
FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the meeting of Thick Whois IRT on Thursday, 11 February, 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux. I'm with the Global Domains division of ICANN.

Before we start, let me quickly do a roll call of the IRT members or experts from the affected parties that have joined the IRT last year. I have Chris Pellin, Marc Anderson, Sara Bockey, Theo Geurts. Am I missing anyone?

PAT KAINE: Fabien, this is Pat Kaine. I'm sitting in for Joe since he's on a plane today.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hello, Pat. Thank you for joining.

PAT KAINE: Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And I also see that we have Steve Metalitz with us. For some reason his connection got dropped. So let me know if I've missed anyone, otherwise I'll keep going with our meeting. I'll just pause a second here.

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.

JOYCE: Joyce here. [inaudible]

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, could you please repeat?

JOYCE: Joyce [inaudible].

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. Thank you for joining tonight.

JOYCE: Sure.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: A few reminders before we jump into our agenda and discussion today. 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. Finally, if at any time you'd like to get into the queue, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

The objective of our call today is to continue our discussion we started last year on the transition from thin to thick aspect of our policy implementation. Our agenda is the following. We will, as you may recall, our discussions have identified several parallel tracks that we're considering when discussing the implementation of the transition from

thin to thick. So we will discuss the existing registration tracks by reviewing the data analysis [inaudible] paper that we shared.

Then we'll move on to discussing some of the discussion points that were raised around this paper, and in particular the contact data requirement. There's been, as you may be aware, discussion on the IRT on this topic. We will use the opportunity today to continue this discussion.

Then we'll move on to discussing the new registration track, in particular with a starting proposal for milestones and potential timeline. And finally we'll end our call with the discussion of next steps.

So let me load the – let's start with the – unless anyone would like to comment on the agenda, I'll move on with our first section, that is the existing registration tracks, and the discussion of our data analysis [inaudible] paper. So bear with me. I'm going to load the document.

This is the paper that we shared. The purpose of this paper is to initiate a discussion with the registrar stakeholder group, with the view to recruit volunteers that would contribute to the conducting of a data analysis on existing .com, .net, and [inaudible] registration to understand the type of challenges we may face when implementing the transition from thin to thick.

So on this paper, we've provided a background to explain how the IRT came to this proposal for data analysis study. We've received here on this section a few suggestions from Jennifer, of edits, so we have those here. And also there was a question by Jennifer as to what was the plan for registrar outreach and recruitment. So for now we are only

considering discussing this paper with the registrar stakeholder group at ICANN 55, and that's the purpose of the paper and the timeline that we proposed in this paper.

Are there any specific questions or comments on the background? In addition to what was exchanged over the mailing list with Jennifer on this topic? I'm not hearing anybody. I'm not seeing any hands raised.

So moving on to the objective section. As I explained, the objective really is for us to obtain feedback from registrars in terms of the type of challenges that they may uncover with their existing data sets when considering the requirements of transitioning those existing data to a thick registration model.

Again, really the aim is to identify potentially challenges and quantify those challenges. Any comments on objective question? Not hearing any. I'm moving on to the scope of the analysis.

We've suggested that the analysis be conducted on a representative sample of registrars. We've suggested here 10 or 20 registrars, potentially from small to very large registrars. We've also proposed that this be conducted on a representative example of existing registrations, time-wise in particular.

There was a question here by Jennifer on whether such sampled data would be stored. Our proposal is that registrars conduct analysis as part of this study on their own data without necessarily sharing that data, and that the results of their findings may be normalized and shared within this work without any sharing of the actual data.

In terms of the objective of the analysis, we've suggested a few types of challenges that may be encountered, such as missing data, incompatible data formats, incomplete data, or the inability to contact registrants based on current data on record.

There was a question here by Jennifer. She was asking whether we were suggesting that the registries would have the right to contact registrants. That's for the purpose of this inclusion here. What we're focusing here is really analyzing the type of issues that we may face, and the scope of the implementation is really about the transition of existing registrations from thin to thick, and it does not including changing any – as we've written here – any of the rights or obligations under the registry agreement of the [inaudible].

A few of you have your hand raised.

