size, etc. I think once we have consensus on what the minimal set of validation parameters were, that'll make some of the other steps fall into place a little bit easier. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marcus. We have some agreement to your [proposal] so let's go ahead and discuss the third question first. Should there be a minimal set of validation parameters? And then we'll come back to the other questions.

So on that topic, we received the info that is on the screen here under three. Roger suggested that those three parameters, [inaudible] we need the minimum set of validation and [inaudible] me on it.

Any additional comments or suggestions here or questions as to some of the details of what those validation parameters should be? Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Fabien. Marc, do you want actually the IRT to come up with the specifications or do you perhaps want to have the registrars come up with those specifications there on those validation parameters? Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. I guess if we could use the validation rules that I provided previously, if we could use those as a starting point and – thank you for putting that up there. If we could use that as a starting point and I think what was suggested is we make changes to this. So if we can, using that as a starting point, if we can come up with a sort of consensus on what that document should look like, that'll be sort of a common

understanding that we, as the registry and registrars, can implement against. So obviously, we can make changes to this. I think I requested this in our previous meeting or in the discussion group is we'd be a little sensitive on the field length. There's very real repercussions there to increasing or I can't have unlimited field length or increasing the size obviously has impact on us. So I'd like to keep at least some level of max length validation in place. But aside from that, I'd just like to, using this as a starting point, come to an agreement on what the contact validation rules should be. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. So should we maybe take the fields one by one and try to have a first approach to what would be an agreement of the IRT for each of these? Would that make sense to you, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, that sounds good to me.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. So maybe if there is no objections to doing that, let me synchronize the document here and we can take them one by one. So there is the contact ID field. Are there any input on whether this one should be required or not and whether max length mean and max length are appropriate? I see that Roger is not seeing the document. Oh, it's the same for Theo. Okay, so let me stop sharing again and restart the sharing.

Marc can see. Okay. Let me unload and load it again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fabien, [inaudible] here in LA. Some of us could see it. Others could not see it. The one thing that seemed to be – oh, now we can see it. One thing that you did before that make it work is don't maximize the width. Just an idea to try.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Okay, Sarah, [inaudible] for you now. Okay, Jody seems to have issues. So I'm trying to adjust the zoom here. Does that changes anything for the ones that were not able to see the document? Sarah, is this changing anything for you? Jody? It's just a gray screen. Okay. Okay, let's see.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fabien, instead of sharing a document, share your screen. Sometimes that works better for people, I noticed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. So let me try to do that. Hey, bingo. Okay, so I see that you're seeing the document. I haven't changed anything so it seems that it's taking a bit of time for Adobe Connect to refresh. So you should be able to control the document in each of your Adobe Connect that we don't create any desynchronization issue. Let me know if you're not able to control the document.

So what I was trying to do is take us through each of the lines of this table one by one.

So the first field is contact ID currently marked as required. I understand that this was part of the... Yes, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Correct me if I'm wrong. I think we have to have a contact ID. I think it's required. I think registries and registrars use this as a unique identifier so I think this one needs to be required and so we need to have some minimum level of validation on this one. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc.

JODY KOLKER: I agree on that, too.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Jody, and I think Roger agreed to that as well on the mailing list.

Any additional comments, objections to that? Okay. So unless there is any, it seems like we're moving on with the contact ID.

In terms of field, any additional comments? Is the range here from 3 to 16 characters appropriate for everyone? Okay. Hearing no comment, I see a check mark from Theo, so we'll move ahead with that as well.

How about the various information that we have underneath, postal info type, name, organization, address, city, state, zip, country, phone.

Any comments on whether any of these should be required or not?
Theo, please?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, it should be. Hang on a second. Am I off mute? Yes, I am off mute. Yes, I think we should actually have that. What is actually not clear to me, it is a UTF8 and 30 year. But this does support multi-byte characters there because we have a boatload of registrants in the Middle East and they use all these fine symbols there in their names. I want to make sure that we can migrate their names correctly through Verisign Whois server. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc, is this something you can address on the fly or should we keep that for later?

