
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining our meeting today. I will – I see that we still have IRT members joining or dialing out, so I'll go slowly for a few minutes so that it gives them a chance to join. Thank you again for joining our call today on the 23rd of March, 2016. The objective of our call today is to discuss the feedback we've received from the Registrar Stakeholder Group during the ICANN 55 meeting. This is not a regular IRT meeting that we usually have that we focus on that topic. Before I get to the details of our agenda, I just want to go through a few quick reminders. Since we're recording the meeting, please make sure you state your name when you speak. Also make sure that your line is muted. I think in LA, in the room, we hear your background noise. Just wanted to let you know.

Let me also quickly run through who from the IRT we have on the call. I see we have Amr, [Jodi]; Amr Elsadr, [Jodi Kolcher], Joe Waldron, Marc Anderson, Roger Carney, [Sara Boeke], and Theo Geurts. Am I missing anyone that I don't see in the Adobe Connect?

Okay. I'm not hearing anyone, so I guess we have everybody in the Adobe Connect. Now that we've gone through the roll call, let me go through our agenda. So in order for us to consider the feedback we got from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and approach the next steps from there, the agenda, we'd like to go through the following. I'll just quickly remind everyone of that meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We'll go through the outcome of the meeting. We'll look at what's the current status of our discussions on the transition implementation plan.

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.

And finally, we'll discuss next steps. Are there any comments at this stage, any suggestions for the agenda?

Okay, hearing none, not seeing any hand raised in the Adobe Connect, let me move on to a quick background. So as you may recall, in addition to our IRT meeting in Marrakech, we had organized a meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group to discuss a potential data analysis that we wanted to conduct in relation to the existing registration track of our implementation of the transition from thin to thick. So as you may remember, the objective of that analysis of data was to identify the type of challenges that registrars would face when transitioning the data from thin to thick, and also quantify those type of challenges.

We were thinking that it would be ideal to recruit 10-20 volunteers to contribute some analysis on their data. And ideally, we'd have identified those types of challenges, as listed on the slide here: missing data, incompatible data format, incomplete data, etc. Any questions on that data analysis and the scoping paper we had chaired with the Registrar Stakeholder Group prior to our discussion?

Okay, so in that paper, we had also included an initial timeline for that potential data analysis that we're considering. We were hoping to recruit volunteers by the 1st of April and leading to final conclusion of that data analysis by early June so that we could then focus on the finalizing and implementation plan early this summer.

Theo, I see you have your hand raise. So let me just try that. The floor is yours.

THEO GEURTS: Thank you, Fabien. Regarding the volunteers, Fabien, how do you picture this? I mean, you send out the request to get some volunteers. But have we dealt with the scoping issues already? Are they going to be facing those scoping issues? What's your thinking there? Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. So I think, you know, we were expecting that the conversation with the Registrar Stakeholder Group in Marrakech would lead to, you know, that type of discussion. And I think that's – you know, that could be one of the... The outcome of this meeting is to kind of discuss where we are from that respect. So I just wanted to, you know, as part of the outcome here, mention that so far we've not heard any expression of interest from registrars on that analysis. And instead, we did receive quite a number of comments on the implementation. So I think that might be what you refer to, in terms of scoping. So, you know, maybe discussing those points will get to where you think we should be in that area. Does that address your question, Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, it does in a way, though I'm thinking back off the discussion in Marrakech. We were able to uncover some points, got some information. But apart from the discussion there, we haven't gained much ground, so to speak, to move actually forward, in my opinion. In addition to that, on the RDAP comment, there was suddenly some strong support for the Google comment to make the migration, basically in a nutshell, to keep things as simple as possible. So I think we haven't

covered enough ground yet. But let's move on and see where we end.
Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Thank you, Theo. And I think the purpose of this call is really to help us move forward in that area. So we certainly welcome the discussion. Joe, I see you have your hand raised.

