

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

FABIEN: [Inaudible] engagement with the global domains division of ICANN. Before we start, let me do a very quick roll call. I see that we have Mark Anderson, Roger [Carnie], and Theo [Gertz] on the call. Am I forgetting anyone from the IRT?

I'm not hearing any voices. So unless they are muted, I think we have three IRT members with us on this call at this point. Just to remind us before we jump into our discussion, please mute your lines if you're 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. And finally, if at any time you would like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect Room.

So, the agenda for the meeting today is twofold. We wanted to provide an update on the consistent labeling and display with output for gTLD [part] implementation. And then continue our discussion of implementation of the transition from [inaudible] and dot job.

Before I get into our, the substance of our discussion, just want to pause here and consult with the IRT members on the call, whether they think this is appropriate that we keep going with the three of you, or whether you think that we should work to reschedule this call. Just want to

---

*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.*

---

make sure we're in agreement as to either keep going with this call or reschedule. Can you please share your thinking?

Theo, please go ahead.

THEO [GERTZ]: Thank you. This is [Theo Gertz] for the record. I've done little less on certain IT, so I'm good to go. Whatever the rest wants.

FABIEN: [Inaudible]. Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: Hi. This is Mark Anderson. You know, I think, you know, when the IRT was first being formed, you know, there was an indication from people that not everybody necessarily wanted to be purchase, you know wanted to be, yeah, involved 100% of the time. You know, I think we're seeing that here.

And that we have maybe some of the more impacted parties on the call, but it's not surprising that we don't have more people. So I would say we should go ahead and push ahead with this, but realizing that we need to give others an opportunity to weigh in.

FABIEN: Thank you Mark. Thank you very much. I'm reconnecting to the Adobe Connect because I had lost the connection. Roger, do you have any...?

---

Okay, agree, let's continue, I see in the chat. All right. Okay. Thank you very much for input. Let's get on with our agenda.

So with the respect to the [inaudible] display, just a reminder, recent developments. You may recall that we have published for public comment or draft, consistent labeling and [display] consensus policy. That was on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, and that was done along with the public comment period on the [R DAP] operational profile.

We have recently extended the public comment period to the end of January. I believe that, as of yesterday, we still did not receive any comments, I must admit, I haven't checked today. But this was the state yesterday. So in terms of, so this as a consequence on our timeline, as you may recall, our timeline assumptions, we discussed in Dublin in October, was the following.

Following the public comment, we would launch the implementation of the consistent labeling and display part of our policy. But since we are not going to be able to close the public comment and process comments before the end of January, we will need to take the next window of the implementation as our implementation calendar, I apologize for switching the slide here.

And so our timeline assumption now is that we would work with the IRT on the public comment that we will receive, and publish our final proposed consensus [inaudible] for consistent labeling and display by July. So this kicks off the implementation, a six month implementation period before the policy is effective at least for, what we've called the low impact of our policy.

---

So this is our date on the consistent labeling and display. Let me pause it here and see if anybody has any questions or comments.

I'm not hearing anyone or seeing any hands raised, so I propose we move on to our second item on our agenda, which is the discussion of the implementation of the transition from [inaudible], which is the second part of our policy implementation. So here is a very quick reminder of our discussion since Dublin.

We've met on December 16<sup>th</sup>, where IRT members propose that we, considering the concerns that were raised in the last few months, that the IRT keeps on discussing implementation of the transition and work to find an implementation [plan], while keeping our heads up. And I think in summary at a high level, the suggestion was that the IRT meets monthly, at this monthly to explore an implementation path that would be gradual and that would consist of two tracks.

I think the tracks that were identified were the track of new registration. The ones that, the future registration after the date of implementation, and [inaudible] registration that is registration that exists prior to launching the implementation of the transition.

So, we, here, just created a few bullet points and a few questions to guide our discussion today. I think from our perspective and in order to advance towards the place where we could start drafting an actual implementation plan, we'd like to discuss with you today on these different tracks, estimates of what would be timelines and [inaudible] milestones on each of those tracks.

