

---

LONDON – Thick Whois Consensus Policy Implementation Meeting  
Monday, June 23, 2014 – 12:15 to 13:15  
ICANN – London, England

HAN CHUAN LEE: All right, it's 12:15, so we will start the meeting. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Han Chuan Lee, the Registry Services Senior Manager from the Registry Services Team. Welcome to the Thick WHOIS Implementation Meeting.

Before we start, I'd like to do a roll call with the Implementation Review Team. So I'll go around the table starting from Steve's side. If anybody is from the Implementation Review Team, could you please identify yourself? Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Steve Chan, Senior Policy Manager.

LARS HOFFMAN: Lars Hoffman from ICANN staff.

BARRY COBB: Barry Cobb, staff.

[FREDERICK LYMAN]: Frederick Lyman, registrars [inaudible].

[ANDREAS]: Andreas [inaudible].

---

*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.*

TATIANA KHRAMTSOVA: Tatiana Khramtsova from RU-CENTER.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] registrar and from the IRT.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

HAN CHUAN LEE: Yeah, if you'd like, let us know that you're present.

ZILLAH WATSON: Zillah Watson, [inaudible] from the BBC.

MARIKA KONINGS: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

[DAMIEN]: Damien [inaudible] Senior Chief.

[MARK SEGALL]: [Mark Segall]. I'm also ICANN staff.

DENNIS CHANG: Dennis Chang, ICANN staff.

---

TONY FARROW: Tony Farrow, ICM Registry.

HOWARD LI: Howard Li, ICANN staff.

MIKE ZUPKE: Mike Zupke, ICANN staff.

JOE WALDREN: Joe Waldren from Verisign.

PAT KANE: Pat Kane, Verisign.

MICHALE MURPHY: Mike Murphy, Com Laude registrar.

DAN RODGERS: Dan Rodgers, Paragon Internet Group.

CHRIS PELLING: Chris Pelling, NetEarth One. Registrar.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] from .madrid.

ANDREA FELTNER: Andrea Feltner from Neustar.

---

ANN YAMASHITA: Ann Yamashita, ICANN staff.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thank you. Does anybody behind want to identify yourself? And if you are also from the IRT would you please identify yourself as well? No? All right, thank you.

This is the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy Implementation meeting. This is the agenda for the meeting. We're going to give you an update on the implementation so far. Then we have a discussion with the IRT on the implementation plan as scheduled and [that's part] of the implementation plan. We're going to talk about the outreach and education and the next step with the IRT.

Okay, this slide. In February this year, the ICANN Board made a resolution to adopt the Council policy recommendation for the WHOIS and to direct the President and CEO to develop and execute an implementation plan. So that's where we are today.

As of March this year, the Staff Implementation Project Team has been formed and a draft implementation plan has been drafted since then.

To address Recommendation 3, we also have a member from the ICANN legal team as part of the project team to advise us on Recommendation 3.

This is the suggested engagement of [inaudible] with the IRT. So if members of the IRT, whether you're present physically or you're in the Adobe Connect, please [inaudible] comments.

---

Before we publish any document, we will definitely send it to the IRT for review and comments. So we will give you a list 30 days, more than a month, to review the document and to give us any comments if you have of the document.

We are proposing a regular teleconference with the IRT on perhaps a bi-monthly basis. If you feel that that's too much monthly, or even once every two months, please let us know what is your preference. Definitely this discussion will also be carried out via the mailing list, and as much as possible, we're going to have face-to-face meeting like what we have today here.

So, comments please? Do you think – are you okay with having the review of documents giving at least a month to look into the document? Okay, I see nods around the room. Any shaking of heads? No? Okay. So I'll take it that this is agreed. And those [of] the regular teleconference meetings, what would the IRT prefer? Do you prefer bi-monthly, monthly, once every two months, once a quarter? [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

You should probably start off more regular meetings initially until we get the ball rolling, and then depending on what we need after that.

HAN CHUAN LEE:

So should we start with a monthly call, and then going from there where we decide that maybe once every two months will be sufficient. We reduce the frequency.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:                   Why don't we start twice a month and then take it down from there?

HAN CHUAN LEE:                   All right, okay. Right. Any other comments or suggestions from the other members of the IRT or from staff? Okay, if not, then I will start the schedule over the mailing list, a bi-monthly teleconference. I understand that there will be [some] challenges with regards to time zone. We have ICANN staff and IRT members from around the world, so we will take this discussion offline the mailing list and we try to find a suitable time and date for the regular teleconference. Next slide, please.