JOE WALDRON: Yeah, thanks, Fabien. So I also want to just comment or post some suggestions on the call for volunteers. I think that in addition to a number, I think we should identify, or at least kind of put some parameters around what our expectation is, in terms of geographic representation, size of registrars, business model. But specifically make sure that we have enough coverage that we're getting a good mix of the jurisdictions that registrars are in, as well as size and, you know, types of challenges that the full set of registrars would have. Does that make sense?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. Thank you, Joe. So we had not specifically discussed that prior to sending the scoping paper. And it seems to me that it may be quite challenging to obtain such as representative sample. That's why I think the representativeness of the sample we had kept quite simple. But we certainly welcome the discussion into this call.

JOE WALDRON: Well, yeah, and what I'm thinking is it may make sense to actually recruit some volunteers if we see that there's a gap, I think, is perhaps a... It's best to take volunteers, and I think that's a good approach. But if we see a gap in no European registrars, I think that would be something that we would want to address to make sure that that's included in the sample.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you, Joe. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: I'm not sure where this got lost, or maybe it didn't come up, but GoDaddy is definitely interested in participating.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Roger. I think this was obfuscated by the fact that we were counting, by default, on the registrars in the IRT to contribute.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, that makes sense.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Especially since yourselves had been leading parties in suggestion of that analysis. But thanks for the reminder. And I think here, on that slide here, in terms of the outcome of the meeting, what I meant to mention here is in reference to the meeting we had with the Registrar Stakeholder Group, where no one specifically expressed interest in

participating in the data analysis, nor did we get feedback after that meeting. So that's just I wanted to just provide a status there.

Theo, I see you have your hand raised, but I also see Joe's hand. Joe, is this a new hand?

JOE WALDRON: No, I just didn't set it back down.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Fabien. I think when you're looking at volunteers, I mean, you asked me point blank in Marrakech if I wanted to join up. And I said no at that given time because, basically, we need to actually know a little bit more as registrars what it actually entails to run a pilot to do such a thing. I mean, speaking from my side, being a small Dutch registrar, we do not have tons of capacity here just to throw ourselves into a volunteer role and just hope that we do not consume too much development time on this. I mean, development time is extremely precious here. So unless we have some rough outline on what we are going to face, I think there's not going to be many registrars joining, unless they know what they're getting into themselves. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Theo. So I'm going back to the slide where we have this timeline and where we were thinking that if, need be, we'd clarify the scope, in terms of reference of the data analysis. So I guess the [data start] was last Friday. It seemed that... So, Theo, I think if you can provide some input as to the type of precisions or parameters you'd want to see in the request for volunteering, I think that would be helpful so that we could further refine the documents. And any further participants, and I'm thinking about [Jodi] and Roger, for instance, if you have any thoughts or have already put some thought into what type of analysis you'd conduct, maybe that would be helpful to share as an appendix to the scoping paper, to help registrars understand the type of work that would be needed, in terms of getting to the results we're seeking. Does that make sense? Is there anybody around the table today that would be willing to share some additional details, in terms of what registrars should be looking into and what type of work they should expect to be doing? Roger?

ROGER CARNEY:

I agree with Theo. I think there's obviously some registrars that won't be able to do this, just out of constraints, resources. We have done, actually, some of this already and actually looked at some historical things beyond what the scoping paper is actually looking for. But what we're planning, what we've started to do is taking Verisign's requirements of what data is required, we actually started running analysis against our data on that data set. So if e-mail is required, okay, how many e-mails do we have? And so on, just field by field.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thank you. So, Roger, what I understand is that you're saying that the requirements we've attached to the scoping paper were enough for you guys to look at your data. So should we be more precise, in terms of what would be requested from the registrars, in terms of looking at your data against those set of requirements?