---

And also try to determine, from your perspective what you think would be worth, what would be a good candidate for making it into the implementation plan, as opposed to the implementation details being worked out between the affected parties. This is really the objective and we surely want to provide also this meeting and opportunity for IRT members to further discuss the implementation path that is being envisioned.

So let me pause here, and if anybody would like to kick off the discussion with comments on any of these topics or general remarks, with statements of the understanding of what we are trying to accomplish, I will just stop now, otherwise we'll move to kick off the discussion with the questions we've got on this slide.

So if anybody has a general comment to start with?

Okay. I see Theo, go ahead Theo.

THEO [GERTZ]:

Yeah. Just a quick one here. This is Theo [Gertz] for the record. I'm looking at the management of registrant concerns, and basically when you're looking at it, the registrar does not obtain the consent from the registrant as actually two paths there. It's either the release of the domain name, in my opinion, or the registrant has a choice to make sure that the, that he or she use a privacy protector service.

I think that's the only two paths there for when there is no consent there. So that's just a quick observation there. Thank you.

---

FABIEN:

Thank you Theo. On that topic, I just want to also bring back a diagram that we had used a few months ago on this topic, where we were, based on the legal review memo, we had drawn what could be potential elements to consider to either the registries and the registrars, and the registrars in particular with respect to obtaining consent.

So I think this is pretty much aligned with what you just mentioned, Theo. We had also identified, or the legal review memo has identified two elements that may be considered and those are using [R DAP] for registrations for which the registrant would not consent a transfer of data. And also potentially using a region WHOIS service as we discussed on our last call.

So I just wanted to remind the group of those elements.

Let me go back to the slides, to the previous slide with the question. So maybe, since we're talking about the management of consent, we think that there is a key question which was discussed on a few occasions before, and that the one of, is the one of the timing for the registrars seeking consent from the registrant.

So I think, if I recall correctly, Theo, do you want to go ahead? I see that you have your hand raised.

THEO [GERTZ]:

Yeah, but maybe I'm going to answer your question, maybe not. When we look at timelines for registrars to obtain the consent of the registrant, and that is completely dependent on the, yeah, the national laws that are in place there, because if I'm looking at the current

---

situation in the Netherlands, I think under the current legislation and the national law, that we do not obtain consent.

At least our current registration agreement should cover it. If we move along with the timeline, let's say further in 2016, 2017, then our registration agreement will probably not be good enough to have the consent. So then from a legal point of view, we will just notify everybody of like, okay, if you do not agree with being transferred, so to speak, then send us an email and then we'll setup a different procedure for the person objects.

So we just reverse the process. Everybody who does not raise his voice, will be automatically consenting there. I think that that's for us, for Dutch register point of view. That is a legal procedure that we can use later on. But of course, this is just me speaking here. I cannot speak for all of the other registrars. And this will likely to be different, depending on legal opinions.

So it's pretty hard to tell when you're talking about timelines there. But that's sort of what I would say is the situation right now there. Thank you.

FABIEN:

Thank you Theo. And so would it make sense to try to define a timeframe that would allow for any type, any registrar to fit in within that timeline? I mean, do we need a spot of the implementation plan to define a duration or a timeframe during which either the registrar obtains consent, or determines that the registrar does not obtain consent or the registrant has not given consent, and we can move on to,

---

as you said, using alternative procedure than the transfer of the data to the registry?

THEO [GERTZ]:

Yeah, and that is just very hard to answer. I mean, if you just go for an automatic consent, where somebody has to actually object against the transition, then you could have a timeline say like four months, maybe five months, depending on the size of the registrar. So that is, you can really, you would actually need to reach out to the registrar group and just see if we can get some bearings there on the legal obstacles there.

And timeframe wise, to see where we stand there. I can't comment on that really. I'm just speaking for myself here, on my own personal capacity. So for a [root zone] registrar, it would be maybe five months if we followed that path. But that is just too hard to tell at the moment.