Okay. We're moving to the implementation plan and schedule discussion. I'm going to give [inaudible] of TW-IPS for this discussion. Next slide, please.

Okay. The draft implementation plan and schedule document has been circulated to the Implementation Review Team earlier part of the month for your review. So what this document basically outlines the milestones and the timeline that we are looking at to complete each milestone as far as which of the parties are responsible. It will be a live document and we will provide a status update to that document as well.

And in the document, I'll highlight the two key activities that we're trying to achieve with the implementation. Firstly is to transition from [a team] to a Thick WHOIS in accordance to the 2013 RAA Specification 3. This is one of the key tasks.

The next key [I think] this is to transfer the data from the registrar to registries, especially for those of us on a Thin model. So once we move to a Thick WHOIS registration model, the data has to be transferred

---

over from the registrars to the registries so that both sides are [synched up]. Next slide, please.

As part of implementation, these are the proposed documents that we will be publishing. So firstly, the Transition Verification Plan. This document basically – we’re going to define what is the purpose for verification as well as what are the tools that could be used for verification and what are the tasks for verification that will be carried out? And we are looking at sometime end of this year this document should be finalized.

In the implementation plan scheduled document, there’s been [inaudible]. We have a little more details inside there as to when we’re going to send a draft copy of the document to you for review, when we’re going to send this up for public comment, and when this document is expected to be finalized. So this is one of the first documents that we’ll be publishing and this should be finalized by the end of the year.

The second document is the Post-Transition Problem Resolution Plan. So as with any implementation, there will probably be some issues that we need to address after the transition. So this document basically talks about what are the possible post-transition issues that may occur. The roles and responsibilities of the various parties to resolve these issues and who are the affected parties, so that everybody has a consistent resolution of issues, so if any registrant were to face an issue because of the post-transition or any registrar were to face an issue so they know from this document where to get help from, who to seek help from. So

---

across the board, there is consistency in terms of problem resolution. And this document was also going to be finalized by the end of this year.

The third document will be the Guidelines for Registries and Registrars. This document [inaudible] the registries and registrars in the implementation. So for example, what are security measures to be taken, if any? And as far as it will define the task that the [inaudible] and a timeframe that the registries and registrars have to adhere to to get the transition to the Thick WHOIS, execute it. And this document will be in March 2015.

Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you want questions along the way or do you want to hold those until after you go through this?

HAN CHUAN LEE: Let me finish this slide, and then we can go to the questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, sure.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thank you. And the last document will be the Post-Implementation Report. So basically after we are done through everything, we'll publish a report so that there's learnings from the implementation for future generations to refer to. And this should be done by January 2017.



---

So these four documents that we are proposing to be published. Comments? Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Can you just elaborate a little bit on the Transition Verification Plan? I don't know how you have a timeline of what that is if you're still planning on defining it. I'm assuming that you have some concept. Maybe you could just share some of that.

HAN CHUAN LEE:

Okay. So for example, when the data is being sent from the registrar to the registries, how do you verify that – how does ICANN verify the execution was carried out correctly, there wasn't any erroneous data that's been carried out. So we might say that, for example, we will do a 10% sampling or we will do a 100 domain name sampling to make sure that the transition is being carried out, that the [inaudible] are being done correctly.

Another revocation could be a registrant who is very concerned about his or her data that is being moved from the registrar, the registry. We may want to check that, okay, is the data that's being transferred the same? There could be a tool to say I key my domain name. It will show me what is the WHOIS information on the registrar side. It will also show me the WHOIS information on the registry side. So I know as registrant that, yes, my data has been transitioned over successfully and accurately. So basically it's to make sure that the transition from the Thin to the Thick WHOIS and the transfer of data from the registrars,

---

the registries are being carried out successfully and that there isn't any errors at all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So I would classify that as a data verification, not necessarily a transition verification. Thank you.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Besides data, we'll also be checking out, for example, the EPP [common] are being implemented correctly as well. So we'll probably be checking [things], the EPP of the registry, make sure that yes the new EPP [common] for a domain [create] work includes all the [inaudible] that's been defined in the 2013 RAA [inaudible]. So it's not just about the data. It's also about the execution, the implementation, the system development itself. Yes?

BARRY COBB: I'd just like to remind people to announce your name when speaking for the transcription. Thank you.

