

**ICANN Transcript
Thick Whois Implementation IRT meeting Part 2
30 June 2016**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Dennis Chang: Everyone. It's 9:15 and we'll get started here. Thank you everyone for coming back for our second session at the ICANN 56 Helsinki Stakeholders Policy Implementation IRT Meeting.

So this is a continuation from yesterday's conversation. And again, my name is Dennis Chang, GDD Services and Engagement Program Director. And I will be moderating this session today.

I think everyone's been here yesterday so we're - skip the introduction and go right to business. We have a long agenda. And I have an announcement to make. I know that yesterday we wanted to talk longer but we couldn't because there was a session immediately following ours.

So today we have managed to secure the room for 30 additional minutes. And what I'd like to know from the IRT is your flexibility in going longer than

scheduled. Let me see a show of hands if you have a hard stop or you can go longer. Which one is it? Hard stop. Anybody else?

Man: Hard stop.

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Chang: Three? Okay. That means we'll have to press on. And if you wouldn't mind, I don't mean to be rude but I am going to maybe, you know, press you a little bit harder to get going and not a lot of repeated conversations hopefully. So we'll get started right away (next).

So today's agenda is a priority item for us today is the consensus labeling and display. This is the policy that we would like to announce next month for an effective date of February 1 - by January, February of next year.

And so this is a pressing topic of the day. So if at all possible at this session we would like to gain understanding, perhaps consensus and ask all your question and have you dialog conversation here today so that when you go back home you have no homework. Isn't that nice? That's an incentive.

The second topic is the notification to GNSO Council for our conversation yesterday. So we did some homework and we're going to let you know what we found out and the process; how we go about that.

The third is the implementation timeline that we were talking about yesterday and will continue to gain more understanding there and see if we can come to a consensus there as well.

So the consistent labeling and display; this is the same chart we showed you yesterday. And let me turn it over to (Fabian) right here. (Fabian), go ahead and take it away.

(Fabian): Thank you Dennis. Hello everyone. So actually it's a new slide that complies some of the information that we've exchanged over the last few months. We just wanted to remind everyone of the, you know, the high level (with types) every comment we got or the feedback we got during the public comment period on the initial draft of the policy language.

Then the discussion we've had with you in the IRT and finally explain what we (will do) with the revisions of the - in terms of revision to the policy language.

So very quickly, in terms of feedback in the public comments, you may recall there were concerns with the time taken to implement the transition. So that's not per se consistent labeling and display. And you know how we've been progressing on that. Concerns that we have been (in fact) of our interpretation of consistent.

They were concerned around the need to collect new data around the reseller information and registrar expiration date. Concern that that date would also create confusion for end users. And there was also concern that the reseller information would have a pretty serious impact on the registrar operation.

The community - there was an alternative implementation proposal in the community that suggested that the reseller and registrar expiration date be optional. And finally there were concerns that the proposed policy would have an negative impact on the registry's contractual framework due to the references in the policy to the 2013 RAA as well as the (unintelligible).

In subsequent discussion with the IRT you may also recall that there were a suggestion that we not require any measures (to mediate confusion) for those registries that would display the registrar expiration date - would choose to display the registrar expiration date.

We also discussed how the expiration date confusion issue may be referred. We initially thought about the RDS PDP but some of you suggested that we consider the GNSO instead and that this was for seeking a long-term solution, which was indeed our intent.

And finally in terms of the reference of 2013 (IANA) policy some of you asked that we clarify or suggested that we clarify the policy in an intent to establish a current linkage there.

So essentially what we did in terms of revising the language. First of all we simplified the language. You may recall that in our language we had - we covered consistent labeling and display as well as the transition although there was no effective date for the transition part of it.

So we decided that we should separate those two to have two different sets of policy language. So what we're going to present to you is specific consistent labeling and display. We believe that this will bring more clarity to everyone.

We've aligned the language with the comments we received and in particular by making optional reseller and registrar expiration data as we explained yesterday.

And finally we've clarified several items, in particular we're removed the reference to 2013 RAA and replaced it with an actual (sophistication) of the changes that would apply to the RDS output for registries.

And in terms of the re-clarification we have made clear that this is a complement to the policy language; it's not a (big) piece of it. So let's look - let's take a look at the document.

So before we get through the revised policy, let me show the draft policy we submitted for public comment just as a reminder. So as you might remember, we had a section containing the consensus policy and then some implementation notes.

The policy section was rather short. The one here was a reminder of the policy recommendation - was actually sort of rewriting of the - or copy of the adaptation of the working group recommendation. And Bullet 2 here was our references to the fact that the RDDS output should be consistent with Spec 3 of the 2013 RAA as well as the (Whois Clarification) Advisory.

And so we had three phases. Phase 1 and Phase 2 are two parts of consistent labeling and display. And then Phase 3 was the transition. So in effect our taking into account of the comments meant that Phase 2 should not exist anymore. But then that would have left us, you know, with a phase of transition still hanging with no effective date. So we've decided to switch that.

So now let me go to the revised policy that, as Dennis mentioned, I believe we shared yesterday on the mailing list. So you may be able to get your own copy. Okay. Here it is.

Dennis Chang: Can I just confirm with everyone that you received it. Yes. Thanks.

(Fabian): Okay. So here it is. I need to browse quickly through the (unintelligible) and we'll look in detail. So first of all, we've changed the title. This is the Registry Registration Data Directory Services, RDDS, Registrar DDS Consistent Labeling and Display Policy.

We - you see here that's the specification I talked about of the changes that apply to RDDS output. So we'll get to that in more detail. And you see here that we have throughout 13 bullets and effective date of 1 February 2017. And then we have short implementation notes that refer here to the advisory and also provide an example output for all intent and purposes.

And finally at the end we have a section with the background of how - where this policy come from. So okay. This was just an overview. Let's go back to the first page.