Like you said, maybe we should reach out to the registrar group there.

FABIEN:

Thanks Theo. Roger?

ROGER [CARNIE]:

Yeah, hi, this is Roger. Can you hear me?

FABIEN:

Very well, thank you.



---

ROGER [CARNIE]:                   Okay, great. Yeah, I agree with Theo. We should probably take this to a registrar group. And this is really, we're talking about for those existing registrations, correct?

FABIEN:                               I'm not sure if Theo had a specific registration in mind. Personally, I think that this question applies to both track, because even for new registration, there may be challenges of that order in terms of obtaining consent, isn't there?

ROGER [CARNIE]:                   I mean, are we in that position already today for new registrations? I don't see that there is a major change in that, I guess.

FABIEN:                               Theo, you want to go ahead? I see that Mark has raised his hand.

THEO [CARNIE]:                   I think, from my point of view right now, I would be, I'm looking at the current registrations, because that's where I, where we might have an issue there regarding the consent, because this is actually from a legal point of view. We are, this is sort of like a moving target here, at least for us European registrars.

If you are outside of the EU, you might have it a little bit easier, since we are entering into a new European DPA here, Data Protection Act. So it's

---

not completely clear how heavy it's going to be, but my read on it is that for the current registration [inaudible] require consent.

We will also require consent for the new registrations, but that is a matter of like if we know the timeframe when we are, this is going down, so to speak, then it's just a matter of first, prepare our registration agreements for the new registrations, and just flip a switch, so to speak, and then we are done.

And I want to emphasize, I'm strictly speaking for myself here, and not for the registrar group. I can't imagine that for new registrations, it might take more time for other registrars to prepare themselves for that. But it would be easier to tackle maybe. Thank you.

FABIEN: Roger, do you want to maybe follow up, [inaudible] this is what you are thinking as well?

ROGER [CARNIE]: Yeah. Absolutely. I was thinking that we handle consent issues for new registrations, and it won't be any different, at least I don't see it as being any different going forward, you know, after these are thick. So I don't see that new registrations is a focus for the consent issue, it will be the current ones.

FABIEN: Okay, thanks. Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: Hi. This is Mark. I'm just going to agree with Theo and Roger. I think the manager of registrar consent is really, you know, should really be under existing registrations track. I think that's a challenge for existing registrations, for new registrations, you know, obtaining consent is a condition of obtaining the domain, you know, obtaining the registration.

So I think, like Roger and Theo said, that's easier to manager and no different from any of the other new gTLDs that are being dealt with today. So I think that's really a challenge for the existing registrations. And certainly, consent needs to be obtained, and that shouldn't be trivialized for new registrations.

I think the real challenge there is on the existing registrations track.

FABIEN: Thank you Mark. Point well taken. So, Theo, you want to go ahead?

THEO [GERTZ]: Yeah, just one more thing. This is Theo [Gertz] for the record. Obtaining the consent, that sort of varies also if you really require explicit consent where somebody has to click, "Yes, I agree." Opposed to where you send out a mass email like, "We're going to do this, this, and this. If you do not agree, email us. If you agree, you have to do nothing."

That is two completely different things here. And it also kind of depends on your national law, if you, which process you want to follow

---

there or you are allowed to follow. If you have to get explicit consent for the transition that's going to be tricky, that the will delay the timeline significantly, I assume. Thank you.

I wanted to just make this clarification there. Thanks.

FABIEN: Thank you Theo. Roger?

ROGER [CARNIE]: Yeah. This is Roger. I would like to agree with what Theo was saying. And I really think, like he mentioned earlier, they should really build a registrar stakeholder's group for discussion. I know a lot of the registration agreements today already support this concept, and even though they weren't transferring data to VeriSign, they already got the consent from the registrants anyway, that they could do it, even though they weren't.

FABIEN: Okay. So then, so I understand that you're thinking that there should be some focused registrar conversation on this topic. And it seems to me that this is one factor to consider in designing the timeline of the transition of existing registration, and it seemed also another factor in influencing the timeline was the complexity of the problems we may find with the data.