JOE WALDREN: Thanks, Barry.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Any other comments from the IRT? I know that there are also members from the IRT in the Adobe Connect. Do you have any other comments on these four documents? Okay, if not, we'll move onto the next slide.

---

So [inaudible] there are two key activities that has to be carried out by the registries and registrar. First is to transition to a Thick WHOIS registration. That means from X day X month next year, any reaction for domain names under that TLD have to follow the Thick WHOIS model. That's the first step. Then the second step will be if there's any data that needs to be transferred over from the registrar to the registry to synch it up.

So for example the registry could be a Thin model. It doesn't hold any registry any information and you need to actually transfer that from the registrar to registry, this will be carried out after the transition to the Thick WHOIS registration. So the timeline is being proposed as shown on the [slide]. So sometime in the January to December 2015, the registries and the registrars will have completed all the pre-transition tasks. For example, system development, the plan for transition. So it's going to give you guys about a year to get these pre-transition tasks executed and completed.

Sometime from December 2015 to February 2016, the registrars and registries will have to complete their testing. So by December 2015, finish our system developments, finish what we need to do, get it tested and sometime in March to April 2016, you have [the stuff] to transition to a Thick WHOIS registration, just the registration.

Then we'll give a period of two months for post-transition verification and problem resolutions in case there's any issues with transition. Let's get that resolved first before. In June 2016, we transfer all the data that needs to be transferred from the registrars to the registry. And again,

---

we will have a two to three month time period in October to December 2016 to have a post-data transfer issue resolution.

So, for example, if they're not going to be transferred accurately, what should the registry do, what should the registrar do? What are the parts of resolution that we need to work out?

Okay. This is the proposal line for the two key tasks – the transition and as far as the transfer of data. What does the IRT think? Yes, Joe?

JOE WALDREN: So I believe there was also a recommendation made for a legal review by ICANN.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Yes.

JOE WALDREN: And I don't see that on any of the timeline, so I'm just wondering when you expect to have that complete because I think that's going to be essential for completion of many of these other deliverables that you've outlined.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Okay. So in terms of the legal review, which is Recommendation 3, we are [inaudible] with the legal team what is the best way forward to get the legal review document up. We are thinking that sometime before the end of the year this document should already be released out to the

---

public. So we are still thinking what is the best way to get that recommendation out.

PAT KANE: So that legal review, what do we expect that legal review to tell the registries that are transitioning?

HAN CHUAN LEE: Okay. So that legal review, as stated in Recommendation 3, is to look at the applicable law. For example, data privacy with regards to – and also the contracts that the registrar will be signing with the [registrant]. What should that contract contain? So it's very specific within the scope of Recommendation 3.

PAT KANE: There's 230 legal jurisdictions where .coms are registered to date, and when we think about privacy, when you think about the collection, the transmission, the storage and the display of this data. So will that legal review be done to that level of detail so we understand at least what the highest threshold is in terms of privacy?

HAN CHUAN LEE: Mm-hmm.

PAT KANE: Was that a yes or is that you understand the question?

---

HAN CHUAN LEE: Yes, [inaudible]. Yes?

MARIKA KONINGS: The working group recommended that the review actually focus on the aspect of transition, because that's a question where indeed the transition of the data and looking specifically at that. I think as one of the examples given in the actual recommendation you talk about something that may come out of that is this notion that maybe consent or specific consent in registration agreement, as Han Chuan was referring to. But I don't think it was the intention to go to looking at privacy laws, because that's understood as we already operate Thick WHOIS registries in many countries. That doesn't need to be reviewed at this stage.

PAT KANE: I think it kind of does, because we're talking about a 20-year-old-plus standard for protocol for WHOIS, and now we're going to lump it onto the largest TLD that we've got. We've got over 100 million registrations. Even Step #15 to perform this transition in one month I think is aggressive.

And so to understand what the new implications are, and then we ought to take a look also – I guess I'm going to go on a little bit – what the Expert Working Group is saying in terms of what the new WHOIS, or the Registry Directory Services, should look like.

I think to go take this monumental step and use a really old protocol without considering data privacy puts a lot of risk on the transitioning

---

registries, I think. Not that people aren't at risk today, because I think they are from a privacy standpoint. But they should all be considered.

HAN CHUAN LEE:

Okay. We'll take your comments back to our legal team and we'll get back to the IRT on this point. Thanks.