THEO GEURTS:

That's correct, Fabien. Since there are a few more people on this call, and I recognize some people from the working group sessions, at least when I read the report, and reading the recommendations, when it comes to missing data, incompatible data format, incomplete data, I didn't reach not so much into the recommendations itself. It more had a recommendation that the format that should be used according to the [IRA] 2013 standards.

I couldn't find actually anything in the recommendations what we should do with incomplete data and missing data. If we're looking at incompatible data formats, that is just a matter of scripting. Marc will send us some information about it. That is just a matter of scripting. If

I'm looking at the missing data and incomplete data, I'm unsure if that is within the scope of this IRT. If somebody has some background on it or some more information, I would really welcome that. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Fabien. I agree with what Theo said. Strictly speaking, that's beyond, you know, as far as incomplete or inaccurate data, strictly speaking that's outside of the scope of the PDP and the IRT. However, I don't want to speak for registrars here, but I believe registrars have their own separate obligations for that data to be complete and accurate.

While strictly speaking it's outside of the scope of this work, I think it will be necessary in order for them to be able to [backfill] all the data. So if for some reason they do have incomplete or missing or inaccurate data, it'll need to be updated.

Of course, we've talked a bit in previous meetings about incompatible data format. This can be just a simple example. For some of these legacy registrations, is it last name first or first name last? Things like that. While a minor thing can be time-consuming from just the perspective of having to sort out that data. Does that help, Theo? Does that answer your question?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, it does. But still the question sort of remains. I agree, complete data is a burden of the registrar. It is a requirement. But I'm just wondering if we are not opening up a can of worms here and delaying a migration which is already rather complex given the size of it. If registrars got to chase down data first, that is a little bit of a worry to me though. Like we said on the last call, maybe we need to make an assessment with the registrar. They go first, then [inaudible]. I just wanted to point it out. I'll leave it there for now, but we need to go back on this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc, is this a new hand or old hand?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I just wanted to respond to that again. I think Theo is right. It is an additional burden, but I think in previous meetings, that's why the IRT came up with this idea. I don't know whose idea it was originally to reach out to the registrars to do this analysis. I think that's also why we've proposed sort of these parallel tracks, because this will be potentially time-consuming. So we proposed parallel tracks so that the one effort doesn't unnecessarily delay the other effort. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. And I think if I can speak to your question, I remember initially Roger [Kearney] suggesting that his company was going to do their own analysis, we I think ended up in a discussion where this could be worth involving other registrars. I believe one of the goals of that

analysis was to identify any type of challenges that could have an impact on how we could proceed with the transition and how long it could take.

If I remember correctly, one idea that was thrown around was to potentially proceed in the registration tracks with several [inaudible] or several types of registrations that some of them could be moved to thick while other types of registrations that challenge in the context of this transition could take more time. I think that's the spirit of why the analysis was proposed, I believe.

Does that sound accurate, correct, to you, Marc? And Theo, maybe?

MARC ANDERSON: Fabien, yeah, I think that's a fair characterization.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I agree there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. So I think here on the paper, if you think that we should revise the wording not to have readers going spinning on some other directions, we would certainly welcome your comments and suggestions [inaudible] language. This was meant to be really an initial list of types of challenges that we may face, and that should be identified and measured as much as possible. Again, if you have any suggestions, we'd be happy to revise the document.

Unless there is any comment or question on this section of the document, the scope of analysis, I suggest we move on. And we are actually reaching the end of the document, which we meant to draft as quite short, and as short as possible and straight to the point. I think Theo had suggested that we draft a document that really attracts the attention of the registrars and not be too dense. So I hope that we have achieved this without sacrificing the substance of what we're trying to accomplish.

The next section of the paper is the data requirements. I think here what we're meaning to do is to attach any document, such as the document that was shared by Marc on the IRT mailing list, which is the contact validation rules.

What I'm suggesting is that we move on to discussing this point of our agenda and come back to the next steps and timeline that we're suggesting here after we discuss the data requirements, if that's fine with anyone. Any specific idea on this topic? Anybody opposed to moving on to discussing the data validation rules that were shared by Marc? Okay. Not hearing anyone.

So let's move on to that, to discussing the paper. Let me just go back to our agenda so that you see where we are. So we're moving on to discussing the contact data requirements. We'll look at the document that Marc shared, and we'll pick up on the discussions that happened on the mailing list as well as the earlier discussion, that is on the requirements for the contact creation and the billing contact.

