

1. What would the a bulk transfer be under option 2 (proposal that registries do not impose checks or validation parameters on the registration data being transitioned from thin to thick) ?

[RDC] I think that having two options would be best, a file option and a dedicated EPP connection(s) option. File Option should have defined specifications i.e. format, size,etc (JGore)

[Theo G.] This will depend on the fields and the parameters. Multibyte or non-ASCII support is required.

2. How can we minimize the amount of “throw away code” ?

[RDC] Allowing bulk through dedicated EPP connection will reuse the create and update code paths. If Registries would agree on a uniformed SDK that would be appreciated (JGore)

3. Should there be a minimal set of validation parameters ? For example:

Numerical/Alphanumerical/UTF8 constraints on phone fields, requirement to provide Contact ID and Auth Info, a maximum length of fields

[RDC] Max length, contact id, auth info.Minimum length (JGore)

4. Should we aim to synchronize implementation of the new and existing registrations tracks ?

[RDC] I think that we should keep these going down separate paths, mitigating any possible delay in one path from the other path. Keep them separate. Focus on New Registrations first (JGore)

5. Once data is migrated, what rules should apply ? Should new and existing registrations be treated differently based on their creation date and the applicable RAA ?

[RDC] New and existing should be treated differently. Current rules (ICANN and Registry policies) should only apply to existing registration contacts once the contact update date is greater than the transition date, exception on transfers see below.

6. Is the potential impact of option 2 on future transfers of registration acceptable

[RDC] Yes, same experience as today, except that it should improve over time. There will be bad contacts on transfers and this should be allowed. This data will cleanse organically over time. Do not prohibit the transfer if data contact information is incorrect or not complete (JGore).

[Theo G.] I do not mind this, but and this is a big but, could we end up in a situation where a gaining Registrar ends up after a transfer or bulk-registry transfer with X amount of domain names with zero or partial data and the burden of data correction will fall upon the gaining Registrar? If the answer is yes, then I am against option 2.

In my experience data correction is a painful and a very costly procedure and in my opinion, the gaining Registrar should not take the brunt for the missing data for the losing Registrar. So is the above scenario, something that can happen? Or if we do not know how can we prevent it from happening or can we add some safeguards that if the above scenario unfolds the losing Registrar must supply the missing data?