ICANN Thick Whois Policy Implementation

Transition From thin to thick - Implementation Path Scorecard - Last updated: 20 June 2016

Legend:

Open	Item has been identified and is pending substantive discussion	**Ongoing**	Discussion of this item has started and is still ongoing	**Closed**	IRT reached agreement on a proposed answer

New Registration Track

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
1	**Milestones** for transition of new registrations from thin to thick	Closed	Current proposed milestones: – Registries to make system changes – Registrar notification of changes – Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in OT&E – Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in production – Registrar notification/transition period – Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in OT&E – Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in production
2	**Timeline estimate** for transition of new registrations from thin to thick	Ongoing	Current proposal: 18 to 24 months overall – 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (optional thick) – 12 to 18 months for Registrars to complete the transition – 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (required thick) **Pending** (31 May 2016): – Registries to provide preliminary overview of system changes for refinement of timeline by 13 June 2016 – Registries and registrars to agree on a detailed timeline

Existing Registration Track

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
1	**Bulk Transfer** - What options would registries provide for Bulk Transfer of existing registrations data?	Ongoing	**Agreed** (10 May 2016): Registries will provide EPP channel for transferring existing registrations under minimal validation rules (see #3). When registries can accept new registrations, nothing prevents backfill of existing registrations (caveat: new registrations validation rules would apply, as opposed to minimal validation rules). **Pending** (24 May 2016): Further discussion needed (see #1a, 1b, 1e)
1a	**Bulk Transfer** - Can **dedicated EPP connections** be made available for parallel processing? (Roger)	Ongoing	**Pending** (14 June 2016): Registries' initial proposal: Registrars to use Verisign's batch pool of EPP connections for backfilling of existing registrations data, with limitation to 30 transactions per seconds per registrar. Registrars concerns: − may require significant development for some registrars (may need assessment of current usage of this connection pool by registrars) − limitation to 30 tps may require months of time for GoDaddy to complete the transition (see discussion in #7) Alternative proposal to be investigated by Verisign (Marc); offer a single connection with unlimited throughput.
1b	**Bulk Transfer** - Can **alternative option** via bulk upload or file transfer be offered? (Roger, Jennifer) Bulk creation of contacts	Ongoing	**Pending** (24 May 2016): To be confirmed and defined by Registries with specifications based on validation rules, with input from Registrars on how to achieve the two activities identified as necessary to complete bulk transfer: - creation of all contacts, (can be achieved via file transfer) - update of relevant domain names with these contacts once created Current proposal by Registries: - Bulk upload of contacts only, update of domains via EPP - Implementation Plan to leave alternative option open

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
1e	**Bulk Transfer** - Can a **data escrow**-based mechanism be considered (Theo)	Ongoing	**Pending** (14 June 2016): Discuss further RrSG feedback suggesting use of the existing registrar Data Escrow files (would be cleaned up by Registrars and sent to Registries), <u>or alternatively</u>, provide reasons for not following this path. Registry concerns with the Registrar's proposal: – May require a significant amount of work on Registry Systems – Management of Auth Info would be a challenge Registrar Data Escrow specification shared over the mailing list for consideration by Verisign (Marc) and further discussion by IRT (Theo)
2	How can we minimize throw-away code? (Roger)	Closed	**Agreed** (10 May 2016): Current EPP code path will be reused (see #1)
2a	Uniformity of Registries SDK is desirable (Jennifer)	Closed	**Agreed** (24 May 2016): This is already the case (Marc). Closed unless Jennifer would like to re-open/discuss further.
3	**Validation Rules** - Should there be a minimal set of validation rules - instead of no validation rules? (Marc)	Ongoing	**Agreed** (24 May 2016): Only three fields would be mandatory: Contact ID, Postal Info Type (due to systems constraints) and Auth Info. This is to minimize impediment and ensure all available data is loaded (even if currently incomplete). **Pending** (14 June 2016): Further discussion needed (see #3c)
3a	**Validation Rules** - Confirmation of Postal Info Type Requirement as part of validation parameters (Marc)	Closed	**Confirmed**, see #3
3b	**Validation Rules** - Requirement for registrars to supply **all available data** (Steve)	Closed	**Agreed** (31 May 2016) – RDDS output be the same before and after the transition (Same amount of RDDS information is provided) – Implementation plan to include note that validation rules are only meant to ease the transition and not to change the contractual requirements as far as what data needs to be supplied.