To clarify your statement on the [inaudible] transition, before that happens, all the development and the EPP should have already been done, created, and tested before the transition. So that transition period of one month is basically for the registries to set sort of like a date set. Maybe on the second of April 2015 at UTC 00:00 any EPP comments that come into register a domain name will have to be on the Thick WHOIS model, otherwise you'll be rejected.

So give the registry that one-month period to decide what is the, so-called, D-Day.

JOE WALDREN:

So just practically where we have done these types of transitions before, doing a hard cut-over like that is very problematic I think in terms of the transactions that are being processed from the registry to the registrar. So I think it's more prudent to work out a transition plan and an implementation plan with the registrars, between the registry and the registrars, on how that transition happens. I'll give you an example.

When we transitioned many years ago from RRP to EPP or when we started implementing other protocol changes, you don't just do those as

---

a hard cut-over. So I think that was what Pat was referring to, saying that trying to get that accomplished in a month is very aggressive.

And I'd also point out that the data transfer phase that you have here is also very aggressive. I think the PDP Working Group discussed this multiple times, but even when .org transitioned, which I think was in 2003, there were about 1.5 million names and it took about a year of a phase plan going registrar by registrar or a set of registrars at a time, and that was 1.5 million names with about just under 100 registrars at the time.

So when you look at the scale in terms of the number of domain names, the number of registrars and the global diversity of the registrars, I think it's a problem that we need to address very carefully in planning the timeline.

HAN CHUAN LEE:

All right, thank you. Let me clarify one more point. In the Implementation Plan and scheduled document that was sent to the IRT for review, there is a task for the registries to submit an implementation plan and schedule in March next year. So that's part of the implementation plan. This is will be something that we will be looking out for as well – how the registries and the ones to carry out the implementation.

So while you say you want it to be over a period of time and you want to give on this day how you envision it, what was the activity for the day, [inaudible]. So in the implementation plan all the registries will have to submit, that will have to be addressed.



---

The other thing I want to clarify here is that we don't expect all the registries to be on the same date that they do the [inaudible], which is why we set a period of time so that the registry can tell us, within this period of time, when is it a comfortable day and the period that they want to actually carry out that execution.

PAT KANE: Not to be snarky, but I think we're the only ones at Verisign to go from Thin to Thick.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Okay, thanks. So all this feedback giving to [inaudible] is very good, and like I stress again, this is just a proposed implementation plan schedule and we're just putting it on the table so that between staff and the IRT and the other people present in this room today, we can have a very constructive discussion on what will be a better plan going forward, what are your concerns, and we definitely can address all the concerns right now before we begin actual implementation.

I'd also like to ask that all these comments, if you can, please e-mail to the mailing list so that it is captured accurately. And we'll make sure that all this have been taken into consideration as well. Thank you.

Are there any other comments on this slide? All the people around the room. Are there any comments from the Adobe Connect? Okay. If not, we'll move onto the next slide.

There are three outreach and education activities that we're planning. From November to December of this year, we're looking at conducting a

---

community outreach and industry education. So registries may not be fully aware what is Thick WHOIS. This is obviously jargon only with people who are familiar with the domain name industry itself, so we're going to do a community outreach to let people know that this is happening, how it's going to affect them, what is it that is being transitioned and what is it that is being moved from the registrar to the registry.

Next year, before we start the actual transition itself, we're going to have a webinar for the registries and registrars. This will coincide with the time that all the deadlines, the Transition Verification Document and the posed [inaudible] plan that by then [inaudible] published. So basically we're just going through all these documents with all the registries and registrars and address any questions or concerns that they have. So we're going to [inaudible] of a period of two months.

After that we're going to publish an FAQ on our website, so address any concerns that a registrar has, what were the questions that had been asked during the community outreach and during the webinar. We will post it up so that everybody has a common understanding of what is happening. So this will happen in sometime January to February 2015 next year.

So these are the three outreach activities that ICANN is thinking about doing. Do you guys have any...?

JOE WALDREN:

So I would recommend that the timeline that you have for that community outreach and education include or be scheduled once you

---

have the legal review done, because I think that will be an important point in that communication.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thank you. So again, it is the vision that the legal review had been done by then as well. So this should be already meaning that when we do all these things, all the relevant documentation should have really been done.

JOE WALDREN: Yeah. I'm just saying that I think that legal review should be a predecessor to this task being completed. I don't think you can complete this without having that legal review done.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Got it. Yes, Alan? Do you mind using the mic, please? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there any plan, although you might not be in a position to enforce it, is there any plan to have outreach to the actual registrants via the registrars, obviously, since they're the ones with the contact?