So, as I mentioned, instead of adding a reference to the 2013 RAA, we worked off of a reference to the current base agreement, which - base registry agreement Specification 4 to which we're adding some requirements.

So Number 1 is the positioning of the registrar with contact email and so on. As far as the communities (probably) in the public comment, there was an agreement that those should be displayed by registries.

So Bullet 1 here specify where those two should be placed in the output. Then - so then we stop here see if there is any specific comments.

Dennis Chang: Any comments in the room? Adobe Connect? Go on.

(Fabian): So then Bullets 2 to 5 are those that refer to the registrar registration expiration date and with other information. And so here in those four bullets we indicate that those are optional, that if they're shown they must appear - so the reseller information that appear after - sorry, before the main status.

If shown the value of reseller must be the name of the organization if it's a legal entity. Otherwise it's a natural person's name. And then use the registrar registration expiration date is shown at - must appear immediately after the registry expiry date.

I'll just pause a second. See if there's any comment or question. So that was for Bullets 2 through 5. Okay.

Dennis Chang: None here.

(Fabian): Okay. So six is about the - is specifying the format of the value for this contact, email and phone, reseller and registrar expiration date by making references to either the (unintelligible) or the extensible market language.

Then Bullet 7. Seven is about the name of the keys or fields in the RDDS output. So left column is the original name in the current Specification 4. The second column is the new name per consistency with the 2013 RAA. And then last column refers to the type of query to which a response - to which a response provided need to include those (in IT).

So this is again to clarify and (it's still) referring to the 2013 RAA (sophistication); we're providing the details here to make sure that this is crystal clear. Let me stop here a second. See if there is any comments or question.

Dennis Chang: None here.

(Fabian): Okay. That might be because it's either quite early or very late.

Dennis Change: So let me pause and ask a question. So the Implementation Team they came up with this new document format felt that this type of format and presentation worked much more clear and it's an improvement. So I'm hoping the lack of questions is a good sign here that we are communicating much more clearly with this document. Any feedback on the format?

Joe Waldron: Thanks Dennis. This is Joe. Yes. No, I think it is - I think it is clear. It is a bit of a revision from the previous one. So I think that, you know, while I think everybody's had a chance to read it, I think that we still need time to kind of digest and compare and, you know, really examine this pretty carefully, so.

(Fabian): Yes. Thank you Joe. I was just going to say this is why we wanted to take some time this morning so that we get a chance to walk everyone through it in addition us yesterday. And we have requested that IRT members provide their review to it by the end of next week.

So we hope that the combination of our taking this time today and providing, you know, more than a week for review is going to be enough for IRT members to review the document.

Dennis Chang: (Krista).

Krista Papac: It's Krista Papac. Thanks Dennis. Krista Papac from ICANN staff. Just to add to what Dennis said. The format is different and I mean I think this in a note (Fabian) sent last night. And absolutely Joe, you guys need to take a look at it for sure.

But we - it's more of a formatting change and not too many substantive changes other than to incorporate the guidance from you guys. And I agree with Dennis. I'm hoping that the lack of questions is both you need to look at it substantively but the concerns you did express in public comments and in these meetings that we've been able to address them in a way that works for everybody, so. Anyway thank you guys for that.

Dennis Chang: Go ahead (Fabian). (Fabian).

(Fabian): Oh, thanks Dennis. Sorry. I was muted. So I was speaking to Bullet 8 here, which is for the billing contacts and then name or the (key) per the table that's here.

Then finally or sorry, I'm sorry. We - this one is for the - let me catch up here. So that's the - an additional (footer) that needs to be put before the (end footer).

Number 10. That's for a number of things to address the situation of gTLDs that have specific provision in their agreement allowing them to provide a sort of a (third) access or we're wrote in here redacted RDDS output. So that is an output that may not contain the full Whois information depending on where the request comes from and how it's provided.

And so here in this case we describe specifically what those - what the implementation here means to these registries. And for instance, right now we have the (unintelligible) name. They are subject to search provision. And so we're suggesting - so we're clarifying here that in this case the fields listed here may be treated as optional.

Then 11 we're clarifying what the field registry (in the meantime) doing, registrant (ID) refer to. Twelve. This is a reference to the RDAP operational profile, which the implementation of which is needed and required for all the (gTLD) registries and others to achieve the consistency of Whois RDS output and that the synchronization that we've worked consistently with over the last year or so in terms of implementing consistent labeling and display.

And finally Number 13. Here that's for the clarification that additional RDDS fields may be - it's possible at the end of the output - the current specification of the output with some restriction as to what does (keyed in) values mean must not contain.

And finally our effective date of 1 February 2017. We've a clarification that for the registry operators (unintelligible). This effective date is not the one by which this should implement consistent labeling and display and they will - they would implement consistent labeling and display when we reach the policy effective date of the transition (unintelligible).

So this completes our presentation of the policy part of the language and our specific issues of the output for registry RDDS. Let me stop here and see if there is any questions or comment before we move on to our - right to the document.

Dennis Chang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Thank you. Steve Metalitz. Thank you (Fabian). I had one question about Number 13 in the phrase confidential information issues there. Is that defined anywhere in this document?

(Fabian): It is not defined in the document. That I can (confirm).

Steve Metalitz: So is it clear what that covers? I mean this is about - this is about additional fields that a registry operator may choose to provide. And it's not clear to me what this restricts. I think I understand the first one. The third is kind of a general one. So that's obviously, you know, that's more of a retrospective one if something happens I guess.

And but the second one - for example, if a registry operator were to provide a (who was) service and provide information on past registrants of the same domain name, would that be considered confidential information even if it's personally identifiable information? It's just not clear to me what that means.

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco Arias from staff. Steve, this is in - this was added in response to a request from -- I can't remember who it was -- in the (activity tech) mailing list.