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
3c	**Validation Rules** - Need to gather **Input from RySG and RrSG** on finalized contact validation rules (Theo, Marc, Roger)	Ongoing	**Pending** (7 June 2016): Expecting feedback from RySG and RrSG on proposed validation rules) by 21 June 2016 (Marc, Theo)
3d	**Validation Rules** - Once data is migrated, what rules to apply? Should new and existing registrations be treated differently based on their creation date and applicable RAA? (Roger)	Closed	**Pending** (7 June 2016): Confirmation of current proposal: minimum validation rules apply to the transition of existing registration's contact data, until the end of "backfill" period. At such cut over date, standard validation rules in registry systems apply, indifferently to any changes on new and existing contact data (to avoid adding levels of complexity)
4	Should we aim to synchronize the new and existing registrations tracks?	Closed	**Agreed** (10 May 2016): Keep the two tracks separate to mitigate potential delays. Focus on New Registrations first.
5	How should **inter-registrar transfers** of registrations be handled if information is incorrect or incomplete? (Jennifer, Roger, Theo)	Closed	**Agreed** (7 June 2016): No issues identified that would be specific to the transition from thin to thick. Can be handled using current procedures/practices.
6	How should **inter-registrar transfers** be handled when registrars are at different stages of data migration in the transition from thin to thick? (Jodi)	Ongoing	**Pending** (7 June 2016): Discussion of potential "corner cases" related to the time taken by registrars to complete the transition of their existing registrations from thin to thick: – Loosing registrar is thick (already transitioned) but gaining registrar is thin (not yet transitioned) – Loosing registrar is thin but gaining registrar is thick One suggestion include requiring registrars to continue providing a Whois Service during the transition (Joyce)

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal

7	**Timeline** - What timeline should be considered for transferring existing registrations from thin to thick? (Staff)	Ongoing	Discussion to date:
			– Start date will be determined by announcement of policy effective date, currently assumed to be in January 2017 (Staff)
			– End date will likely be the cut off date after which regular validation rules apply (Marc, Roger)
			
			Pending (14 June 2016):
			Further discussion needed on the following topics (see also #7a, 7b):
			
			– 18 months window is seen as reasonable by registrars (Theo) in particular if EPP connections are limited at 30 transaction per second given that 5 to 10 transactions for 63M domains would require between 6 and 12 months to complete (Jodi)
			
			– Options to be considered to potentially reduce the time needed to transition existing registration data:
			    o Offering of unlimited throughput connections by Registries (may suit the needs of large registrars) - See #1a
			    o Use of bulk upload via file, RDE-based in particular (may suit the need of smaller registrars) - See #1e
			
			– Uniqueness of this transition compared to .ORG's in terms of scale and tools available (such as the RDE specification)

7a	**Timeline** - Need for a way to estimate system throughput on contact creation (Theo, Roger)	Ongoing	**Pending** (31 May 2016): Registries to investigate possibilities to address the needs of the dozen of so high volume registrars and report back by 13 June 2016

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
7b	**Timeline** - Need to factor in coordination of 2000+ registrars, including potential non-responsiveness (Theo)	Ongoing	Current proposal by registries to offer the same window for all registrars considering second-hand experience of the .ORG transition and amount of registrars involved in this transition. **Pending** (31 May 2016): Further discussion needed to flesh out details, including potential incentives or measures to avoid bottlenecks before closure of window for migration of data, considering that: – it may be challenging to mobilizing silent registrars (Theo) as well as small registrars based on the .ORG precedent (Jodi) – driving uptake of transition by requiring Thick in OT&E before cutover in production may not be effective due to modest use of OT&E currently