HAN CHUAN LEE: The bar in blue is basically looking at outreach to everybody, not just the registrant. It's also about the registries and also to the registrars that will definitely be impacted as a result of this implementation. But Alan, thanks for the feedback. We'll definitely take it into consideration

---

in executing this task that is in blue down here that perhaps the registrars would play a role in outreaching to the registrants as well.

Are there any registrants here who would like to respond to Alan's suggestion? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] I think as registrars we will be very happy to first contact our registrars. I'm speaking for myself. Because I don't really like my customers getting e-mails from someone they don't know. They could think it's phishing. They could think it's some spam and so on. So I'd be happy to do some of the job, because [we know] our customers.

For some registrars, maybe bigger registrars, it might be more difficult. But at least if you can include a phase where the registrars can contact the registrant could be a good idea to include that.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thanks. Alan and then [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, you may not be in a position to force registrars to do it, but it wouldn't be bad to have something ready. And in terms of the timeline, I don't think you could ask them to contact their registrants until you have your FAQ up on the website that they can point to, at the very least.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thank you, Alan.

---

VOLKER GREIMANN: Volker Greimann, Key Systems Registrar. As any of these changes requires change in the contracts with the [inaudible] name holders, we will of course have to reach out to our customers and inform them that the terms of the registration are about to change. I support Alan's comment that we will have to have something to point to when that happens.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thanks.

ELAINE PRUIS: Elaine Pruis with Donuts. Since we're talking about registrants, I'm wondering if there's something in the transition plan that states at what point the registrar synchs up with the registries who is – I found in our new gTLDs that sometimes the registrars are displaying WHOIS based on their own database rather than what's at the registry and that's causing confusion with the registrants. They're not sure which one is authoritative. Is there anything in your transition plan that says "at this point, this one's authoritative"?

HAN CHUAN LEE: Let's put it this way. Once the registry has transitioned to the Thick WHOIS model, the data on the registrar side and the data on the [registrar] would have to be the same because it's all going to be based on 2013 RAA Spec 3. So there's no reason why the data should be different.

---

ELAINE PRUIS: I'm sorry, why [inaudible]?

HAN CHUAN LEE: Because as part of the implementation, everybody will be moving to the 2013 RAA Specification 3. The 2013 RAA Specification 3 basically states what is the WHOIS format, what the data will [inaudible] label, what it's going to look like. And this will have to be the same on the registry side as well – all the registries. So the data will be the same.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay. It's not so much the format, but the actual content. So I've seen where a registrar would accept a contact change at the registrar database, but not update to the registry. So the registry should have the authoritative data for that TLD, but the registrar is displaying to the registrant the change which hasn't been sent to the registry yet. So I'm wondering is there some stipulation or language in your transition plan that says the registrar must refer to the registry's WHOIS information to display that publicly, or as they are now can they just pull from their own data?

MIKE ZUPKE: Hi, sorry. This is Mike Zupke of ICANN staff. I just wanted to speak to that a little bit in terms of what the Registrar Accreditation Agreement currently requires. Historically, there has been some permitted lag between what the registrar is required to put in WHOIS in their own WHOIS service and then when they're required to update the registry.

---

And so while that lag time is still permitted even under the most recent form of agreement, what I think is a practical matter, what we'll see is most registrars will begin displaying the registry level WHOIS output instead of their own, and in a lot of cases, at least that's sort of what we're hearing.

The other thing is that registrars are no longer obligated to populate the Thick WHOIS data at Port 43 if the registry is Thick. So we think that probably, as a practical matter, this problem will start to go away. I'd be happy to talk to you maybe outside of what the agreement specifically requires. We can potentially refer as a compliance issue if there is one.

PAT KANE:

Pat Kane, Verisign. Mike, I think it's interesting because when you talk about authoritative for the data, the registry by definition cannot be authoritative for any of the data because we don't have the relationship. For a non-vertically integrated registry, we don't have the business relationship with the registrant, so therefore we can only display what we receive from the registrar. So we may be the ones that display it, but because of that you're going to create – well the registry will be the de facto authoritative and we're not. And so we can't actually assert that that registrant is named for that domain. Only the registrar can do that.

ELAINE PRUIS:

But isn't the zone file considered authoritative? The zone file doesn't change.

---

PAT KANE: But the zone file doesn't have registrant data. The zone file only has information about how the resolution for the domain name occurs.

ELAINE PRUIS: So maybe not the registrant, but expiration date change.