ROGER CARNEY: That's a good point, and it may help out. I know that Joe and [Marc] from Verisign have been very helpful on identifying those exact requirements. And we're basically just running it off of that. Much beyond that, except for looking at new registrations and turnover, basically, and how long the zone actually lives, a new registration lives for. So I don't know. I can take a look at the scoping paper again and see, as we've identified things, if it can be clarified or not. I guess that's about all I can offer.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Roger. I think that would certainly be helpful. Theo, I see you have your hand up?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, that's correct, Fabien. I think if you are looking volunteer registrars, you actually need to come up with some kind of game plan here that describes, "As a volunteer registrar, we expect this, this, this, A, B, and C, and this from you." Then actually compliance folks, like me, or people in the organization of a registrar, can go to the development team and go like, "Okay, this is what ICANN is asking us for a volunteer

role here. We need to do this and this and this. How much time is this going to cost us?” And from that perspective, then a registrar can decide, “Okay, for the sake of the community, we are going to do this. We are going to be a volunteer registrar.” But if there is tons of loose ends here, I don’t think that many registrars are just going to jump into some black hole here if they have no idea where it starts, where it ends, and how much time is going to be involved. So I think that sort of covers my main issues here with the volunteer role of the registrars. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Theo. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY:

Theo, would it help to maybe come up with, I don’t know, a report or analysis output that... I don’t want to direct registrars or registries, anybody, to say, “Hey, run these queries,” or, “Run this analysis.” Maybe the output, come up with a common output for everyone. And how they get to it is basically their operational choices. But would that help?

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, thanks. And I think that will actually help there to at least have a couple of definitions, if you will, so we get some more guidance there on what we can expect. I’m just talking in general. I’m not just talking for real-time registrars specifically. That’s just my general sense, that we need some more information before registrars are going to sign up and dedicate time on it. So thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Theo and Roger. Can I also suggest – and this relates to a discussion we had together, Theo, I believe, in terms of how we can attract interest of registrars on this topic. Could we potentially come up with, first, assumptions of how we would approach the implementation of the existing registration tracks so that it would provide a first vision for registrars as to what would be expected, in terms of the transition? And this could be a motivator for them to look at their data. Would that make sense for members of the IRT to try to come up with a first set of assumptions as to how we could proceed to the transition of existing registrations and add that as some kind of high-level approach to the transition, to the scoping paper? Theo, I see you have your hand up.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah. I think that's a good idea, Fabien. And maybe we can even expand on it. I mean, this isn't exactly new, what we are doing here. I mean, there was a migration back in the day when it came to .org. Do we have any materials from that period there, how it went down, what kind of approach was being used there? I expect there were several communications from ICANN with instructions, or from the registry back then, "Registrar, we're going to put you on the agenda for time X, date X, and we expect you to do this and this and this." Do we have any information from that time? That could help us there to visualize it a little bit better, what we are expected to do as a volunteer there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. So let me go to [Jodi], who may want to contribute on that topic.

[JODI KOLCHER]: Hi, can you guys hear me?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, we can hear you well.

[JODI KOLCHER]: So what I remember about .org, and I think I've stated this in a couple of different meetings, basically .org, when it was transitioned, I believe it was only a couple of million domain names. And GoDaddy's piece of that was about 600,000. And these are really rough, rough numbers. I remember actually creating these contacts and going through this. And it took, it [inaudible] several years for this to be done. And what we had was we didn't have a full, what do I want to say, implementation by all registrars. We were still getting compliance issue warnings from .org for domain names that had transferred into GoDaddy that were at least a couple of years past the time when we were supposed to be transitioned, warning us of bad contact data or the fact that contacts hadn't been set up on the domain.

So I guess what I want to warn everybody about is that it's going to take a long time to get done. We're talking about... That was only a couple million domains. We're talking about – is .com at 120 million yet? This is 60 times bigger than that. And this is going to be a very long process to get this done. And I think we need to do it very carefully to make sure

registrants are not losing their domains. So the implementation of this, I think that we can talk a little bit more. I think the next slide has proposals on the implementation process. I don't know if you want to get into that right now.

But one of the things that I think that we would like to favor is to do this on registration. But because it allows us to basically tip our toe in the water here on new registrations. Providing that on new renewals, I think, would be very dangerous to registrants, because registrants usually have their domain names on an auto-renewal on most registries, and they don't even think about updating contacts when the domains are being renewed. If we do, do that on the renewals, we run the risk of the registrant losing the domain name because the contacts could not be created, because the registrant didn't come in and update their contacts to be in the correct form to be allowed to register the domain, or to renew the domain.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, [Jodi]. So I think we can certainly go through the feedback we got from that respect. But maybe before we get there, I saw that Joe... Did you have your hand raised, Joe? Maybe in this [inaudible].