Let me load Marc's document. It seems to be having challenges to load. Let me try again. Marc, while I'm loading the document, could you please confirm that you agree with the idea that this document would be attached to the paper in the spirit of representing the type of constraints or requirements against which registrars should analyze their existing registration? Is that correct?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yes, Fabien. This is Marc. When we discussed the need for registrars to do this analysis, we also discussed in the previous IRT meeting is that for our registrars to do a proper analysis, they need to understand what are the exact fields required and what, if any, are the validation rules that go with each of those fields. I agreed to provide that information, and that's what this document represents. To your other question, yes Fabien, I'm fine with this being included as an attachment to the request to registrars for this analysis.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Excellent. Thank you very much, Marc. Are there any questions on the document? Would the participants like a review or an introduction to this document, or is this – have people had enough time to review the document? There are two specific discussion points, so we could move on to that discussion unless someone would like some more details about this document and these rules. So let me stop here and see if anybody would like to ask a question.

JODY KOLKER: Hi, this is Jody Kolker from GoDaddy.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hello, Jody.

JODY KOLKER: Hi. I'm sorry I was late to the meeting. I had one question from mark on the Address 1 field. It shows a max of 64. I was just wondering is there a minimum number of characters for Address 1?

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, Jody. No, there isn't. I think the Address Field 1 is one of the discussion points for today, but at least as this document is written, that field is listed as not required. So there would be no minimum there.

JODY KOLKER: All right, thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I see in the chat that Joyce is asking why the address is not required, so maybe that takes us into the discussion of that topic, on that discussion that was started on the mailing list. Maybe Joyce, would you like to speak to this discussion topic? Joyce, are you muted by any chance?

Okay, so I understand the discussion on the mailing list to be regarding whether the address is required or not – to be required or not for the

creation of a contact. Marc, would you like to respond to that question or comment on the discussion that happened on the mailing list?

MARC ANDERSON:

Sure. I guess I'll summarize. When I provided this information to the IRT, Roger [Kearney] brought this up initially, and he raised the same question that Joyce has raised. That's the fact that in this contact validation that I provided, both the address field and the phone field – sorry, I forgot the second field – the address and the phone field are both listed as not required.

Roger, as his e-mail astutely points out, that this is in compliance with RFC 5733. Don't worry, you're not required to know that off the top of your head. But for everybody else's reference, that RFC is the EPP RFC that specifically deals with contact information. The RFC that governs the EPP commands for transmitting contact information between the registrar and the registry. That RFC lists those fields as optional. Internally, I guess when we and [Verisign] were putting together this contact validation document for the IRT, we based it off of that RFC, which is sort of the standard that we had to go on. I think I'll stop there and leave it for discussion, I guess, from here.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Joyce, I see you are in the queue.

JOYCE:

Yeah. Why is the address field not required? I thought in other registries, all the EPP address is required.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I see we have Theo. Would you like to address that question? I see we also have Francisco in the queue.

THEO GEURTS: Thank you, Fabien. Yeah, I'm just going to echo what Joyce just said. I've passed this document on to our developers and they said, "Wait a minute, the address field should be required." That is just a requirement. You can't escape that. So that is basically our view [inaudible].

JOYCE: I think that the state or province – either it's United States it's state, the other countries maybe it's province. I believe that's also required. And a ZIP code is also required. All the other registries.

THEO GEURTS: ZIP code is, to my knowledge, required, but state isn't a requirement if there isn't one mentioned anyway. At least that's my take on it. Thanks.

JOYCE: Choice of state or province. Okay. Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, Joyce. I didn't mean to interrupt. Would you like to finish your sentence? Sorry.

JOYCE: Phone is also required. You say the phone is required if the phone extension is provided. That's funny.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Let's see, Francisco I see you're in the queue. Would you like to go ahead?

FRANCISCO: Thank you, Fabien. Looking at [inaudible] and I was thinking that I understand what Marc said, that it's based on the EPP [inaudible]. But I was thinking if these two [inaudible] are considered other requirements that are in the contacts and policies, like whatever the 2015 [RA] says is required for registrars [inaudible] what the [inaudible] says the Whois advisory or other things that may be there, I haven't looked at it. I'm just saying perhaps we not only need to consider [inaudible] but also other requirements that are in the [inaudible].