I think this came up in the context of the RDAP profile but it also applies in the Whois side. And there was a concern about language in the profile about the need to request permission from ICANN to add a RDS field.

So we're saying it's okay to add them but you have to use a contact (but) have to make sure that you are not adding any - security will now read in what you are doing. You have to be careful in what you are adding.

And we also - if you look at the last sentence in Number 13, what else can they - (they are ready to) provide us with the list of (relational fields) to ICANN before they deploy them so we can have -- how do you say -- a time check just in case we did something that may raise an issue so we can deal with the registry before they're deployed.

(Jeff): Thanks. (Jeff) (unintelligible) here. So my question is also on 13. I also - first I had that same question on the confidential information. But I guess reading this it seems like it says that it -- where was it -- that without further approval by ICANN but then it says prior to deployment registry operators shall provide an update to the list of all the additional fields supported to ICANN.

So it seems like it's a tacit approval, right, if ICANN doesn't say anything? It's still approval but you're saying you don't need to get explicit approval from ICANN. But it's still basically approval because you can come back and say no, those fields cannot be in there. Is that correct?

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco Arias from staff. So we don't see this as an approval (rather than) - and we don't expect there to be an issue. But it's, like I said, just a sanity check just to make sure that if let's say someone worked (one and) it would be a very silly example (with) field that says give me here your user ID and password for your banking account.

And so I wanted to (put that). They would say oh, are you sure you want to do that. You know, it's that kind of a filter but we don't expect we'll get to be - there to be an issue.

(Jeff): Okay. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: We have a question from the room. It's from Chris Pelling. I know just by fluke the page where we provide information to the registry I did not see a (I missed) reseller information being a reseller centric registrar similar to (CO) (unintelligible). This would be a field where we need to populate. Was it me or I just missed it? I apologize for that mispronunciation.

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco Arias. Oh, that's (Fabian). (Fabian) is (coming up). Reseller (field) in there for - oh, that's the value. It is showing where it will appear. Number 2 is mentioned that this is an optional field. This is coming from the 2013 RAA with reseller as an optional field. So we are replicating this in the (unintelligible).

Dennis Chang: Go ahead (Roger).

(Roger): This is (Roger). On Number 9 it looks like the URL for the registry is different than the registrar. This is different than what we're required to show.

Francisco Arias: Let us check on that.

Dennis Chang: Thank you. Go ahead Joe.

Joe Waldron: Yes. Joe Waldron from VeriSign. So I have two points. One I think just for clarification. I'm trying to get to the footnote - the footnote at the end of the first section. Since we defined yesterday that there were really two effective dates, I think we should just be clear there's an effective date in the chart that you showed yesterday that had an effective date for new registrations versus the (backflow) of legacy.

If I remember - if I remember that chart correct - the Gantt chart with the timeline slide. (You don't) - okay.

Dennis Chang: I think you're referring to transition.

Joe Waldron: Transition. Yes. There was a slide - the transitional implementation path. So there's a policy effective date for new registrations and a policy effective date for existing registrations. So since there's two different dates, I think it's just

ambiguous in the policy document that we just sent out in terms of which one or how is that being implemented. So I think we should just make that clarification.

Dennis Chang: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Chang: No, go ahead if you want to address that first.

Francisco Arias: Yes. So very quickly. This is Francisco by the way. This slide is about the transition from thin to thick. The effective date that we're showing in the document is only about consistent labeling and display, which is you could say a tier policy effective date, different to these two.

So that effective date is being shown in the screen it's only about consistent labeling and display. It's not about the transition from thin to thick. Does that make sense?

Joe Waldron: I'm referring to the footnote at the bottom. It says registry operators for (comment and jobs) shall be subject to this policy upon the policy effective date for the transition from thin to thick.

Francisco Arias: Oh.

Joe Waldron: I'm just saying that that's ambiguous.

Francisco Arias: Understood. Yes. Thank you. We probably should make clear that for - that this is what you're doing two effective dates for (unintelligible) would be the effective date for (unintelligible) would be the other date. Yes, we need to...

Joe Waldron: I would say let's have a discussion about how we want to clarify this statement then. I don't know that you want to be in this limbo land. But we - we'll have to figure out what the right clarification is.

And then the other question I had was on the - on Number 12 with the RDAP service. And I'm just - maybe I haven't been keeping up on the RDAP profile but I guess I just have - I still have some concerns with including the language that we have to - that this is going to mandate implementation of the RDAP operational profile.

And I know when we had the session in Marrakech, I think for instance (they) made the comment that the profile is really just documenting existing requirements and specifications.

So I guess without knowing what the status of that document and saying that we're, you know, we're going to review this and having that profile that hasn't been really finalized I don't believe and still is in progress, I think that leaves an uncertainty at this point.

Francisco Arias: I'll take further questions Joe. This is Francisco. And - so as you may remember, we - a long time ago they estimate the decision to bundle the implementation of both RDAP and (CLD). So we're still with that. And I - the team to send the updated version of the outlook profile. It's almost finalized and it should - I expect to send it today.

And it's a updated version like this one and incorporating the feedback we received in the public comments. There are many (unintelligible) but there are some clarifications that were requested by the community and we are doing that. So the idea would be to put those in a synchronized form.

Joe Waldron: Yes. Thanks Francisco. I think that, you know, look - you have to look at the two documents together, right. So I think that like part of the dependency on being comfortable with the RDAP language here, so.

Francisco Arias: Yes.

Joe Waldron: Absolutely agree. We wanted to make sure that we weren't duplicating and doing repetitive work. So appreciate the work to try to get this done and just make it a point that we need to look at them in coordination with each other.

Francisco Arias: Yes Joe. You will see that. Go ahead (Jordan).