JOE WALDRON: I was just going to give him the numbers, and I just thought I'd put them in chat instead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, great. Thanks. Thanks a lot. Theo?

THEO GEURTS:

I just want to piggy on what [Jodi] just said there about the transition moment there. I had some discussion with some people, I think on Wednesday evening, about migrating the data. My sense from this little crowd – we were like seven registrars there. And even these seven registrars had different point of views on how they wanted to migrate. There were people who wanted to migrate in one batch. There were people who wanted to do it on the renewal date. And a few other suggestions came up. So there's a whole mix there on how registrars actually want to do this. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you, Theo. And I think what your saying is actually a summary of the slide that we have up here, where I tried to summarize the type of feedback we got in the meeting. So, for instance, if I pass over the first one, which was the discussion of the [user] data escrow, which was ruled out a long time ago, I believe, there was some suggestion that there should not be this differentiation between new and existing registration, but instead that we proceed on a per-registrar basis, as was done for the .org. I think that was the comment. Would anybody like to talk about this point specifically and provide some rationale or not going the alternative way? [Jodi], I see you have your hand up. Is this a new hand?

[JODI KOLCHER]:

It's not, but I'd be happy to comment.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sure, if you would like, please.

[JODI KOLCHER]: So I guess on the point of splitting it by registrar, I think that that calls into issues with transferring domain names between registrars that have implemented thick contacts and registrars that haven't. I think you could run into problems on that. And I guess you will run into issues on that on new registrations also, but it would at least give you 60 days or all registrars to at least start implementing some of this. I guess I just want to bring that up, is that you could have a problem with transfers between registrars that haven't implemented the thick yet and the ones that have.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thank you, [Jodi]. Anybody else like to comment on this specific point? Theo?

THEO GEURTS: But we are looking at a point. We had a discussion there in Marrakech. Just looking at them, there's some really good points there. Volker made a good point there. Rob Golding made an excellent point there. And I think we need to dive deeper into those comments there, like the comment from Ben Anderson, like we need the staging area there. These are all true, and we need to take them all in account, and we need to take deeper into them, in my opinion. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. Yeah, thank you, Theo. And I think if you all agree, I think today is a first opportunity for starting to do that. And for instance, it seems to me that if we look at the second bullet, which we just discussed, this [plea] between new and existing registration as opposed to proceeding on a per-registrar basis, it seems that there's no specific support for the per-registrar approach in the IRT. And so I think it's helpful to understand why, so that if this comes up again or potentially later in public comments, we can explain how this was addressed in the definition of the implementation plan. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: And just looking at the contracts and everything, that seems to go against the spirit of registries treating registrars equally. You know, whoever goes first here is going to probably be at a disadvantage, because they're going to get a lot of bad transfers that they're going to have to clean up, if you do it on a registrar-by-registrar basis. It just seems like you're putting the early adopters at the cost of everybody else.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks for that feedback. Should we move on to the next suggestion that we received? Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. I agree with everything that's been said on this topic, but I'll just throw one more thing out there. And that's that one of the

rationales for us proposing the split of the transition of new registrations versus back [inaudible] of existing registrations is that the two present different legal challenges as well. So I just wanted to remind everybody that that was one of our rationale for proposing the split in the first place. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Marc, would you mind refreshing my memory of the examples of the specific difference? Because I certainly remember your discussion of the need for separating those two. But from a legal perspective, was it because new registrations come in a different context, legally speaking, than the original data that was gathered for existing registration? Is this what it was?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah. Yeah, that's it exactly, Fabien. I'm not a lawyer. Of course, I have to caveat that. But consent seems to be a key when we're talking about privacy data. And certainly with new registrations, registrars can be sure to have obtained proper consent. With existing registrations, it's sometimes not clear what consent was obtained and what the legal ramifications are around transitioning that privacy data from one entity to another, in many cases crossing multiple jurisdictions. So again, it's not necessarily apples-to-apples there between new registrations and existing registrations. So in recognition of that, I think the IRT proposed and was supportive of splitting out the two efforts.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, thanks, Marc, for your confirmation. And thanks for adding that element to the discussion of the specific point. Unless there is any other comment or input on this one, should we move to the third bullet and a proposal from Volker Greimann that no registry-side data format check should be imposed? So I understand this to mean that the rule for transitioning the data would be transition the data in the way it is, instead of enforcing some checks on the data. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thank you, Fabien. That is basically what I understood from Volker when he made that comment. And it is not a general consensus among the registrars there. But talking to most of the people there, some of them would really love the most simple approach as possible here, just to avoid any long delays with checks on data format or cross-field checks. Like I said earlier on, I've got this general sense that people like to keep it as simple as possible. And I think that is a way forward there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. [Jodi], I see you're next in line.