MARC ANDERSON: I guess I can't be sure, but I suspect UTF8 covers all your use cases. I would hope so, but I guess if not, maybe we can revisit this one.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay.

JOYCE: I have a question. Fabien, hi.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hello.

JOYCE: The address is not required. If it's not required, why bother to talk about if the UTF8 is applicable or not? Is it just a temporary not required, or forever not required?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think the document as it stands suggests that the address is not required.

JOYCE: It looks like the whole address is – the only thing required is country.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Just in the table it's the city and country, actually.

JOYCE: Yes, city and country. I'm sorry. Yes. And so the address is not required anymore? Street number or anything?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So in the current proposal I think that's the case. I think we're trying to determine whether there is an agreement among the IRT of whether this should be the case or not.

JOYCE: If ICANN is asking for the public Whois data accuracy then there is no way that ICANN can come and say, "Hey, you don't have the address for this [inaudible] domain name [inaudible]." Is that what's going to be in the future?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce, I think the proposal that was put forward by staff at this point for the transition registration is that the minimum possible checks being proposed so that the transition could proceed on the fastest track possible, and considering that the thick Whois policy did not include specific requirement with respect to accuracy of the data, and assuming that these requirements stem from current agreements that apply to those registrations, they are independent from the transition of the existing registration data. So those requirements would remain and stem from current agreements but not from the implementation of the policy.

Marc, I see you have your hand raised.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, Fabien. Thank you. If I could, I think the IRT is not trying to make a statement on what data is required or not required here. I think that what we're talking about is what validation rules the registry would apply to the registrars. And so I think what we're talking about right now is separate from what data registrars are required to capture and what data is required to be displayed. I think that's a different conversation altogether. I think here we're solely talking about what

validation rules the registry will apply to registrars when uploading the data. Thank you.

JOYCE: Okay, thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you for the clarification, Marc.

Are there any other comments with respect to whether there should be validation of any of those contact-related fields under contact ID [inaudible]?

JOYCE: I have one more question, Fabien. Sorry. Can I have another question? The postal info is three is a minimum or that's maximum or could be from one to three? Because normally in the United States we just use one. Or is that from one to three or has to be definitely three?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: From my reading of the table, Joyce – but then Marc will certainly confirm – either LOC as a value or INT. Is that correct, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. The way it is now, there is two possible values: LOC or INT, so the field length would always be three characters long.

JOYCE: And that's a requirement – three characters?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. So this is the postal info type, whether it's localized or internationalized.

JOYCE: So it's info type. That's not the country code, is it?

MARC ANDERSON: Correct. That's different from country code. That's a postal info type. Just from a background standpoint, initially we had ASCII only support in Whois and the postal info type was added later as a bootstrap to try and add support for non-ASCII internationalized characters within Whois. So it's just a way to differentiate whether you have traditional ASCII characters or if you're supporting internationalized character sets. If that's helpful at all.

JOYCE: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay? Thank you, Marc. Jody, please go ahead. Jody? Are you on mute maybe?

JODY KOLKER: If we're discussing whether city needs to be included and country, from our standpoint we'd just like to see none of that or not required.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So Jody, you're talking about the city and country information. How about name and postal info type that are currently required now?

JODY KOLKER: Yes, we're fine with all of that, with all the Nos that are on here for required. It's the city and the country. In order to speed implementation of this, to not have a validation of having that be required for city and country.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Any follow-up on this suggestion? Steve, please. Steve?

STEVE METALITZ: I'm sorry. I think I was on mute. Can you hear me?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I can hear you loud and clear, thanks.

STEVE METALITZ: Okay. I was just going to ask on that last suggestion is that the only things that would be required would be the name and the e-mail address and the [inaudible] info?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Steve, you're referring to the second page as well where you've identified the –

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, I'm just trying to figure out what's the totality under that last suggestion what would be required. So I guess it would be contact ID, postal info type – I'm not sure what that adds if you don't have any address – name, e-mail, and [authent], right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody, would you like to respond to Steve directly, or should we go to Theo in the queue? Okay, we'll go to Theo and please Jody, if you'd like to answer Steve's question please get in the queue. Theo, please.