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Francisco. I think from that respect, we should also look at the consistent labeling and display requirements obviously that we are working as well on the panel. Marc, I see that you are in the queue. Joyce, is this a new hand?

JOYCE: No, that's an old hand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you. Marc, would you like to go ahead?

MARC ANDERSON: Sure. Thanks, Fabien. Thank you for everybody's comments. I guess my question is for Theo and Joyce, or my comment I guess, is for Theo and Joyce. You've listed and said some of these fields are required or must be required. But I'm wondering if you can point me to where this is – what's your source of information for this? It's interesting.

I think we'll talk about this a little bit when we get to the billing contact. I think there isn't a real authoritative source that I could find that would tell me that. I recognize that Francisco brought up the point, the consistent labeling display point, which does refer to the 2013 RAA. But I'm not aware of a thick Whois RFC, if you will. Whois itself – the Whois standard that we have today to work on – doesn't specifically address this. Sort of the only authoritative document that I could find to go off of was the RFC that Roger [Kearney] brought up. So I guess that's sort of my question or comment for you guys. Why are we saying it's required? I guess I'll pause there.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Joyce, you're in the queue.

JOYCE: Yeah. You know, if address and the phone and everything is not required, then how can you comply with the Whois accuracy laws? You

know what, I was off for a couple minutes. This page here is for registering contact, right? It's not just for registrant or any contacts, am I right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Marc, would you like to respond?

MARC ANDERSON: If you're asking me, yes. If you read what I posted on the IRT, I make the point that – contact, a contact is just a contact. It can be used as registrant, admin, technical, or billing.

JOYCE: Okay. And that information would be in the public Whois, right? When you query Whois, the address and everything, this contact information will be displayed, right?

MARC ANDERSON: If it exists and it's in the Whois output.

JOYCE: Yeah. So the address, ICANN requires that we have – we need to verify address, phone number and everything. And now you put it not required. That doesn't make sense to me. And I know that EPP, all the EPPs, .org, .info, other registry, those fields are required. You got to have at least Address 1. Address 2, Address 3 are optional.

If you check the EPP requirement – I [inaudible] get involved a little bit of development. Not much, but in the old day with .org, .info, that they first launch. Those EPP, they all require, [inaudible] use the similar if not identical EPP. Those Address 1 and the phone number, they are definitely required. But here it says that phone is required if extension is provided. So that means that if you don't provide extension that the phone is not required. That doesn't make sense at all.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So Mark, I see that you are joining the queue again. Maybe before going to [inaudible] would you like to respond to Joyce?

MARC ANDERSON: Sure. I mean I guess, to Joyce, this goes off of what's in the EPP RFC for contacts. I think that's specifically dealing with the information that the registry would, as a system, require or not require. Right? That has nothing to do with the information that you as the registrar are required to capture from the registrant. And our system won't prevent you from passing it. It just won't fail it if you don't pass it. So I would argue that if you feel that it's absolutely required, then you as the registrar would be sure and capture it from the registrant and pass it to us as the registry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc.

JOYCE: Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce, do you mind? Christa was in the queue. Do you mind?

JOYCE: Okay, we can wait. Because there's no point to going back and forth. But the previous page, you say that the registry will provide the documentation, and you will see when [inaudible] when they provide the documentation, Address 1, phone number, everything is required, I can guarantee you. Okay? [inaudible]

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. Christa?

CHRISTA: Thanks, Fabien. Hello, everybody. It's Christa [inaudible] from ICANN staff. I just wanted to delve a little bit on what Francisco, Joyce, and Marc were just discussing here. I think Francisco talked about the RFCs not being the only requirement related to this transition.

I think with respect to this specific conversation, which from a registry perspective affects .com, .net, and [inaudible], there's the RFCs, there's the contract, and there's consensus policy. I hear what you're saying, Marc, about what the RFCs say, and I don't actually know anything hardly about RFCs. That's Francisco's bailiwick. But I trust that you guys know – you're exactly right about what you're saying about RFCs.