[JODI KOLCHER]: My question would be, the format checks that we're talking about, I think Theo referred to city and state, that kind of thing. Or are we talking about there has to be a zip code, that kind of thing? I'm curious what the format check is, more than anything.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, would you be able to give some more color to it?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, just a little bit of more color. Yeah, I'm going to speak as my own capacity here. I don't want to speak for the registrar group here. And I'm going to sound like a broken record here. But I think we just should migrate the data with what we have, and that is it. And if their data is missing, at some point then it will be up to the registrars to fix it. But there should be no registry requirement like, "This data field needs to have data in it or we won't [migrate]." If the data isn't there, okay, then we just keep on moving, migrating with the data. And that is how we should approach this, in my opinion. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thanks, Theo. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. This is Marc. The validations that we've previously provided and were included as part of the scoping paper represent a fairly bare-bones set of validations, and essentially just the minimum validations that are required by [EPT]. And I took that approach because it was my feeling, or my opinion, that registrars would prefer minimum validation. I think the less validation or the less restrictive we are on that, the easier it is to facilitate the transfer of that data or the migration from thin to thick for registrars. That's the approach and the intent of the data validation rules that we've applied so far. But we've had some discussions about this already, and it continues to be a topic.

I'll just say I think it's a good conversation to have, and we're certainly open to adjusting any of those, if that's the feedback or advice from registrars and the rest of the IRT. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Marc. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Maybe we can get Theo to channel Volker a little more, just questioning. It sounds like, from what Volker was talking about, is whatever the registrar has, send it up. The one comment that Theo made about correcting it, I'm not sure how that comes into play. I think that's a possibility. Whatever the registrar has, maybe they have the street name and no city or zip, whatever it is, push that up and wash your hands of it and be done, until something happens.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thank you. Well, Roger, I'm just looking at it from this perspective. I mean, we've got loads of old data there in WHOIS, and maybe it has missing data. Maybe it has not. But it is currently not creating an issue. There is no issue right now. So if there is missing data and we just keep on migrating with it and we skip a few fields as a registrar because the data is not present, nothing will happen. I mean, the world will not end. And we just continue with whatever we are doing. And if there is an

issue for whatever reason, then it will go through the regular procedures. It could be a WHOIS complaint. And the registrar has to act on it, and they'll have to deal with it on the normal basis, which is specified in this RAA 2014 contract, and make sure that the data gets updated and that it is correct. So like I said, if there is some data missing, I think we shouldn't be weighing too much on it, in my opinion. Thanks.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thanks for the clarification, Theo. Oops, sorry. Sorry, it was muted. I apologize. So what I was saying in those two minutes was that I was wondering whether IRT members could share their sense of whether this topic is still an open issue that we need to dig deeper into, in terms of whether we can keep the requirements as they have been proposed by the registries, or we need to discuss them further and potentially make adjustments to them. Can somebody share a sense of whether this is a topic for further discussion? Or should we just move forward with the requirements the way they are right now? [Jodi], please, go ahead.

[JODI KOLCHER]:

The requirements, are you specifically talking to the no registry-side data format checks?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, what we've attached to the scoping paper. Sorry for the imprecision.