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Fabien. Though I understand that we want to have a lot of flexibility here and I'm in support of that, I would like to caution the IRT that we should not end up in the situation that we are migrating almost zero information – only the name and the e-mail address in this case – if that is the only two requirements in case of a mass [book] or registry transfer, I do not want to end up like being the receiving registrar who has to correct all the data. I definitely want to go there. So just pointing it out there. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Jody?

JODY KOLKER: I agree with Steve on a couple of points there, but all that we would like to see is just a contact ID and auth info. And I understand the point of we may have problems with some registrars that are not uploading all the information or maybe they're just removing that and never uploading the information and that would be a problem. And I think that that would be a problem in invalid Whois as they don't provide Whois information themselves and they're only looking at the registry for that information. The customer is going to be in violation and could possibly lose their domain name if that information isn't sent up there.

From our perspective, Steve, I see your point that when the domain is transferred in, if there is no information in the contacts then when you try to create the contacts to make sure that you have them in your registrar, yes that could be a problem if the contact validation is updated in X number of years, where that information is now required.

I'm not sure how best to fix that unless we're going to – whatever the contact validation is going to be in five years and we require that now. And if we require that now, this is going to be very, very, painful I think for a lot of registrars. I know from our perspective that we have some contact data that is just not very good that we've gotten from transfers ourselves that are very incomplete.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Jody. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: I just want to tag on with what Theo and Jody were saying. The reasons we're looking for minimal validation on these is not because we don't want to supply what we have, we just want to make sure we can get everything that we do have loaded. And maybe that is something we do have to discuss. We don't want to degrade Whois by not supplying data that we have, we just want to make sure Whois is the same before and after the transition.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Roger. So are there any dissenting voices to the idea of only requiring the contact ID and the auth info, which I understand to be the suggestion by Jody and Roger? Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. I guess I'd like to get back to the IRT on postal info type. I'm not comfortable agreeing that we can make that optional. But to be honest, I'm not sure about the ramifications of that. So on that point, I guess I'd like to ask that I can get back to the IRT on that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Marc, just to follow up on that. You're thinking maybe we have to pass in – and I'm not sure that there's an issue with this, but – we may have

to pass in the postal type though the rest of the postal information could be left blank. Is that what you're saying?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, exactly.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, yes. I guess from my standpoint, I don't see a huge thing in passing the postal type or not. But if you could confirm if we need to or not, that would be great.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. I'll follow up. I'm just not sure on that one offhand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you, Marc, for taking the action. So should we move on our discussion of the other open questions with the understanding that we would move forward with the requirement of a contact ID and an auth info, and that would be it? I see that Steve, you have your hand raised.

STEVE METALITZ: Yes. I'm just kind of looking at this from the viewpoint of the user experience. I don't think this is thick Whois as the policy mandates if the only thing that appears at the registry level are those two items. I understand this is for contact validation and that if there is other information available it can be supplied unvalidated, but what requirement is there for the registrar to supply it?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Steve, I think that maybe we can handle that and that it would be the discussion of this is for existing registrations. New registrations wouldn't have the same validation. It's the existing registrations. And again, like I said earlier, we're not looking to degrade what is in Whois, we're looking for Whois to be the same after the transition as it is today on these existing registrations.

STEVE METALITZ: I understand this is for existing registrations, but as I understand what's being proposed here, much less information might be available about the existing registration at the registry level than what's required to be available at the registrar level.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. What I'm saying is I'm not suggesting that we provide less information than we provide today. I'm suggesting that we provide the same amount of information but the validation rules have to be relaxed to let us get that data in because different pieces could be missing on different contacts as they do today.

STEVE METALITZ: I understand that this isn't simply about validation, but I just think we need to make it clear that all the data has to be supplied, that's all. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Steve. Any additional input? Yes?