(Jordan Shantry): Staying on the - it's (Jordan Shantry) with Google. Staying on the topics of RDAP for a moment. I think there has been discussion of allowing registry operators to run a separate instance of RDAP or something like that alongside the one (running) the official operational profile to get some operational experience with some of the other features of RDAP.

That doesn't seem to be reflected here. Is there a plan to specifically allow registry operators to do that somewhere else?

Francisco Arias: Thank you (Jordan). This is Francisco. Yes. The language is going to be included in the profile. And looks that we are (going) to share it and my goal is to share it today. And there you will find language that is allowing a contracted party (registry) operator to operationally run a test out of (unintelligible) separated from the production service.

(Jordan Shantry): Just as a - is there a reason why that belongs in the RDAP profile as opposed to in the - in this policy? It seems like the profile as I understood it previously

was describing the behavior of the sort of production RDAP instance whereas here we're talking about like oh, and you can have another thing where you can do whatever you want, right.

And it just feels like that - normally I would think that that would go into something like Attachment A to the registry agreement. I don't know what the equivalent on the registrar side is. But having it in the policy itself seems like it would also be enabling for registrar - registries/registrars whereas here - but are you just trying to do that so the registrars also have the option or is there another reason?

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco. Yes. Indeed that's the exact reason why we are planning to put it in the profile because this policy applies only to registries while the profile applies to both.

Dennis Chang: Any other questions, comments? (Fabian), I don't hear any more questions or comments from here in the room and I don't see any in the chat. So then are we okay to move on to the next topic? Request to the IRT is to provide their final comments by next week I think. We'll share that date. It's on the slide that's coming up. Go ahead (Fabian). You want to share the implementation notes now?

(Fabian): Yes. Just wanted to (show those modes) and in particular Number 1, which is the reference to the advisory. And then Number 2, which is the output that we provide for unintended purposes, the example output.

And so that I'll put a bit in to reflect obviously what we are requiring as far as this policy. And that's pretty much it for - as for our document. They need the background so we'll need that for the IRT to read when they're - (at their own mark).

So I think that if there isn't any - if there isn't any comments or question on the implementation, we can certainly move on.

Dennis Chang: Let's move on. Let move on to the next topic (Fabian).

(Fabian): So this is a reminder of the timeline of our next steps. We're requested that the IRT members provide their feedback, their review to the other (unintelligible) next week.

We would then work to announce the policy effective date by the end of the month of July as we mentioned or an effective date of 1 February 2017. If there isn't any question or comment, we can move on to discussing the (transition).

Dennis Chang: One question here.

(Jeff): (Jeff) (unintelligible) here. So on the deadline for the EU it says by the IRT. Does that mean it is not open to comments or any other language before - by anybody else besides members of the IRT?

(Fabian): So thank you (Jeff) for your question. I think we are at a state where the first draft was submitted for public comment. We - I believe that our document here addresses those comments. We are checking with the IRT that (this is indeed) that they share this analysis. And, you know, unless there is a strong case for this needing to go through public comment, we intend to move forward with this document provided the IRT agrees with our analysis.

(Jeff): Okay. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Go ahead.

(Roger): This is (Roger). On the date. I don't believe the IRT is meeting between now and then. Do we want the team to meet and address any comments before? We're giving everybody a week to talk - ready it. I mean should we meet before?

(Fabian): So (Roger), I think we were not going to schedule a meeting of the IRT next week because it's so close to the meeting and travels. But if the IRT thinks we should have one, we can certainly look into it.

What we were thinking is that we'd have a meeting the following week so in terms of dates, that would be on the 12th where we would discuss any feedback we'd receive from the IRT. But so (Roger), what's your preference?

(Roger): This is (Roger). No. I think that as long as we're talking about it before we say it's final, I think that's good.

Dennis Chang: Yes. Our intention was to collect all your last comments and incorporate it and present to you the final version for one more look as a team. Go ahead Joe.

Joe Waldron: Yes. Thanks. This is Joe. So I'm just going to say that the 8th is pretty aggressive knowing that people are traveling back. We've got at least in the U.S. a long weekend coming. So it's a short week. And I don't want to put Francisco, you know, under the gun here.

But, you know, having to compare the two different documents I just think it - the 8th is aggressive. I think we can try to meet that but I think - I just want to get some caveats that there may be extenuating circumstances.

Dennis Chang: Understood. Yes. That's our target date. We're trying to meet the 31 July. So you know that there is a couple of weeks between those times.

Krista Papac: Thanks Dennis. Krista Papac. Yes. Just to kind of build on that a little bit. So knowing it's a little aggressive. But to Dennis' point, we've made a commitment to you guys to try and give you more predictability and sort of regular scheduling for implementation work. So that's why we're trying to meet the 31 July deadline because that's a promise we made to you guys, one.

Two, once we all - IRT and the staff are in agreement, there's still a number of things we have to do to get the notification out to the contracted parties, et cetera, so.

Everything you can do to try and meet the deadline would be very much appreciated. I know you will. I just wanted to make sure you guys understood sort of the logic behind why we're really pushing. So thank you.

Dennis Chang: Thank you. (Fabian), go on. Let's go to the next topic.

(Fabian): So yes. Let me go back to GNSO. We're working through the discussion of the transition (unintelligible). And so let's start with the notification of the GNSO in relation to the Recommendation Number 3 we discussed yesterday Dennis.

Dennis Chang: Yes. We discussed this yesterday and the process that we would like to use is that we're fortunate to have a GNSO Council liaison on this IRT. Right. (Amar) is it?

Woman: (Amir).

Dennis Chang: (Amir), okay. (Amar), (Amir). He's not here. But I think his charter for duty to have that liaison. So what we would like to do is use that. And so I know that Joe, you know, you kind of volunteered to maybe draft something so we're going to take you up on that.