[JODI KOLCHER]: No, that's all right. Are there requirements now? Are there requirements currently? Basically, what Verisign has implemented – or maybe not implemented yet, but suggested, like you have to have country code, that kind of thing? Are we talking about removing those format checks?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Well, I think we should certainly add that [to clarity] on this. And I didn't mean to portray those contact data checks as requirements, because obviously there are contract provisions that constitute requirements on the registrars. So we probably need to consider those as well. But I think what I'm trying to find out is whether, on this topic of what is exactly that is going to be enforced in the context of the transition, do we still need to clarify this? Or can we move forward with what we have currently, which is the document that was proposed by Verisign and Employ Media for .jobs? [Jodi], does that answer your question?

[JODI KOLCHER]: Yeah, it does. I think you might need a little more conversation about it. As I remember, it was a pretty lively conversation about not requiring a street address and, I believe, a zip code. I thought that there was someone who was very vocal about their opinion of having to require these fields, like "address 1." Am I not remembering that correctly?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, that's correct. In the last IRT meeting, I believe there was indeed that discussion. So that's certainly a fact, we probably need to bring that discussion to a close.

[JODI KOLCHER]: From GoDaddy's perspective, and this is kind of an off-the-cuff opinion, is that if there was no format checks on the data to be pushed into the registry, then that would definitely make the transition much easier for registrars, as there would not be as many bad contacts that would need to be fixed by the registrant, because there are going to be a large number of those. We see transfers that come in all the time that have just very poor data on it, where the only thing that we were able to actually get out of the WHOIS was an e-mail address. So it doesn't include "address 1," a city, a state, a zip, or a country. And as you do this analysis by all the registrars, I think it's going to be eye opening, is the number of domains that have poor contact data. So removing that restriction, I think, of the format, of requiring that, will make it much easier for registrars, I believe. I don't know if there's any other registrars on that could speak to that, but I'd love to hear their opinion also.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you very much, [Jodi]. Roger, did you want to contribute to this discussion?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I just wanted to add. I think that you brought it up earlier. Should we provide possible forward solutions or forward-implementation

options? I think this is just one of those that we can say, “Well, this is a possible way to go forward.” Obviously, we can discuss this a little more as to if Verisign gets to [remove all checks] or whatever, if we decide to do this one. I think this is just one of those future options to take the current registrations forward.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you. Thank you, Roger. That’s certainly helpful, and we can certainly approach it in that way. Theo, I see you’re in the queue?

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, thank you, Fabien. I’m actually in total agreement with [Jodi] here. And this is basically on the last call, there was some confusion. And I’ll admit, I was confused to it myself, because we, as registrars, the RAA 2014 stipulates pretty much what we need to have when it comes to the data. However, and this is what sort of created the confusion back then, because the requirements from the registry side were less, and that was sort of confusing. But actually, it’s making a lot of sense, because if we loosen the restrictions there on the registry side on what data needs to be imported, we’re going to make our lives a lot easier. And when we look at the recommendations, in my opinion, if we look at the recommendation that the working group made that the format should be —well, “equal” is perhaps not the word – but should be in line of the RAA 2014, I think the recommendation is pretty clear there. It talks about a format, but it doesn’t specify anything when it comes to the data. So if there’s no data present, okay, they’ll just skip that field and keep on migrating with the data. So I think there’s nothing in the

recommendation that is restricting us to make sure that we are moving forward with the implementation, even if there's data missing. In my opinion, there's no issue there. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Theo. Joe?

JOE WALDRON: Yeah, thanks, Fabien. So I really appreciate the discussion, and I think that we're open to alternative solutions. But I'm just having a hard time understanding what "no validation" means, because does that mean that we would essentially take a thick WHOIS update that would have no data in any of the fields? I don't know how that would work. So I think it might be helpful... And again, just to reinforce Marc's point earlier, we've tried to take a fairly light touch, in terms of required fields are required based on what the EPP spec is. And we're not going to validate a postal code to ensure that that postal code exists and it matches the country code, and so on. There are certain things that we want to take a fairly light touch, because our position all along has been this is data that the registrars are authoritative for. And we're going to display the data that we receive from the registrars. But it might be helpful then if we got a proposal back to that document that explains what the validation is, because I think that we would want to look at what "no validation" means, just because I'm not sure how we would be complying with the move to thick. But I think that if we were looking at specific fields and taking something that's maybe required and make it optional, or a text field or a number field and changing the validation of

