

## ICANN Thick Whois Policy Implementation

### Transition From thin to thick - Implementation Path Scorecard - Last updated: 6 June 2016

#### Legend:

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

#### New Registration Track

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
1	<b>Milestones</b> for transition of new registrations from thin to thick	Closed	<p>Current proposed milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registries to make system changes</li> <li>- Registrar notification of changes</li> <li>- Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in OT&amp;E</li> <li>- Introduction of optional thick (contact support) in production</li> <li>- Registrar notification/transition period</li> <li>- Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in OT&amp;E</li> <li>- Cutover to required thick (contacts) for new registrations in production</li> </ul>
2	<b>Timeline estimate</b> for transition of new registrations from thin to thick	Ongoing	<p>Current proposal: 18 to 24 months overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (optional thick)</li> <li>- 12 to 18 months for Registrars to complete the transition</li> <li>- 90 days notification of systems changes to Registrars (required thick)</li> </ul> <p><b>Pending</b> (31 May 2016):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registries to provide preliminary overview of system changes for refinement of timeline by 13 June 2016</li> <li>- Registries and registrars to agree on a detailed timeline</li> </ul>

## Existing Registration Track

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
1	<b>Bulk Transfer</b> - What options would registries provide for Bulk Transfer of existing registrations data?	Ongoing	<b>Agreed</b> (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).  <b>Pending</b> (24 May 2016): Further discussion needed (see #1a, 1b)
1a	<b>Bulk Transfer</b> - Can <b>dedicated EPP connections</b> be made available for parallel processing? (Roger)	Ongoing	<b>Pending</b> (24 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
1b	<b>Bulk Transfer</b> - Can <b>alternative option</b> via bulk upload or file transfer be offered? (Roger, Jennifer)	Open (10 May 2016)	To be confirmed and defined by Registries with specifications based on validation rules (24 May 2016)
1e	<b>Bulk Transfer</b> - Can a <b>data escrow</b> -based mechanism be considered (Theo)	Open (7 June 2016)	
2	How can we minimize throw-away code? (Roger)	Closed	<b>Agreed</b> (10 May 2016): Current EPP code path will be reused (see #1)
2a	Uniformity of Registries SDK is desirable (Jennifer)	Closed	<b>Agreed</b> (24 May 2016): This is already the case (Marc). Closed unless Jennifer would like to re-open/discuss further.
3	<b>Validation Rules</b> - Should there be a minimal set of validation rules - instead of no validation rules? (Marc)	Ongoing	<b>Agreed</b> (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).  <b>Pending</b> (24 May 2016): Further discussion needed (see #3b, 3c, 3d)
3a	<b>Validation Rules</b> - Confirmation of Postal Info Type Requirement as part of validation parameters (Marc)	Closed	<b>Confirmed</b> , see #3

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
3b	<b>Validation Rules</b> - Requirement for registrars to supply <b>all available data</b> (Steve)	Ongoing	<p><b>Agreed</b> (31 May 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RDDS output be the same before and after the transition (Same amount of RDDS information is provided)</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pending</b> (31 May 2016): Discussion of potential incentives/enforcement measures if appropriate</p>
3c	<b>Validation Rules</b> - Need to gather <b>Input from RySG and RrSG</b> on finalized contact validation rules (Theo, Marc, Roger)	Ongoing	<p><b>Pending</b> (31 May 2016): Sharing of final validation rules with RySG and RrSG and request input (focused only on validation rules) by providing 2 weeks for input.</p>
3d	<b>Validation Rules</b> - 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)	Ongoing	<p><b>Pending</b> (24 May 2016): Current proposal: minimum validation apply to the transition of existing registration's contact data, until a defined date. After such date, regular validation rule apply to any new or changed contact data</p>
4	Should we aim to synchronize the new and existing registrations tracks?	Closed	<p><b>Agreed</b> (10 May 2016): Keep the two tracks separate to mitigate potential delays. Focus on New Registrations first.</p>
5	How should <b>inter-registrar transfers</b> of registrations be handled if information is incorrect or incomplete? (Jennifer, Roger, Theo)	Ongoing	<p><b>Pending</b> (24 May 2016): Current proposal: do not prohibit transfer in such cases. Registries to confirm feasibility.</p>
6	How should <b>inter-registrar transfers</b> be handled when registrars are at different stages of data migration in the transition from thin to thick? (Jodi)	Open (24 May 2016)	
7	<b>Timeline</b> - What timeline should be considered for transferring existing registrations from thin to thick? (Staff)	Ongoing	<p>Discussion to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Start date will be determined by announcement of policy effective date, currently assumed to be in January 2017 (Staff)</li> <li>- End date will likely be the cut off date after which regular validation rules apply (Marc, Roger)</li> </ul> <p><b>Pending</b> (31 May 2016): Further discussion needed (see #7a, 7b)</p>

#	Question/Open Item (Proponent)	Status	Comment/Proposal
7a	<b>Timeline</b> - Need for a way to estimate system throughput on contact creation (Theo, Roger)	Ongoing	<b>Pending</b> (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
7b	<b>Timeline</b> - 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.  <b>Pending</b> (31 May 2016): Further discussion needed on potential incentive or measures to avoid bottlenecks before closure of window for migration of data