---

So do you have ideas or a suggestion as to how we should approach this topic of designing a timeline for the transition of the existing registration, given those, these two [problems]?

Theo, do you want to go ahead? Can you hear me?

THEO [GERTZ]:

Yeah. I can hear you, thank you. I think it's really hard to tell, we are going to, the transition is going to move over some really old legacy data, and we're talking about millions of records. And maybe what could guide us is on the WHOIS ARS webinar last Monday, where the team did some explanation on the current WHOIS records they have reviewed by now.

And that could give us a little bit of indication how well or how bad the situation is, when it comes to telephone numbers, email addresses, country codes, street address, etc. etc. So maybe we can have some look at that, maybe we can learn something from it. It's just a suggestion here that I'm offering. Thank you.

FABIEN:

Roger?

ROGER [CARNIE]:

Yeah, hi. This is Roger. Going along with Theo, [inaudible] on the WHOIS report, I think yesterday or the day before, whenever it was, and an interesting question came up. I think Kathy [inaudible] brought it up was, about contact-ability, and I know the ARS is looking at the whole

---

contacts, the phone, email, and postal address. And Kathy brought up the idea, nothing new I guess, she just mentioned this, the true goal is probably contact-ability and not necessarily 100% accurate data.

The ARS report mentioned that, you know, postal address had a much better operational resolved and it did a syntax, which leads to, you know, what is important, is that we'll be able to contact this people? Or is it that their email, phone number, and postal address are exactly correct.

So it's just an interesting topic that we should keep in mind is the goal really contact-ability? Or is it, you know, getting 100% of those, or whatever that goal is, of accurate phone, email, and postal.

FABIEN: Thanks Roger. [Inaudible]

KRISTA: Thanks so much. Hi everybody. It's Krista [inaudible] from ICANN staff. And I just wanted to... So those are interesting points, Roger. And I missed the webinar yesterday, but we had an internal discussion about the same information, and I heard about Kathy's comments. I had, when we were reviewing that deck before the webinar yesterday, I had kind of the same questions.

I thought it was an interesting point about, or an interesting observation that the testing found that contact-ability was, in many cases, significantly higher than syntax. To me, I'm not a technical person like the rest of you. So I think very simply about these things, but syntax is

---

formatting and contact-ability is, can I find these people? However I need to do it, whether it's email or postal. And it seems that... So I ask the question... So the first thing is, my understanding, and I don't purport to be familiar with the RIA because I'm on the registry side of things, I have my hands full with that contract.

But my understanding is the RIA requires that formatting, which I why we're testing syntax. And then it further requires that we're able to get ahold of people, which is where the contact-ability comes in. And so, I think, I don't think this is for the Thick WHOIS conversation, but I do think that this is a very interesting question, and maybe something to be considered in some other more appropriate forum in the future is, what is the ultimate goal?

Is it to make sure everybody abbreviates California with a capital C and a capital A, rather than spelling it out and putting C-A-L-I-F, or that...? And if that's important, then we should keep doing it. Anyway, I have the same observation, I wanted to share that. And ask those of you on the IRT to think about kind of thinking ahead, post-thick WHOIS or outside of the thick WHOIS, if that's an important topic, what's the best place to bring it up?

Is it in the GNSO or some other forum to start looking at whether those contractual provisions are really reaching the ultimate goal or not?

FABIEN:

[Inaudible] Roger do you want to [inaudible] anyway? I see that you're tying things I'm sure will come up in our discussions. Roger, do you want the floor on this topic?

ROGER [CARNIE]:                    Yeah, [inaudible] that everybody is taking a look at that, and Krista, yeah, it is from the RIA standpoint, yeah, obviously, there is a few syntax issues that are specified in the RIA, not as great as what the ARS went into, which is great. But yeah, I mean, definitely the contact-ability is the, to me at least, is the end goal.

FABIEN:                                Theo [inaudible]?

THEO [GERTZ]:                        Sorry Fabien. What was that?