PAT KANE: Yeah. So that piece of data, we are authoritative for in terms of the expiration. But when you're talking about the Thick aspect of it, that's the piece that we can never be authoritative for by definition.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Yes, [inaudible]?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Volker again. There is a couple of those cases where the registry must be authoritative. For example, we have had a few cases in our own history where had displayed WHOIS data that was simply incorrect because we were no longer the registrar of record for the domain name but did not know that.

For example, it happens when the registry receives a court order, implements that and sends us an e-mail. We may see that e-mail at some point and implement that and kick the domain out of our database, but until that happens we are assuming that we are the registrar of record and display wrong data.

In most cases the registries also send an EPP command, but they don't always do that. In those cases there are differences between the



---

registry database and the registrar database. So one thing that should be part of the transition plan coming out of this transition is that the registrar WHOIS requirements be revisited and possibly removed. So to avoid any inconsistencies between displace of WHOIS data from the [registrar] from the registry.

[PAT KANE]: So I agree with you, Volker, that the Thin elements the registries can be authoritative for, registrar of record, expiration date, term, name server records, etc. Those are things that we have to possess.

But in terms of eliminating the need for a registrar to display Thick WHOIS, is that what you're suggesting?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes.

[PAT KANE]: Okay. I think it's a burden that you're then placing on all of the registries to basically do enforcement actions for you, because law enforcement and intellectual property will come to [inaudible] the registry and it should be the other way around.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Okay. Maybe we are discussing the word "authoritative" in a different way. We're understanding it in a different way. I'm meaning authoritative as that which third parties can rely upon when looking at the WHOIS [inaudible]. Maybe you have a different definition of that.

---

[PAT KANE]: Basically, you're right. You can only rely on what we are telling you for the registrant, but a third-party can only rely on what's in the WHOIS and that's what I see as authoritative.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: I just wanted to point out that the working group actually didn't look at this issue of authoritativeness quite extensively and it's actually in the report that speaks about this. And also I think the difference between looking at the accuracy or who is responsible for making sure that the information is there and who holds it at the end of the day. So it may be worth looking at that, but the working group did conclude that – believe that currently is not creating any significant issues. There was no need to actually change the current environment, whether it's a specific policy or around the aspect of who has authoritative data. But again, that may be something you may want to further review based on the discussions that the working group had on that topic.

HAN CHUAN LEE: Thank you, Marika. Any comments from the remote participation? Anything? No, okay. So we'll move onto the next slide. Sorry, one more slide.

This is the next steps from this meeting. So I'll ask the IRT to complete the review of the Thick WHOIS Implementation Plan and schedule, and please let us have your comments via the mailing list so it is recorded.

---

We're looking at after the other comments have been received, hopefully by the end of July, we should be able to finalize the Implementation Plan shortly after that and then we can start to [inaudible]. I'll be going through the mailing list to actually fixed the regular meeting times with you.

JOE WALDREN: I may have missed that, but is the Implementation Plan only being reviewed by the IRT or is that going to receive any kind of public review?

HAN CHUAN LEE: So we will post it on our website not for public comment, but we'll be posting up mainly review by the IRT.

JOE WALDREN: I'm not sure I got the answer correct.

HAN CHUAN LEE: The review will only be carried by IRT.

JOE WALDREN: So will this Implementation Plan be published to the community or will it only be circulated and held within the IRT?

HAN CHUAN LEE: It will first complete review and comments by the IRT first before it gets published to the public.

---

JOE WALDREN:                   Okay, thank you.

HAN CHUAN LEE:               And I'd like to remind everybody in our room that Thick WHOIS Implementation affects all registries. It doesn't matter whether you're a Legacy or you're a new gTLD. It affects all the registries. Basically your WHOIS data model has to follow exactly the 2013 RAA Specification, meaning that in your RAA Specification 4, you will have to [inaudible] the same thing.

Okay. What's the time now? Oh, we are well ahead of time. Are there any other comments around the room on this Thick WHOIS implementation? If not, you are welcome to catch us along the corridor if you have any comments on this. I look forward to the IRT giving us your review of the Implementation Plan over the mailing list, and if there's any other suggestions or feedback that you want about this Thick WHOIS Implementation, please feel free to give it to me or you can get my e-mail address after this meeting.

Okay. Thank you, everybody, for attending this meeting. We adjourn until the next meeting. Thank you. So the meeting is closed. Stop the recording, please. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**