So what we'd like to do is maybe have you draft something and circulate it within the IRT. And then perhaps if you guys will agree then have (Amar) liaise with (Janice) from counsel. Go ahead, (Steve).

(Steve Metalitz): Thank you. (Steve Metalitz). For the benefit of those of us who were not here yesterday because we had conflicts with this meeting and because the agenda for that meeting was distributed less than 48 hours in advance in violation of Icann policy, what are you talking about? What is this request?

(Joe): Yes, this is (Joe). So what I brought up was an issue that really goes back to the original charter in the legal review that was done by Icann staff looking at the privacy and PII issues, which one of the outcomes of that paper essentially said that registries and registrars should do their own analysis.

As we've been conducting that analysis and as we've seen some of the changes with the EU privacy laws, we've seen other jurisdictions begin enforcement of rules that talk about like in Russia I think on September 1st the data for Russian citizens -- I'm not sure what data that includes. I haven't read the law myself -- but is required to be maintained on servers within the country. So as you start seeing some of those changes, one of the -- I can go back and re-read the exact language, but there is a note in Task 3 to the charter for the IRT that if we identify any issues related to privacy that were not addressed by the working group, that we should notify the GNSO.

So it's just the notification going back to the GNSO to make them aware of those issues that we want them to call to their attention.

Dennis Chang: Yes, furthermore what we discussed yesterday -- and this was just brought up yesterday and is that if a notification and we are going to do that, but the IRT agrees to move on with our work, and it's up to the counsel to take action if they should wish to. So that's ...

(Steve Metalitz): Thank you for that explanation. So there will be a draft of this notification circulated before it goes?

Dennis Chang: Absolutely.

(Steve Metalitz): Okay. Thank you. And just to be clear, there is no expectation this would change any of the timeline that was set out in the last scorecard as far as the transition, is that correct?

Dennis Chang: Again, correct.

(Joe): So I think the issue that I brought up was that it's essentially - I believe it's an obligation to us to provide that notice based on the way the language is written in the Task 3.

Dennis Chang: Okay. Let's continue. Time for timeline discussion and (Steve) since you weren't here, maybe I'll give a little bit more time to explain what this is for those who were not here yesterday.

Man 3: Sure. Thanks (Dennis). So what you're seeing here in this slide is a summary - an attempt by us at summarizing what we've heard so far in the conversation of the IRT regarding the transition path for the transition. So we've

represented in this slide the true timeline for new registration and existing registration starting - that timeline is (unintelligible) announcement of the policy effective date in January 2017.

And from there we decide to lay out what we've understood would be the stuff and the timeframes involved. So regarding new registration, we understood that the registry is needed to make changes and revise those changes so that we thought six months was consistent with what was discussed. At that time registrars would be able to optionally create new registration with the thick model and they have had six months to prepare and six more months to transition all their new registrations and for all registrars to transition their new registration (unintelligible).

And then at the end of those 12 months in 2018 registry will require thick registration from new registration and that's the time at which the policy would be effective for new registration. So that's for the first half. And the second half -- existing registration -- here we have those six months we discussed for the registries to prepare and notify and then the mediation month that was discussed and requested by registrars to complete those transitions of existing registration under the terms that have been discussed so far. The limited valuation rules.

And so that would create another policy effective date for existing registration. Let me very quickly mention that yesterday in the discussion there was a comment by (Jody) that the expectation was that the 18 months for existing registration would start after the registry has had a time to make the changes and announce them. So this was the request from yesterday and I show again our slide - our previous slide, sorry.

So that was our summary. The 18 months for existing registration would start right away. When (Jody) was suggesting that those 18 months start when registry was actually ready to take registration or to pick up existing registration data.

Let me stop here. This is what we would like to continue our discussion and understand whether that's everyone's understanding or if that seems - that indeed seems reasonable for everyone in the IRT.

(Steve Metalitz): This is (Steve Metalitz). I was not here obviously for the discussion yesterday, so I'll have to go back and check that. But I am not - I would not support what is in effect delaying the transition from thin to thick for an additional six months in the lower left-hand corner of this slide. I don't know. I feel like we've discussed this over the last several weeks in great detail and so I don't understand why at this stage an additional six months is being asked for.

Just to kind of look at this from a slightly broader perspective. I think this policy effective date of January 2019 means that it will take longer to do the transition from thin to thick that it took the United States to land a man on the moon in the 1960s. It took longer than World War II. It is seven years, basically. And I don't understand why that would be necessary. So I'll be happy to go back and look at the transcript or maybe people can you know, I don't want to ask people to repeat their arguments from yesterday but I would be opposed to this.

Dennis Chang: Yes, just to clarify (Steve). Yesterday we started a conversation but we ran out of time and we all agreed to come back this morning and continue the conversation so it's perfectly okay to ask for clarifying questions and have this dialogue and discussion. Now (Jody) is online and I would like to give (Jody) an opportunity to speak. Go ahead.

Man 2: Hi. First of all, can everyone hear me?

Dennis Chang: Very clear.

Man 2: All right great. It was always my understanding, (Steve), first of all to your question. Delaying it by six months - it has been my understanding that the registrars would be given 18 months after the registries have implemented and were in production. I didn't realize that we were overlapping the six months of preparation for them for the registries with their 18 months that the registries were going to be - or registrars were given to basically transition this data.

To your point, you're talking about seven years since we've started. I'm not sure when it started - if it started seven years ago. If you're trying to spend all this time down to make it less than what World War II was, I think then we should be done already I guess. We can't take 46 million records for (unintelligible) and get them done in a one-month period or a six-month period. The reason we're asking for 18 months is because there is a lot of data that needs to go over there. We will start the transition as soon as we can and we want that extra - it's not like we're asking for to start implementation extending 18 months over that 18-month period.