The contracts for those registries talk about thin data, so there's no requirements about address or not because it's about the domain data and not the registrant data. The consensus policy is the other thing, and what we're all here working to implement, is I think would be what would be the guiding factor here. I have to admit, I'm familiar with what the policy recommendations say, which is all gTLDs should be thick and that we need to transition this data.

I'd have to go again and look at the final report. I'm working from memory a little bit. But I believe in the final report, when it talks about what the PDP working group felt was considered registrant data, I do think address is included in there. But I would think that should be our guide for defining whether address is required or phone number, ZIP code, or the various data points that you guys are referring to. And then I just wanted to comment briefly on – and I think the discussion Marc and Joyce were having about what the registrar contract requires them to do.

I'm not from the registrar team; I'm from the registry team. But I think that that is a separate requirement. Meaning, you're absolutely right, Joyce. Your contract requires you to have certain data. I think there's – I'm again, not as familiar with the RAA as I used to be, but there's certain requirements around how that data gets verified or validated and how accurate it needs to be, etc. I think that is a separate topic, that all gTLD registries must be thick and that registrars must transition the data to the ones that are not thick.

Again, just to reiterate that I believe we should use the consensus policy as the additional guide for what those data points should be. They need

to be transitioned from registrars to the three remaining thin registries
Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Christa. Joyce, I see you have your hand raised.

JOYCE: No. Maybe – no, I did not. Let me clear this. Okay, sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you. May I suggest that we add a reference in our scoping paper – so let me go back to scoping paper here. When we refer to these data requirements in our scoping paper, maybe we could add a reference to the fact that this is only meant to be the system requirements of the registries, and that the registrars would still be subject to the relevant obligations applying to their registrations. As Christa mentioned, in particular the consensus policy. Does that make sense? Does anybody have any comments on this suggestion? Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. First, well put, Christa. I think you summed that up quite nicely and I agree with what you said. Fabien, to your question, I think that's a good clarification to make. One final point I guess is, I guess what Verisign is proposing is to implement that set of validations for .com and .net, complying with RFC 5733 which is the applicable RFC. But to Christa's point, there is also consensus policy.

As this is the implementation review team for that consensus policy, I would ask that if it's the view of the IRT that some of these fields that are optional now instead be required, that that be very clear in the final output of this group.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Any additional comments or responses to Marc? Okay. Hearing none. Let me switch it back to our agenda. We had another discussion item on this topic, and that's the billing contact discussion. Okay, sorry. [inaudible] document. Marc, would you like to go ahead and speak to that topic, which I believe you raised in previous discussions?

MARC ANDERSON: Absolutely. I apologize for monopolizing so much of the time today. This is another topic I raised when I posted the draft – sorry, the list of contact validation rules. I guess [inaudible] what Verisign is proposing to implement would require the registrar admin and technical billing contacts for each registration. Just to back up a little bit, the difference between the thin registration and the thick registration is the thick registration has contact information associated with it, whereas a thin registration does not. Essentially, the Whois information is the same apart from that.

However, my comment earlier, there isn't a universal agreement on what it means to be thick and what exactly is required for thick. One of the areas where there are differing opinions is around the billing contact. I note that some registries have implemented thick requiring a

billing contact, some have left it as optional, and some don't allow a billing contact at all.

I wanted to raise that at the IRT, especially considering that the thick Whois PDP thought consistent labeling and display was important, and if we have some inconsistency with how billing contact is implemented, I think that sort of goes against the intent of the PDP. So I thought this was worth raising to the full IRT to get everybody's input on this topic. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. Theo? Theo, are you on mute?

CHRISTA:

Could I say something?

THEO GEURTS:

I think I'm not on mute anymore. Thanks. Okay, thank you Marc, for raising this. I think we had one policy a couple of months ago or maybe half a year ago that actually made the billing contact an optional requirement, not a requirement at all. So we are no longer showing the billing contact. For our Whois [inaudible] Whois or [inaudible] Whois. I think that's quite some time ago when that policy came through. That's my take on it. Thanks.

JOYCE:

I have a question. Sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Go ahead, Joyce. Go ahead.