FABIEN:                                You're next in the queue.

THEO [GERTZ]:                        Yes, sorry, you have a little bit of a distortion on your voice there Fabien. I'm not sure what's going on there. At least on my end. Anyways, I was going to point out that if we go into, I would be sort of cautious not to take [inaudible] when it comes to the reachability contact-ability of the registrant.

If you look from a syntax point of view, a couple of years ago we transferred 200,000 domain names to one register to our own register account, and of course, not everything was in order, but when it came to the syntax of the RIA 2013, we were able to script it in such a way



---

that it would meet the RIA 2013 requirements. But if you would look at the data itself, when it comes to the contact-ability, that's a complete different rule there. And I would be very cautious to go anywhere near that, would be very against it.

You're going to make things extremely complex if you want to go there. So I just want to point it out there. Thank you.

FABIEN:

Thank you Theo for the input. So, in terms, so I think Theo, you also mentioned that we should use the ARS work as a way to guide our approach to the implementation. And I think this echoes what was suggested by Roger, I believe, on our last call, that there may be a need for conducting analysis of the problem of the data and potentially contact-ability before we can define how we could go with the implementation.

So I remember Roger mentioning that [inaudible] and I were going to do some of that analysis and may be able to share some of those results at a high level, so I was wondering if we should structure our approach to doing that type of analysis within this discussion in our work with the IRT. Roger, I see you have your hand raised.

ROGER [CARNIE]:

Yeah hi. This is Roger. Thanks for reminding me. I do remember bringing that, and I was going to bring that back up again, I guess, that I definitely think before we can set timelines, we need at least a fairly rough analysis of the current data. We were talking about some

---

registrations dating back 10 plus years. So I definitely think that we should pursue some type of reporter analysis prior to coming up with timelines.

FABIEN:

Thanks Roger. And may I follow up with a question to you? How long do you think we would need, and what channels should we use to get a fairly, or an analysis that would be, that would provide results that would be relevant and you know, [inaudible] enough of varying situations we have out there.

Do you have any suggestions on those two topics? Time we would need and channels we may want to use?

ROGER [CARNIE]:

Yeah, this is Roger. Yeah, and I suppose I'll leave it to Mark too to maybe bring up the largest [D poll] of these data. You know, I obviously we're one of the larger ones, but I have asked this question multiple times internally, and until it actually becomes a priority in the working group or the RIT says, yeah let's do it, I would guess the resources to take would be a month to two months to get an analysis done on all of the records that we have.

So that [inaudible] by some useful information taking in, so that we can probably derive some timelines from it. But you know again, probably the registrar group should make a statement of their own if this is something the registrar group wants to provide. Or, like I said, Mark

---

may have some information on some other registrars that have a lot of data.

FABIEN: Okay, thanks Roger for your suggestion. And I think that's quite helpful. Mark, would you like to go ahead?

MARK ANDERSON: Yes, thank you. This is Mark. I preface this a little bit on the last call, but you know, the transition of existing registrations, you know, we're also, we start to deal with percentages. As far as the transition of new registrations, those you can have very clear milestones where you have a cutover point, you know, at this state you cut over. It's a very clear milestone.

But with the existing registrations track as far as migrating, using registrations, you're going to have, yeah, you're going to have percentages, you know, a certain percentage are going to migrate without any trouble. And maybe we get down the road, different buckets, the last 1% is going to be the hardest.

We'll spend the majority of our time on a minority of the registrations, but that creates a real challenge as far as setting hard timelines and milestones. So I sort of cringed when you first asked, how do we go about setting timelines and milestones? I think it's certainly easier and more manageable for the new registration track, but for the existing registrations track, that's going to be...

---

It's almost impossible for us especially without hard data, to set solid milestones. And I think we just have to be aware that there is going to be a long tail on some of these. They're just going to take more time. Thank you.

FABIEN: Thanks Mark. So I think that this motion, you know, of a long tail that we would need to manage, to me the information is very important information that we should be able to include in a plan and kind of plan how we handle it. Yeah, I think this is worthwhile to discuss and in turn, how we can manage that.