JOYCE: I have a question for Roger. He said that validation is different from verification, right? So if it's just a validation that means that you can just put any name in the city and anything in the country, and as long as the field is not empty and then abide by the number of characters rule, then that would pass the validation. Am I right or wrong?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, validation is more than just –

JOYCE: Make sure the field is not empty, yes.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. Technically validation is empty or not. You're either choosing to make it empty or not. So validation would allow an empty field as well.

And again, I think that that's going to have to happen due to the current registrations that exist.

JOYCE: Wait a minute. You say if it's empty, it's still allowed?

ROGER CARNEY: Right.

JOYCE: Then what does the require means? Doesn't require mean it needs something in there?

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And that's what we're saying as required. Required would be contact ID, the auth code, and the others would not be required depending on Marc's –

JOYCE: [inaudible] address issue. I think that the whole address one and the [inaudible] one city and country and zip code, right? State, whatever. And right now the city is a requirement, [inaudible] but the address is not required. So what I'm saying is if it's required, then it needs to have something in the field. It cannot be empty is what I'm saying. [inaudible] can be empty?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, Joyce. We have a hard time hearing you. You're cutting off.

JOYCE: I'm sorry, okay. I said that if the city is required, that means that it cannot be empty. But, Roger, you said that it can be empty? Maybe I misunderstand something here?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. I'm saying that we're recommending that city and country and those not be required for that reason so that they can be left blank.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So Joyce, if I may reinforce, the proposal is that this table would change. It would only show required for contact ID and auth info. All the other parameters would be marked as non-required potentially, and it's only the open question of postal info type. This is the proposal that is put forward for us to move forward in our discussion.

JOYCE: Okay. So you're going to change it to not required on the city and country. Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thank you, Fabien. I hear some divide here, so to speak. Is that maybe an idea to put this to the registrar list and see what their feedback is than just a few of us discussing this back and forward? Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Any response to that suggestion from Theo? Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: I guess just a question for Theo on what he thinks are the sticking points here. I don't see a problem taking it to the registrar list, but I just want to hear – and from anybody else, really – what the sticking points are of just requiring those two fields, and whatever Marc comes up with, I guess.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, I'm going to respond to that, Fabien. Roger, I'm actually not sure. I think we are sort of making – maybe it's just me, maybe it's just [inaudible] here. I have a feeling we're making an on-the-spot decision here, and I'm not sure how this will play out after the migration, and that worries me a little bit. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Again, I don't have a problem taking this to the registrar list. I'm not sure that I'm hearing anything that people are demanding anything else. But again, I'm not opposed to taking this to the registrar list.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: May I suggest that we try to explore the other open questions based on this assumption, see where that takes us and then come back to your suggestion, Theo, as whether there should be some form of consultation of the registrars [inaudible] group. Would that be agreeable to you?

THEO GEURTS: It would be fine with me.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks. So I think we have a first approach to what could be an answer to question three, it would only be a requirement for contact ID and I think for now, with the respective length, we're waiting on Marc to confirm whether the postal info type would be required, and we may need to validate the max length as per what Marc had shared before and Roger agreed to in the meeting.

So now, should we look again at the other questions? I want to be conscious of the time, we have 15 minutes left. We want to safeguard a few minutes at the end to provide a very quick update on [inaudible], so let's see if anybody has any specific input on any of those questions that we have, the other questions, one, two, four, and five.

So let me unsynchronize the document so you can browse through the document, and let me give you the floor, if anybody would like to contribute to any of those questions. Marc, please.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. On the first one, how would the book transfer work? I think Roger's proposal makes sense, having two options. I think being able to do things over EPP, I think that would be an option regardless. I think that would be sort of assumed, that you would have the option of doing things over EPP.

The second option would be something that would have to be built, and that maybe leads into question number two as far as throwaway code, but building some capability for the bulk upload of files could be done. As far as the question on undefined specification, I think the validation rules we defined for number three really informs that question. So really, the bulk upload, the specification format size would be based on the validation rules from number three. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Should we discuss more the file option and the rationale for offering this additional option? Yes?