the specific field, I think that's... Getting a specific proposal back, or suggestions of things that we would want to discuss, in terms of how we would modify what's in the document now, I think that would be most helpful.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Joe. It sounds like this could be a good way to move forward on that discussion inside the IRT. Roger, would you like to speak to something? And maybe we'll try to draw a line under this one and move to the other ones.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. And I agree, I think it's a great thing to discuss, and I think we'll need some more time to do it. I'd just say an initial data dump from registrars to registries, I would guess that it would preferred that there were no checks at all. And then I think that we would need to discuss, okay, when should it be updated, and through what processes would the updates to that current data come from?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, Roger, if I understand correctly, you're suggesting that a potential way to proceed with the implementation of the transition of the existing registration would be to allow, as you said, an initial dump without any checks, and then updates to data that would have issues? Is that what you're suggesting?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, yeah. And again, I think that this group should discuss how or when those updates would be required and how long – maybe forever – that initial dump would survive, that data itself.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thank you, Roger. I think we should add this to the discussion of that specific point, moving forward, and try to clarify whether that's something the IRT would like to consider further, as for the implementation of the existing registration track. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much for the discussion. So let's try to take a look at the other points of feedback we got, in the last ten minutes we have.

So if I move down to the fourth bullet, "Implementation should favor a cutoff date, rather than a multistage process, in order to minimize systems impact." That's from Volker. [Jodi]?

[JODI KOLCHER]: I guess I would like a little more explanation of that. It's basically a cutoff date when all registrars need to have all domains have all four contacts on the domain? I'm guessing that's what it means, but I just want to verify.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Theo, would you be able to provide more color to this one, based on potential subsequent discussion you had with Volker? My understanding was that he was pointing to the fact that he would rather have one specific deadline with the necessary developments to do, rather than several ones where he would have to do [sequential]

developments. I think he wasn't specific, but I got a sense that that's what he meant in principle. I don't know if that helps you understand his point better.

THEO GEURTS: That was sort of my interpretation also, Fabien. He didn't want to run multiple WHOIS servers for a very long time. At least that was my sense of it. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: [Jodi], please, go ahead.

[JODI KOLCHER]: So he's talking about running multiple WHOIS servers. Does he mean that once all the thick data is at the registry, the registrars won't need to perform or support a WHOIS server?

THEO GEURTS: [Jodi], I think there's something in our contract. I'm not Volker, of course. Let me point that out.

[JODI KOLCHER]: Yeah.

THEO GEURTS: I think there is something in our contract that if every registry is a thick WHOIS, then we can stop our own WHOIS server on the register side. I

think that was it. I think Marc has the answer there. If you look at the chat, I think [inaudible].

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you, Marc, for providing the actual text of the transcript. That's helpful, because the summary may not be accurate enough. But I got a sense from his comment and the fact that for him, a multistage transfer would mean that he would have to have two or three parallel systems running at the same time, that made me think that that might also be specific to how his implementation of the WHOIS registration system is set up. So I wonder, I'm not sure if this feedback is universal or specific in a... I think that's a point that I'm wondering about. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. Yeah, I read through the transcript, so when I saw that bullet point, I pulled out the text there. And I thought Volker's comments were interesting. I'm not sure I understand or necessarily agree with his point, but I do feel for him where his concern seems to be that he has to maintain multiple systems, or parallel systems, at certain points in time. I don't necessarily agree that he has to do that, but I'm sympathetic to his concerns, I guess is what I'm trying to say. So I think from an IRT perspective, we should be conscious of that, and we should make sure our final proposal minimizes impacts. And we should look to make sure we're not creating a proposal that would require registries or registrars to maintain multiple parallel systems at any one time. I'm not sure I agree with his point or I understand what his concern is. But on a

high-level basis, I'm certainly sympathetic to that concern, and I want to make sure we're avoiding that. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thank you, Marc. I think that's certainly a concern that we need to address in the implementation plan, in terms of what's the impacts of the proposed implementation. So maybe in that area, we could reach out to Volker and get some more detailed explanation about the points that we can address it properly. [Jodi], I see you have your hand raised. Is this a new hand?