Krista, would you like to go ahead?

KRISTA: Thanks Fabien. Krista here. So yeah, I agree with you Fabien. I think that's an important point to capture and manage too. Just a couple of questions around, for Mark and Roger and Theo, and around some of what I heard.

So, on the point of, I'm going to talk about the new registrations first because I think we all believe that is easier, whatever easier means. Do you guys think we could start working on some timelines around existing registrations and then what we think is reasonable and then just kind of start trying to put some more solid timing around that?

And then the second question is on the existing registrations track. I'm hearing a couple of things from you guys which is, one, I think you would like to consult with the stakeholder group, or maybe you want to

---

consult on the stakeholder group on both of those threads. But two, but that's harder and that you probably need to do some data analysis, or those that have lots of data need to go do some data analysis, and that that will take a few months.

And so on that path, I'm wondering first of all, as far as the data analysis goes, do we think we could start thinking about a timeline to have that completed? I'm just trying to, I'm not sure we're showing progress in this policy implementation as well. And that's going to be important for all of us and the community to see that.

And so if we can even say like the data analysis period is going to take X number of time, and then once that's complete, we'll be able to start thinking about timelines for transitioning the existing registration. And then sorry to throw three things at you guys at once.

But the third thing I have is with respect to consulting with the registrar stakeholder group, I'm wondering the best way to do that, because I know that the registrars, or my understanding is that the registrars don't necessarily have like a frequent meeting of the stakeholder group, but I know they meet at ICANN meetings. And so I'm wondering if this is something that, you know, Roger or someone else in the registrar community would want to put on, try to get on the agenda for the Marrakesh meeting.

And then could maybe have whoever you guys want, if you want staff to support that with you as well. Like, what's the best way to go about doing that engagement? So three questions. New registrations, could we start putting some timelines around that? Second question, existing

---

registration, could we try to come up with a timeline to at least do the data analysis? Third question is, how do we engage with the registrar stakeholder group?

FABIEN: Theo please.

THEO [GERTZ]: Yeah, thank you Fabien. Well Krista, this is Theo for the record. I pretty much answered your last question about, I think it would be helpful if staff would just send a sort of semi-official request to put this on the agenda at the upcoming Marrakesh meeting. And I just request, or just mention the few topics that have been discussed, and which we need answers for when it comes to the IRT here.

And then we should definitely add the registrar impact. We should definitely discuss that in Marrakesh. And I think that would be the best way to go. I don't think it would be very useful if we put it on the list. I'm a little bit afraid that it will miss somewhat [tension?] there, I mean, email list, as you we all not, is not usually, can sometimes be a not most efficient way to give the attention it deserves.

And I think this should be, give some real attention. So I would suggest that staff just formally notify the registrar group through Michele or Gram, and get it on the agenda and see if we could get some time there together. And maybe some roundtable discussion there. Thank you.

---

FABIEN: Thanks Theo. Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: Hi this is Mark. I can't really answer Krista's second two questions. I think that's, yeah, a registrar question. But on the first one, I do think we can at least start tying timelines and milestones in order, what are the key deliverables? And you know, requirements on new registrations track.

I don't see any reason why we can't do that. I do have one other thought though, and I guess this is maybe for Roger or Theo, but in order to do a proper analysis, do you need, do you have everything you need from the registry as far as, what are...?

I'm thinking in terms of what are the other required fields? What are the field lengths? What are the filter optional, filter required? What are the field lengths and what validation exists? Is there anything along those lines that you would need from the registry, or are the existing EPP requirements sufficient for that? Thank you.

FABIEN: I see that Roger and Theo are in the lane. Roger?

ROGER [CARNIE]: Yeah, this is Roger. Yeah, again, I think, I agree with what Theo was saying earlier. I think that if we can get this on the Marrakesh, again, the two month analysis, I'm just throwing that out as a Go Daddy thing. I don't know if other registrars have that ability to do that now, or when

---

they would have that ability. So yeah, I definitely think that the registrar group should say something about that, and it should be brought up at Marrakesh.