It's going to be a lot of data that needs to be moved over there so we're asking for a cushion in case there's any kind of issues that we have, either a placement on those scalabilities - not scalabilities, but just a monotrack that we're going to create at the registry and the amount of data that we need to have in addition to the registry. It's quite a lot of data.

We went through this once before at (unintelligible) and I know (Joe) was there. I think you have better numbers than I remember, or more concrete. But

at the time that we moved that over from thin to thick, I think that was 12 years ago. Go Daddy had I believe it was 600,000 registrations and I think dot org is only about 1.8 million or two or three million. It was a small number compared to dot com. So it took a very long time to get that (unintelligible) in fact it was years after we started the transition, but we were still getting the warnings from the dot org operator that our contact information was incorrect and most of that had been from transfers (unintelligible) that had transferred into us years after the transition.

Now we're talking about a scalability that is between 50 and 100 times greater than what dot org was at the time.

Man 1: (Pio).

(Pio): Hello everybody. This is (Pio). (Jody) just actually covered what I was going to touch upon and let me add to that 18 months - six months - this is taking indeed quite some time. But on the other hand, we have to realize we still have a working system here so from my point of view, if there is any extra time required let's take that time and make sure this thing gets done in a correct manner. And like I said just a few before, we have a working system now. Thanks.

Joe: Yes, this is (Joe). So I just wanted to kind of echo the stats that (Jody) gave that when the dot org transition occurred -- and I think we've talked about this a number of times in the PDP and so on -- it was a long time ago. The systems were less complicated. We didn't have (DNSEC), we didn't have IPv6, but at that time there were little over a million-and-a-half registrations in dot org. There were 98 registrars of which 92 successfully migrated. I don't know what happened to the four - if I did that math right - six.

Public math. Not my strong suit. And I believe that transition was done incrementally kind of on a registrar by registrar basis. I think there are people from the registrars that still remember going through that like Jody. But it took more than a year to just go through the initial transition for those registrars at that time.

So I think that when you look at all of the other competing opportunities and initiatives that everyone's got, you know, I think that 18 months is a reasonable expectation. It also allows to coordinate the activity with the normal lifecycle engagements that registrars have with their registrant.

(Steve Metalitz): (Steve Metalitz) again. Yes, I appreciate the scalability issues. We had discussed this over the several meetings about 18 months and I'm not going to engage in public math either here, but maybe we can put something in later. I mean, 18 months - it is obviously is a large number of transactions that will be needed and even if 30 transactions per second is not going to, you know - 18 months provides a great deal of cushion.

And I note that Verisign offered as I understand it an alternative method which would allow for approximately -- with a lot of caveats -- 80 transactions per second. In other words, three times as fast. Almost three times as fast. So that again means I think that the 18 months is ample.

My concern was that did we just forget about this first six months or you know, this issue of overlap versus running in parallel. Was that just an error for the last several weeks/months we've been looking at a timeline that didn't have the six months during which time registrars would not be transitioning? And how we have to add that in at the beginning, thereby pushing the end date out into 2019. Why was that not in there before?

Again, while we've had this discussion about 18 months and I understand the reasons that are being put forward for it, but it's now become 24 months.

(Krista Papek): Hey, (Steve), it's (Krista Papek) from Icann staff. So my understanding from the staff perspective is we have been talking about 18 months for a while now. And we've been presenting it without this other - you know, thanks (Fabian). So good with these slides. It's been looking like this I think what I heard yesterday was registrars were thinking they have 18 months to implement.

Meaning when they heard 18 months, they were hearing once we have everything we need from the registry operator we then have 18 months to implement and on the registry side of it they're saying well, we need time to build that in order to give it to you.

So I think there was a disconnect. I don't think it was a deliberate disconnect. I think people are thinking of this from the chair that they sit in -- the registrar chair -- the registry chair -- and I think there was general consensus in the room that it was 18 months but when that 18 months began is where I think a little bit of the disconnect was.

(Rich Morgan): Hi, (Rich Morgan) here from Go Daddy and I'm coming in as an observer into this and have not been part of these earlier discussions, but looking at this slide I would have called out that it's interesting that there are six months for both registries and registrars to prepare and during that preparation period, we somehow have an overlap of the actual execution of that. And it seems that it would have been an error not to have them be a critical path of 24 months. Just as an observer and seeing from the outside.

(Rich Morgan) again. Using the World War II analogy, it's saying lets prepare for the landing and send the men now. And can't do them both at the same time.

Man 1: (Steve)?

(Steve Metalitz): This is (Steve) again. I do see the overlap under new registration, so that's not a problem. You can be - while the registries are updating you can transition your new registrations from thin to thick.

(Rich Morgan): This is (Rich) again. I'm just speaking specifically about the one element. I'm not talking about the other.

(Steve Metalitz): Okay. Well, I guess that's my question is why the overlap can't exist in both but ...

(Joe Weldon): This is (Joe Weldon) from Verisign. So I think we're looking at - I guess that's orange. The 12-month and 18-month bars and drawing interpretations on what that means. So registrars aren't doing nothing during the time that the registry is updating the system right? During that time you know, we're producing documentation so that the registrars can build their systems. We're delivering an (OT&E) environment so that registrars can connect and test and make sure that systems are working correctly.

So that's what's happening where the six-month and 12-month period overlap and then we open the production system where you see that diamond called Optional Thick. That begins a period that registrars have a period to migrate their production systems and begin doing new registrations.

So I think we were making the assumption that you know, similar activity is going on in the bottom portion for existing registrations, where that 18-month bar represented a combination of the preparation work as well as the execution and production.

And I think that was what caused the question to say what we really need for the production execution of transitioning the, you know, in a number of registrar's cases tens of millions of domain names over - they needed 18 months' worth of execution time.

So I think that it's a little bit of interpretation of what those bars were representing.