[JODI KOLCHER]: Actually, it is. My question has to do with the cutoff date itself. What would happen if a registrar doesn't hit the cutoff date? What are the repercussions of that?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Well, I believe if we do document a cutoff date as a deadline for some action on the part of registrars in the consensus policy, I assume it would become a compliance matter, should that deadline not be met. But that's an assumption at this point.

Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Fabien. Yeah, I think that's a great question. And again, I want to break that out. For new registrations, I think it's pretty clear. If

we have a cutoff date at some point, we determine, okay, at this point thick data is required for new registrations, at that point it's pretty clear. Registrars that don't meet this requirement would be unable to create new registrations. I think that's a more clear, or at least more straightforward, answer. But for existing registrations, where they have the legacy data, if you will, I think that's a topic I don't think we've really delved into. And I think at some point, that's a topic we'll have to consider and discuss how that should be handled and what the best path forward for that is. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marc. I see that we only have three minutes left. I want to be respectful of everybody's time in the meeting here. I see we have three other points to discuss, including – this was discussed a bit – whether we should rely on registration renewal or transfer for the transition of data. And speaking to the time line, which could take ten years, that was a contribution from James Bladel. I just want to, if you don't mind, take you to our next slide, just to give you a summary of where we are, in terms of discussing time lines. And I don't mean to not have a discussion on the other points, and I suggest we move that to the next meeting that we'll organize.

Just here, as a reminder, in terms of implementation time line so far, on the new registration track we've discussed in our Marrakech meeting... If I understood correctly – I've redone my math after the meeting – it seems that we were talking about a potential time frame of 18-21 months for completion of implementation of the new registration track, the transition of new registrations, while for the existing registration we have not had a specific discussion of time line yet. And I guess we're

getting to it through the discussion that we got with the [inaudible] group, and we will make sure that we keep this discussion going to get to a place where we may have a first approach of a time line to share as part of the data analysis, if that's our decision to keep moving in that direction.

So let me here get to next steps. So on the existing registration, so let me go to new registration first. We have defined some next steps in our IRT meetings at ICANN 55. So I won't come back on those. They deal with refining the current assumptions we have and agree on an actual proposed time line. With existing registrations, I think we need to make a decision here of what we do, in terms of the data analysis. If the IRT believes that this should be conducted, we need to make the adjustments that were discussed today and issue a more formal call for volunteers and then hope that the registrars respond as we'd like.

Can I get a sense of what IRT members think we need to do in that area? So I think the two alternatives... Marc, please, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you, Fabien. I think I understood from Roger that GoDaddy had already started some analysis based on the assumption that the validation rules that we provided earlier would be what's in place. But if we're going to make changes to those validation rules, that would certainly change that analysis they're doing. Now, I think we need to come to some consensus on what validations will exist in order for registrars to do a proper analysis. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you, Marc. That makes sense. And it seems to me that along that discussion, we probably should also consider the signing, some parameters of what could be an approach to transition, as an introduction for the registrars to project themselves into what would be the implementation, and then hopefully motivating them to participate in the data analysis.

So do we have a sense of consensus around this proposed approach by Marc that we keep discussing the type of checks that should be in place and some parameters of what would be the highlights of the implementation plan before we reach out again to the registrars? Is there any objection to doing that? I'm not seeing any hands raised, nor hearing anybody objecting. So let me suggest that we move this way. I will follow up on the mailing list and suggest that we have a discussion on the mailing list until we can schedule our next regular IRT meeting, where we would pick up that discussion. And we'll try to schedule that meeting as soon as possible so that we can move as fast as possible in that respect.

Are there any final comments, questions? Not hearing anybody, thank you so much for your time today. Thank you for participating with such a short notice. We really appreciate your time. And we will be in touch via the mailing list very soon. And our next IRT call will be scheduled in the coming week or two. Thank you very much for your time, and have a nice day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]