As far as, like Mark was mentioning, it would be good, I know that we've passed some of this information back and forth over the years, but it would be good to get what those requirements are. And we could obviously fit those into the requirements of the EPP, but you know, the EPP is a lot looser than what the registry will have. So it would be great if the registry could provide those requirements to the fields, any cross-field that they're doing or whatever they're doing would be beneficial.

FABIEN:

Theo, would you follow-up on this or should I go to Mark first for that?

THEO [GERTZ]:

No, I'll just answer to Mark. This is Theo for the record. To Mark's point, I'm going to ask internally also to see how things are looking at our end, or have some sort of discussion with the team that will register. I got a feeling that we won't have any issues at all as we move to backend not so long ago.

So we have formatting and syntax corrections already our entire NTT Elite Portfolio. So I think we just can do the migration very easy. But it always good to discuss it, and that's what I'm going to do and see if we can get some read on how things are looking on our end as a mid-sized small registrar. Thank you.



---

FABIEN: Thanks Theo. Mark, would you like to follow up on what Roger mentioned?

MARK ANDERSON: No, I guess, yeah, Roger answered my question. I guess, I know, maybe we need a deliverable or an action item for registries to provide that data to the registrars, so that they can conduct a proper analysis. And I think it's, you know, that field, you know, as Roger said EPP provides certain guidelines, but registries have additional validations and restrictions at times.

So in order to do a proper analysis, it's really looking at what data, what is your percentage, what percentage of your dataset is outside of those validations or those roles. Yeah, so I think that would be sort of a prerequisite for being able to do a full and proper analysis.

FABIEN: Thanks Mark. And to your point, I'm thinking that while we organized this discussion, we work to organizing a discussion in Marrakesh with the [inaudible] stakeholder group, maybe we could work within the IRT to draft a sort of scoping paper that could serve as guidelines, or details for that analysis that would need to be conducted. And in part, as part of that documentation, we could potentially join whatever the registries could provide in terms of expected format in addition to anything that we could clarify as to the scope of that analysis.

I see that Theo, you are in the line.

---

THEO [GERTZ]: Yeah. This is a new hand. Thanks Fabien. One more thing about reaching out to the registrars. If we could make the request, or if you guys, staff, could make the request for a [inaudible] or easy to understand what's at stake here. Make sure I don't want it simplified, of course, but if the request would be setup in such a manner that everybody realizes what's at stake, what needs to be done, then with the real issue here is, what we need to move on.

So I just want to sort of emphasize that this is clear, that the old, that the registrar schedule [inaudible] and then go like, okay, this is something we need to attend, and it's something like, I've got something else better to do. Such meetings, as they are completely busy. So I wanted to make sure it gets the right attention. Thank you.

FABIEN: Thank you Theo. So what I'm thinking is that we could work together on a short paper that will provide this type of information requesting Theo as well, scope and what we discussed with Mark and Roger, for the registrars to consider when approaching that meeting. Do you think, would that be helpful and appropriate? That we work on such a draft before our next meeting?

THEO [GERTZ]: Yeah, I think that would be very helpful, if only it just sort of emphasizes the work ahead, that we might have. So yeah, I think it would be very helpful. Thank you.

---

FABIEN: Thanks Theo. Roger, Mark, do you have any, do you agree with this idea of starting a paper? I see that you're plus-ing Roger, okay. Agreeing Mark. Excellent. Thanks. And Mark, following on your discussion of the new registration and track timeline, do you think that you could like propose an initial approach to that and share that with the IRT on the mailing list somehow?

So that we can get the discussion going maybe before our next meeting?

MARK ANDERSON: This is Mark. I can absolutely do that for [common net], even though [inaudible] backend registry services for jobs, yeah, I can't speak for that. Yeah, because we're not the contracted party. So I think we have to engage employ media, the register operator for dot jobs. They do have a slightly different data set because they have additional validation rules for jobs.