MARC ANDERSON: Are you asking me or is that a general question?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: That's a general question, and potentially for Roger, who suggested we consider the second option. Yes, Roger, please.

ROGER CARNEY:

Again, for the volume of [inaudible] that we have, I don't think we would use a file transfer. I think it would just cause us a lot of extra work, but I was just putting that in there as an option for other registrars. And as far as the dedicated EPP connections, all that I was trying to suggest there was maybe some additional connections just to process this off the normal connections that we have today. Other than that, I don't really have a whole lot to say about the file, because I don't think that we as GoDaddy would use it, but I think other registrars would like that idea.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Roger. So maybe we could also here move forward, assuming that there would be an EPP connection or an EPP channel for sure, and that as an option for future consideration, there could be another option, which is supposed to be some kind of file transfer option for now. Would that be agreeable to everybody on question one? Okay, thank you for the checkmarks, not getting any objections to that, moving on.

Question two we've discussed a bit, and we are addressing it when we are assuming that to question one we answer by an EPP connection option for sure maybe. I don't know if, Marc, you'd be able to confirm at this stage in terms of first approach that [they created] and that they passed could be used for the purpose of the transfer. Yes, please, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. I think Roger's point there is that using EPP you're at least using some of your existing code paths, so I guess I just agree with

the statement there. I appreciate efforts to minimize throwaway code, but I think there's going to be some. Essentially, we're talking about a one-time effort to backfill millions of legacy registrations with contact the data. Some amount of throwaway code's unavoidable here, but to the extent that we can minimize that, that's certainly appreciated.

Also, I wish Jen was here. I'm not sure what she means by "If registries were to agree on a uniformed SDK, that would be appreciated." I guess I'd like to get her to elaborate on that. Certainly at least from a Verisign perspective, our TLDs use the same SDK, so from that perspective, I guess there wouldn't be an issue with the uniform SDK. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Marc, and thank you for touching upon that second point from Jennifer. I guess we can follow up with her after the meeting. Unless there's any question or additional comment regarding the minimization of throwaway code, let me try to move on quickly to question four, five, and six. Let's try to cover those in five minutes. Any comments on any of these in addition to what was shared on the mailing list already? Marc, please.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. Yes, I do think we should keep the new and existing registration tracks separate. As Roger says, there's no need for delays in one to impact the other. I think there's different issues, so we should keep them separate.

I also agree with Jen on focusing on new registrations first, mostly because I think they're easier. I'd rather tackle the easier one first, that's my personal preference I guess as far as that goes. But I do want to raise something here, I think now is a good time to point this out. For new registrations, sort of at the point the registry opens up the system to allow thick data for new registrations, there's nothing that would prevent a registrar from starting to backfill thick data for existing registrations. I don't see that as an issue, I just want to raise that to make sure everybody's aware that at the point that we start accepting that thick registration data for new registrations, it would be possible for – there's nothing systematically that would prevent the backfill from starting for existing registrations. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, Marc, could you explain it a little bit to me? What do you exactly mean with backfill? Maybe it's my Dutch kicking in today, my English is dropping down here. I'm not getting it. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Sure, Theo. We talked about two tracks, one for requiring thick contact data for new registrations, and a separate track for the backfill of thick contact data for existing registrations. Now, for the track of requiring thick contact data for new registrations, what we've proposed is sort of a two-step process. First step where we optionally allow registrars to

begin adding contacts, and then at some point we would have a cutoff period where registrars would be required to provide thick contact data for new registrations.

THEO GEURTS: Yes, I get it. Thank you. Not to interrupt you there, just keep on going if you'd like, but yes, just being clear. Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, fair enough.

THEO GEURTS: Okay, thank you.

JOYCE: Roger, I have a question. I have a question about the new and the [inaudible] the existing one, the contact.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce sorry, you're breaking up again.

JOYCE: Sorry, can you hear me?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, it's better.

JOYCE: Will Verisign provide an OT&E for the new registration and also the contact transfer?

MARC ANDERSON: Joyce, this is Marc.