JOYCE: We're talking about all the fields, which one is required, which one is not, so on and so forth. Maybe we should have a [inaudible] registry presented exactly what fields they require, and then we just go from there and say, okay, we can do this [inaudible] or something. Right know we don't know, or maybe I'm not aware of, if they have presented the data format that they require. Doesn't that make more sense, to let them put it out there and then we go from there and discuss? It's really what we're talking here, right? It doesn't make much sense, because someday when the registry put out all of the requirements, and then we are wasting our time to talk about it's required or not. Right? They don't tell us what they need.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joyce. I see that Marc has joined the queue. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, thank you. Joyce, I'm sorry, I've not met you and don't know you. Let me just introduce myself to you for a second. I'm from Verisign. I'm a product manager at Verisign.

JOYCE: Good.

MARC ANDERSON: My position, I manage the registry platforms, including those platforms that operate in .com and .net. So in that capacity, I'm representing Verisign. I was a member of the PDP representing Verisign as well, and I represent Verisign here on the IRT. I was the one that provided to the IRT that contact validation document that we reviewed earlier.

JOYCE: Then I'm really confused, because I don't know which registry doesn't require address. Can you tell me? Or phone number?

MARC ANDERSON: Joyce, just to clarify, currently Verisign for the .com and .net registries do not accept contact information at all. So –

JOYCE: I know, I know. But we are talking about the transition from the thin to thick, right? So we have to provide, as registrar, we have to provide you with all the information. So someday when everything is transitioned, to you they will be able to display it [inaudible] Whois. Right? Is that what we are talking about here? Am I missing something?

MARC ANDERSON: That's exactly what we're talking about, and that's why that document was provided so that you'd understand [inaudible] –

JOYCE: Okay, then you tell me which registry doesn't require address and phone number. I cannot think of any one registry that doesn't require the phone number and the ZIP code and the address.

MARC ANDERSON: I can say that I have looked at what other registries have provided. This is what we're proposing to provide for .com and .net as part of this transition.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Joyce and Marc, thank you very much for the discussion. Can I suggest that we move on to the other two points that we have left on the agenda? We have less than 15 minutes. I would like us to cover our entire agenda. We could always keep this discussion going on the mailing list and potentially have a follow-up call as needed.

I think in terms of the outcome of the [inaudible] and deliverables that we're currently working on, which is the data analysis scoping paper, I think we will try to clarify the framework of the discussion in terms of the data requirement. As we suggested earlier, by referring to the policies that apply, consensus policy as well as all other requirements that apply in terms of determining what data are required. I think Marc has suggested that document that he provided is a view at the systems requirement. So I hope that the clarification that we will bring in this scoping paper will help with this discussion.

If you don't mind, let's try to move on to the other items of our agenda.

JOYCE: Yes, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you very much. So before we get to the new registration track and discussing the implementation milestones and timeline, let me go back very quickly to our scoping paper and the timeline and next steps we have there. I want to get a sense with the participants of whether that timeline and those next steps are agreeable. What we're suggesting here really is that we finalized this scoping paper very quickly so that we can share it in advance of the ICANN 55 meeting where the registrar stakeholder group has agreed to meet with representatives of the IRT to discuss this study.

In this context, here in the next steps we're suggesting that the IRT draft terms of reference of the study, if that makes sense, to provide potentially more detail or structure to the study that would be conducted with the assistance of volunteer registrars. So I'd like to get a sense on whether IRT members and potential volunteers would think we should [inaudible] in terms of terms of reference. What types of framework and structure of the sty we should set before we engage with the registrar stakeholder group.

The proposition here is that we have a draft of those terms of reference before talking to those registrars and potentially amend it after the meeting. Can I get a sense of what participants think of this proposition? Okay, I'm not hearing everybody. I see a question by Steve Metalitz in the chat: "When will the target date be set for all registries to be

operating with a thick Whois structure as required by the consensus policy adopted more than two years ago?”

[inaudible] implementation notes document. Timeline is not agreeable unless it includes the target date for coming into compliance with a consensus policy for thickWhois.

I think if I may try to respond to Steve’s question, the agreement of the IRT that has been developed over the last few meetings has been to approach the transition from thin to thick with the different tracks, and the current assumption is still valid. The current timeline assumption, which was laid out in the last meeting and which I have here – let me go back to that very quickly. Okay, move here. I want to go very quickly to this.

The current timeline is still the expected timeline. That is that the IRT would define an implementation plan, which would become effective ideally in July of 2016 and implemented over a period of time that we are currently trying to define who the scoping and through the data analysis that is suggested, as well as the timeline discussion that we would like to initiate today on the new registration tracks.