Man 1: Continuing with maybe looking at these slides and interpreting it the same way, I'd like to ask a question. Should the registrar ready and willing to transition, they can do so in August of 2017. Is that correct? Should the registrar be ready and willing to transition the data, they can do so in August of 2017. That's the first time and earliest they could do it, correct? Go ahead, (Jody).

Man 2: Well, that's my understanding, is that we could start in August 2017. Taking new registration. Or providing new registrations with contact data. And we could also start the existing transition from thin to thick for existing registrations.

But to (Steve)'s point, I was also going to ask a question on the first timeline there. At the end of that 12 months for registration - I'm sorry - new registrations from thin to thick, what is the contact data validation requirements that time? Is it still only the three validations that we're requiring

when we're doing the (unintelligible)? And then talking about contact ID, (op) code and (unintelligible) email but I'm not sure.

Woman 1: (Joe) I think that might be a question for you. I heard (Mark) for what it's worth, I heard (Mark Anderson).

Man 3: Yes, (Mark), you want to jump in on that?

(Mark Anderson): Yes, this is (Mark). Can you hear me okay?

Man 3: Yes.

(Mark Anderson): Okay great. (Jody), to answer your question the proposed contact validation is the reduced contact validation would have to stay in effect for the entire period of the existing registrations timeline. So from the system perspective, right? A contact that's created for new registrations and a contact that's created for existing registrations looks no different. In fact, you could use one for both right?

So from a system perspective we have no way to differentiate the two. So we would need to keep the (unintelligible) rule in effect for you know, the entire 18-month period that's in place for existing registrations to migrate. Thank you.

(Dennis Chang): So this is (Dennis Chang). Just for clarity, and I think when the IRT were having a discussion of 12 to 18 month range, I think that was a cause of confusion when what we should have been talking about was from the point of announcement to the effective date, to effectively what we're looking at here is a 24-month correct? Everybody agree? And from what (Mark) said that the reduced validation rule would stay in effect for two years no?

Man 2: This is (Joe). So the first time that anyone would be able to begin updating data would be at the beginning of Optional Thick which would support new registrations as well as backfill any existing registrations. But really, it really is just that 18-month period that the reduced validations would be in effect.

Man 1: Good point. (Jody) go ahead.

Man 3: What I was going to add - thank you (Mark). That makes sense to me that we would have a reduced contact validation until the end of the existing registration or until existing registrations are completed. At that time - and I guess what I'm curious about what we would be talking - at the end of existing registration when they've all been completed, is that when the new contact validation or contact requirements I guess be required by the registry? Is that when we plan to implement them? Is that February 1st, 2019, then or (unintelligible) registration?

Man 1: (Mark), I see a nod from (Joe) here. Do you want to answer that question?

Man 2: I'm nodding too. I guess you can't tell. But yes, I think my understanding is the discussions we've had within the RRC is that yes, on that policy effective date for existing registration you know, at that time the registries would be required to switch over to (unintelligible) that their standard validation rules. Thank you.

Man 1: Any more questions/comments on the timeline? So, one of the things that I've been observing and I've been following this IRT for some time now, is that there's a lot detailed technical discussion. It's almost like design by committee. So I think there was a little bit of talk at the last IRT meeting maybe we're getting too detailed in that discussion. So from now on I think our aim is to

focus on the policy level and once we lock down the agreed-upon days, then we're just going to push forward and if the registry and registrar needs to have a detailed discussion on technical exchange, we can maybe do that in another form. Is everybody okay with that?

(Joe Weldon): Yes, this is (Joe Weldon) from Verisign. So absolutely what we'll do. You know, Verisign has done this with registrars a number of times. I mean we'll kind of go through our standard development process, engage with the registrars. We'll have our normal communications so I think that you know, this part of it -- the technical implementation -- should just follow our standard registry/registrar processes.

(Steve Metalitz): This is (Steve Metalitz) again. I just want to put - you know, remind people of what the chronology has been here. This policy was adopted by the Icann Board on February 7, 2014. So we're now talking about five years to implement this policy from the time it was adopted. A final report from the Policy Development Process Working Group which most of the people on this IRT had some involvement in was October 2013. The policy development process started in March 2012 - that's seven years. An issue report was issued in September 2011 - seven-and-a-half years.

So I understand that this is a big change in just in volume. It is again a transition of a major legacy GTLD registry did occur in far less time, 12 years ago. I understand that it was probably not 100% perfect and there were some registrars level behind perhaps if the math is right. But basically it was able to happen then, so I'm just going to - I just want to make sure that we're all aware of the pace that we are now seem to be prepared to endorse here. Thank you.

(Fred Aguimeaux): (Fred Aguimeaux). Yes, I agree that it should be a bit faster at some point, because I mean I think we have already agreed on the policy and I think we

should be in the details now - maybe more into the details and get ready to implement. Because the sooner it is finished, well the better it is for (unintelligible) so we can then work on other things. So yes, I think we really should go into the details and consider maybe the policy is locked on that but try to make more decisions.

(Steve DelBianco): Hey this is (Steve DelBianco) with Business Constituency. To (Steve Metalitz)'s point, when something goes on this long it's always a significant risk that externalities change the circumstances. In the DC in our comments we were well aware that changes in data localization laws which are extremely unfortunate and damaging to ecommerce and DC members and also changes to data privacy laws have the potential to impact how we do what we do - not when we do it, right? But how we do what we do in terms of migrating data.

So I wasn't here yesterday. So I'm unaware as to whether all of these plans anticipate that some data may not be allowed to be ported and transported across borders, particularly of personal information. Is that just something we assume registrars or registries and their lawyers and law firms - that they'll just work that out and so we're not explicitly dealing with it at all?

But it does imply we have to have a certain flexibility as to what the ultimate solution may have to look like, where you just can't move these 2 million records to the United States because it would be against the law.