So I can certainly do that for com and net, but I can't do that for dot jobs. At least not directly, I should say.

FABIEN: Okay. Well what I'm thinking is we could certainly reach out to the registry operator, and try to include them in this discussion. I remember a discussion with them in the past, and I think there were amendable to this notion of collaborating in the context of its implementation. So I don't think it should be a problem, that we can certainly help with that.

---

Roger, I see you have your hand up.

ROGER [CARNIE]: Yeah, this is Roger. Just going back to, I think Mark brought it up, the long tail, the data issues, obviously there may be some pretty quick hit things that we can, I guess, my question stems a little further back. Are we under the assumption that these contact records will not have any grandfathered privileges moving forward, meaning that these will have the same requirements that these old, not old, but the current [inaudible] contact records will have the same requirements that new ones do?

Or is that still a viable option that these current contact records have a grandfathered, I guess, reprieve from being exactly the same as what current ones are?

FABIEN: Thanks Roger for the very important question. Does anybody have ideas or answer on that question? Krista, you have your hand raised.

KRISTA: Thanks Fabien. If I'm understanding the question, well let me put it this way. This is Krista by the way. The policy, the thick WHOIS policy says that all gTLDs have to have this consistent labeling and display per the 2013 RAA and they have to be thick. And I put one of the things that was already taken care of, I'm not going to mention here.

---

So, I don't know if you're asking rather like from a grandfathering... Like I, do not mistake what I am saying for not understanding the complexity of that, and having dealt with old data myself in previous places I've worked, like I completely understand the challenge.

But just the, looking at what the policy says and sort of the, at ICANN, we look at the policy as sort of our marching orders for what we're supposed to do, unless we're told differently. You know, it pretty clearly says that it needs to follow those formats. So I don't know if you're saying that there is going to be some sort of period of, or you're asking if there is going to be a period of time allocated to enable getting that data up to the standard of the 2013 RAA, or if you're asking if you can definitely will be in a different format or whatever.

But I think just generally speaking, the vision of the policy recommendations was that would it all be consistent? Getting there is not as easy as writing the policy recommendation.

FABIEN:

Sorry. I saw Theo raising your hand, but it went away. Anybody wanting to respond to Krista's comment on our comments? Roger please.

ROGER [CARNIE]:

Yeah, this is Roger. Thanks Krista. Yeah, that was actually the point I was trying to get at is, and I think you brought up a really good distinction of yeah, do we want these hanging out there indefinitely? Or is it more appropriate that says, okay, that you know, after renewal

---

or whatever it is, you get a grandfathered amount of time to update those. And that's what I was really looking for, and I appreciate the answer. And I don't think that anyone wants that infinite state, but yeah, I was kind of curious that if there was something that allowed us to say, okay, our implementation says, you know, you have this and after reading it a little, you have to have it updated in X amount of time, or however that works.

FABIEN: Thanks Roger. Mark?

MARK ANDERSON: Roger, I'll add one other thing. I know from participating in the PDP, we specifically did not touch on timelines. I can't speak from having recently read the final report, but at least on the PDP itself, we avoided timelines, feeling that that was a decision best left to the implementation team.

So at least that was the intent and the discussions we had during the PDP.

FABIEN: Thanks Mark. And so, I understand that this may be, these types of decisions or approach to the implementation may be consequences of the analysis that we could benefit from, as I understand from what Roger was suggesting. So we've reached the end of our meeting, our allocated time.

---

So unless anybody would like to make additional remarks, comments on what we've discussed or not discussed today. I suggest we adjourn our call, and follow-up very fruitful discussion today on the mailing list, in preparation for our next meeting as well as the Marrakesh meeting where an engagement with the registrars would be a turning of order.

So I'm not hearing anybody nor seeing any hand raised, so let me thank you again for your time here today in joining our call and sharing your perspective on the implementation of thick WHOIS, and we will follow up on the mailing list in the coming days. Thank you very much and have a nice day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**