Steve, I hope that helps with your question? So while Steve is typing, I will again go back quickly to our time line here and the scoping analysis.

Once we meet with the registrar stakeholder group, the idea would be to finalize terms of reference for the study by mid-March, and hopefully set a deadline for recruitment of volunteer registrars by the first of April to then complete the study by early June at the latest. So that’s the general idea of timeline for this study. Any comments on those next

steps and proposed timeline around the data analysis? Hearing none, I'm going back to the chat.

I see there's a followup question: "The chart that we showed indicates end of 2017 for compliance. Is that correct?" So I think this for now has been the running assumption, that the transition would at least need a year and a half to be implemented. But it seems that the current discussion with IRT members has raised a concern around existing registration which may require more than – potentially require more than a year and a half due to prior experience with .org and the state of legacy or existing data.

So I believe the purpose of the data analysis that we're discussing on the existing registration track is to try to identify specific challenges that may need more time. So I hope that answers your question, Steve.

Let's very quickly now go back to the new registration track. I apologize for jumping around between documents. This is our last discussion point. We have five minutes left. I hope that this will be enough. We have discussed up until now [inaudible] the existing registration tracks in the IRT as discussed studying and other parallel tracks in the approach of any implementation plan, that would be a track dedicated to new registration. Marc has suggested some milestones to consider in order to define a timeline for the implementation of the transition of those new registrations. Marc, would you like to introduce your proposal?

MARC ANDERSON:

Sure. Thank you, Fabien. Fabien asked me to provide this at a high level to sort of create a framework for the IRT to discuss and review. What I've provided are just, like Fabien said, high-level milestones here that would represent what transition for new registrations from the current model, where the registry does not accept thick data or contacts, if you will, at all, to an end state where contacts are not only accepted but required.

What this looks like is basically a phased approach designed to minimize the impact and present as smooth a transition as possible. So if you look through, I have in there a phase where we'd introduce optional thick contact support, first in the operational test and evaluation environment. At this point, the .com/.net registries would accept contacts and allow registrars to create, modify, and delete contacts in the registry over EPP, followed shortly by the introduction of the same support into the production environment.

That sort of in-between phase would exist for a period of time. Determining that period of time I think would be one of the key discussion points of the IRT, and that would allow for sufficient registrar notification and transition to allow registrars to update their systems as appropriate and make all the changes that are necessary to support this.

Following that would be a cutover where contacts or thick data would be required for new registrations. [inaudible] broken that out, calling it out for the OTD environment prior to the production environment. I guess sort of the bullet that's not here would be [inaudible] at the end.

[inaudible] cognizant of the time here, that's a very high-level description of sort of what this framework represents. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. Are there any comments or questions on those milestones and those phases? Again, not hearing any, nor seeing any hands raised. So Marc, I believe we had discussed in terms of timeline, as I mentioned to Steve earlier, it seemed to me that an assumption of the approach to the transition was that it would take at least a year and a half to implement. Do you have a sense of the duration that you would suggest for those different phases – at a very high level overall. Is it still in that range of a year and a half, or is it different?

MARC ANDERSON:

I think that's probably a reasonable assumption to start from, but as I've mentioned earlier, I think certainly there is some registry impact here. No doubt about that. But I think the registrar impact here is something that people need to weigh in on and get their input as far as what kind of notification and transition periods they would require for each of these steps and phases.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. So that sounds like an action item for registrars in the IRT and the group of experts that we've added to the IRT for the next installment of our discussion. I see that Theo agrees with your suggestion, Marc. Okay. I see that we are at the top of the hour, and I believe we've covered our agenda for today. In terms of immediate

action items, we will get back to the mailing list with a final proposed scoping paper for sharing with the registrars at the latest by the end of next week, I believe, and probably even earlier. So we'll please expect that on the mailing list. We will suggest [inaudible] discussion of the new registration track that registrars contribute their thinking in terms of timeline.

Thank you all again for your time today, tonight. We appreciate your participating in the meeting, and we look forward to the continuation of our discussion on the mailing list until our next IRT meeting, which will be during the ICANN 55 meeting early March. Thank you again for your time, and have a good end of your day. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]