Man 2: Thanks, (Steve). This is (Joe). You bring up a good point and I think that's kind of the reason that we talked about this letter that we're going to provide to the GNSO is to call that out.

Early on in the IRT work (Fabian) had a slide that he had showed addressing this exact scenario. We talked about waivers where there is a waiver process within Icann to address that situation. And we had I guess an (RDEP) based to work around solution that was something considered early on.

So I think it is something that we've addressed and considered. This is really kind of the standard case of what we're talking about in terms of how we're implementing the registrations and the backfill. So I think it is a good point and it is something that we've addressed - probably not in the extent of the detail that we've talked about for kind of the standard case, though.

(Steve DelBianco): If I could follow up - I would need to know the details but we would let them have (Steve Metalitz) revisit the situation in six months where now we've discovered that these data location and privacy laws are going to further extend the timeline.

So I'm just asking if everyone is fully aware of those limitations as you design your solution so that the timelines incorporate the technical people at the registries and registrars with their legal people and given that challenging legal environment, these timelines are still doable. We wouldn't want to come in and say well, given the new legal environment we need to change the timeline.

Man 2: (Joe), I'll follow up again. We'll have a private discussion - no. That's exactly right and this is why I think early on when we first started this group up, a lot of the people sitting at the table today weren't here.

And I think there was a concerted effort by Icann staff and others to get more participation so I think it's important that we have registrars here because registrars are the ones that have to comply with their local laws as well as

registries and that's why I think it is important that we provide this letter back to the GNSO because you know, it's not just Comnet and Jobs - it's not just the registries that Verisign is operating that have this issue with the privacy data. It's really all of the GTLDs.

So it is an issue I referenced yesterday that this was discussed quite extensively in the RDS meeting that (Chuck Holms) was hosting, I think it was on Tuesday. So it is an important point that's being discussed in a number of different venues you know, throughout the community but I think that you know, what we're tasked with doing in the IRT is implementing this policy.

(Seth Pio): Thanks. This is (Seth Pio) from Rules and Register. So (Steve), since I joined this group I've been talking and mentioning that when we are looking at the new EU regulations that are coming into effect at some point - it's a moving target. My plan - and maybe I was a little bit naïve here - when I started this I was hoping we could have this done before those new EU regulations would kick in because when I consulted with my lawyers back then, we had no issue.

We saw no issue. Our contracts with our registrants were able to give us the consent to move the data and we are now looking at this timeline somewhere next year I assume these new EU regulations will kick in.

And what I heard back from my lawyers back like 14 months ago is that (Pio) if those new EU regulations kick in, we have no idea if you are compliant or if you can move the data. So from my perspective as an EU registrar, I cannot promise you we are not going to fumble with that timeline again because I basically simply do not know.

((Crosstalk))

(Seth Pio): That's one part of it. Thanks.

(Erika von Eichenbot): Good morning. (Erika von Eichenbot). Maybe to get some clarity on this last point. So the legislation will kick in the new regulation in 2018. I would have to check the exact month but there are two stories to it. The one is the legislation and the second one is the so-called privacy shield. The privacy shield is a little bit (unintelligible) ensures the transfer of data under certain conditions and ensures accuracy between - that there is a certain amount of accuracy between Europe and the United States with regard how data is treated is preserved.

Now, the story is it was supposed to be - the agreement was supposed to be agreed on and the documents to be presented to the public on the 5th of July. I just had a long discussion yesterday and it's now very likely going to be the 12th of July. They still have some internal quarrels in particular between the European member states because of some of the issues. They had to do some final adaptation on certain texts and documents but it seems to go okay.

Which doesn't mean -- and this is the third part of the story -- always keep in mind the privacy shield can be challenged again in court, but it gives you at least certainty for a certain period of time before somebody might challenge it again in court and then we have to find another solution. I can give you more details. I am happy to send it to somebody who can distribute it about the timing and the issues. I have a note prepared on this. So I am happy to share this.

Man 1: (Steve), did you want to speak?

(Steve Metalitz): And it would be great to have that information from (Erika) on the timeline. I will just say on the privacy shield my understanding is - or I guess I could ask

it as a question. Does any of the registries or registrars around this table currently rely upon or did they rely upon the safe harbor that privacy shield is replacing to cover the transfer of data to existing thick registries, for example? I think the answer is no. I don't think that has been an issue, so you know, that may or may not be relevant in the new environment but I think the fact is as (Pio) said, people were looking at the existing law and seeing if they seemed to be compliant and again this was similar to the conclusion that ICANN's outside counsel reached also in that report that came here a couple years ago now.

So obviously the landscape is changing in data localization as (Steve) points out, which is kind of separate from this whole data protection issue. Also is going to have an impact - that's true. There's nothing we can do about that outside environment, but of course if we had proceeded on a more expeditious schedule we would have a system in place now and we'd be able to evaluate that system against the changing legal environment. Thank you.

(Fred Aguimeaux): (Fred Aguimeaux). I also wonder, does it mean that at some point we will stop all the registrations in (unintelligible) like dot info and all the others, because of this privacy law? I mean there are thousands of registrations every day and data transferred from Russia to the U.S. and so on and the world is still running.

So maybe - okay, I'm not a lawyer, but maybe we shouldn't worry that much. Like if we have one year to do that, maybe some people will renew their registrations but one of the arguments - one of the thing we said during the IRT is when they renew they can accept the terms and conditions so they can accept the transfer. We have plenty of things to ease and to move forward I think.

Man 1: Any more comments? We are beyond the 10:30 mark and I know (Joe), you had to go. So then I will go ahead and close out this meeting. Thank you everyone for coming and we will - don't forget our target date, next week Friday we would love to have your comments and following week we will have another IRT meeting and hopefully we can hit a couple of those early milestones. Next week is July 8th, Friday. Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

END