JOYCE: Marc, I'm sorry, yes.

MARC ANDERSON: The plan that's been put forward so far – I don't know if any of you have that handy, but assumes that there will be an OT&E period and that it would be available – your question was that the optional and the required field there Fabien has proposed milestones. I think we're proposing that – the short answer is yes, but we're proposing an OT&E for both periods, and that we believe our contract requires us to have an OT&E of at least 30 days prior to production.

JOYCE: Okay, thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc, and I think that's where the discussion of the registry registration [inaudible]. Thank you for making that bridge, Marc. We haven't talked about the open questions related to what are the

consequences of the minimum validation on the data that's transferred on future transfer registrations, so I think that's going to be a question for us to address over the mailing list, before our next meeting. I just want to hear, stop a second if there's any specific comments on the new registrations, additional information anybody would like to provide, or a question.

So I think we're going to try to focus some discussion on the mailing list of this topic as well, so that we can get to a place where the timeline can be refined a bit here, based on the current estimates that were shared in discussions to date. So then for the last three minutes, unless there is any objection, I'd like to take us to a short update of consistent labeling and display. A few reminders here.

As in every call, we discussed and shared an e-mail as well in the mailing list last week for the IRT's input on the question and the proposal that we've put forward in our response to the public comments we received. So that's still up, and we'd like to get your input as soon as possible. We currently have the date of tomorrow as a deadline. Since we haven't heard or we haven't seen any recent contribution on the mailing list, is it because the date too aggressive? Do we need to revise this deadline? Anybody have any thoughts on this?

THEO GEURTS:

Yes, this is Theo. If you could set the deadline a little bit further into the future – I'm not sure about anybody else here, but if I'm looking at [inaudible] from ICANN itself, it is killing me already, and then I've got a job to run. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. Okay, so how much time would you need, Theo, realistically?

THEO GEURTS: Next week is the GDD, so end of the week, I guess.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: End of this week, or next week?

THEO GEURTS: Next week is not going to be very productive when it comes to these [IRTIs], so if you can move it over to – yes, I'll go for next week then I guess, and not everybody will be at the GDD, so maybe we get some action on the list. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you Theo. Marc, I see that you have a plan to respond. We'd appreciate seeing your answer [inaudible] for sure, and Theo will push the deadline a week ahead. So after the long days of GDD, some of you should have some [inaudible] respondents. Does that work?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Regarding the bonding of the TNT implementation, translation and transliteration implementation, we've constantly been on display. As you may be aware, it has been added to the GNSO council agenda for discussion this Thursday, the GNSO council meeting. There was a suggestion from Steve on the mailing list that we make it clear that our intention is not to delay the transition from [simplistic] part of our implementation. So thank you, Steve, for reminding us of your comments, and that's currently what we're documenting.

So please stay tuned for the discussion, and I would like here to remind everyone that we will schedule our next meeting not next week, but the following one, because of the GDD summit next week, and in the meantime we will be in touch with you over the mailing list. Any final comments or questions from anybody? Hearing none.

KRISTA PAPAC: [inaudible]

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes.

KRISTA PAPAC: Sorry, just real quick. Hi, everybody. Krista Papac from ICANN staff. I just wanted to mention that for the Helsinki meeting, we heard your feedback about wanting to have an IRT meeting there if possible. We're still working through the agenda, folks are still working through agenda, so I'm not sure about room on the agenda, and I'm told that the focus of the meeting is to make sure we have enough time in sessions and

whatever for PDPs, but we are trying to – I'm working with the GNSO to see if we can get something on the agenda, so as we know more, we can certainly update the IRT. But just kind of a heads up that we're working on that and trying to see if we can pull the session, or even – yes, at least pull one session together so that we can continue the good work that's going on here. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Krista, and thank you everyone for joining today. Thank you for taking the time, and we will be in touch via the mailing list, and see you all Tuesday in two weeks. Thank you very much.

JOYCE: Thank you, bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everybody.

THEO GEURTS: Have a good one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]