

---

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome, everyone, to the Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation IRT meeting on 23 August 2016.

As a reminder, please speak your name before you speak so we can have it for the recording. All of this, of course, will be recorded and put on our community wiki. Let's get started. Thank you, Fabien. Fabien is helping me in the background, and I'll be running the slides and running the meeting.

Okay, so the agenda for today, I thought we would take just a few moments to talk about the meeting logistics. Then we have some candidate requirements consensus policy language that we've developed that we want to share with you and some of the open items on our scorecard that we have not yet closed out.

Okay, let's see. Can everybody see the slide okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Perfect.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, is that better?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, [it's good.]

---

*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.*

---

DENNIS CHANG:

Meeting logistics, let's talk about that. What I'd like to do is make sure we're on the same page about the meetings. As much as we can, I'd like to get IRT agreement on the meeting schedules, both near-term and long-term perhaps. I know that in the past we have agreed on weekly meetings and on the same day and time. That's what we've booked until the end of August, I think. So we'll have to talk about whether we need to do that for the end of September, which is what I'm proposing today.

The meeting invites will normally be sent out via e-mail. It usually goes one at a time in sort of a batch system. So you know our teammate [inaudible] sends out those meeting notices and meeting invites. Then typically what I like to do is at the end of the meeting when we talk about the next steps, I like us to confirm the time of the meeting for the next meeting and, hopefully, we want to establish some agenda for the next meeting. I think it may be clear to us when we get to the end of this meeting what we should be doing at our next meeting, so let's do that. Of course, the meeting recordings and materials are posted on our community IRT wiki page.

Any questions or comments on our meeting logistics? Hearing none, I'll move on.

This is a transition implementation path timeline we established on 19 July, and it hasn't changed. But because this is a complex program and project, I think we need to – I mean, I certainly do – have to come back to this slide as a reference very frequently. So you'll see this same slide again and again for us to remind ourselves exactly what we are talking about every time we have a topic.

---

For our consensus policy language, the first [action] typically is our effective date. I would like us to make sure that we're on the same page. These are the two most important items on the policy. We on this policy have two effective dates, as we agreed on before. On 1 May 2018, all new domain name registrations must be created as Thick. And by 1 February 2019, all data for existing registrations must have been migrated from Thin to Thick.

This should be consistent with your line of thinking, but I'd like to hear from the IRT members if there are any discussions to be had on these two dates. It should be consistent with these two blue milestones that we have been looking at on the timeline. Can I hear some acknowledgement from IRT members? Anybody? Hello? Is the audio enabled?

[FABIEN BETREMIEUX]: Dennis, we have a checkmark from Marc.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you. That's good.

KRISTA PAPAC: Hey, Dennis. I think because you're running the show you can't see the chat. We've also got Roger Carney saying "timeline looks correct" and Jody Kolker saying "agreed."

---

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, thank you so much for your help, guys. Yes, you're right. I can't see the chat.

So let me move on. This is very important that we do this. These is the language that you will see in Section 1 of the consensus policy that we will be preparing. Next item, the implementation team thought it would be helpful to provide some definitions that the IRT and everyone can agree on. Those three terms we picked out are "Thin Registration," "Thick Registration," and "Existing Registration."

Now Thin and Thick Registration have been talked about in many different forums. Even training sessions have tried to explain what these mean. In a lot of the [engineering from technically] there are descriptions. But we decided to pull all the information together in a concise language, that is at a policy level, to describe what we mean by Thin and Thick.

Probably all of you are very familiar and knowledgeable about these two terms, but I think it's important that when we present our consensus policy that these are the first things that they see.

Let's talk about Thin registration. Any comments on this definition? Is there something that's unclear, or should we make it somehow better? Any comments? If you want to do a checkmark too, that's okay. Thin registration definition, are we good with this definition?

[KRISTA PAPAC]:

Dennis, you have Roger in the queue, and you have a checkmark from Jody Kolker.

DENNIS CHANG: Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: I'm just wondering if it would be beneficial to mention contacts in both of these descriptions and that the contacts for Thin registration are only at the registrar. You mentioned the technical information, but I wonder if we shouldn't mention contact information.

DENNIS CHANG: Contact? Did you say "contact" or "context"?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, the contacts. Their contact information – their name, their address, their phone number – the registrant.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I see.

KRISTA PAPAC: I think your point being Thin registration, this definition is specific to a registry of Thin registration, not to a registrar. So your point being that the registry it's just the domain name, but the contact information or the registration itself is Thick at the registrar level. Am I understanding that correctly?

---

ROGER CARNEY: Again, when you look at the definition, it looks right. But I think that if we put in there that the contact information is maintained only at the registrar, it may add more information or be clearer to people.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else agree with that? How do the other IRT people feel?

MARC ANDERSON: I have my hand up in the queue as well. I agree with Roger. From a practical standpoint, the only real difference between a Thin registration and a Thick registration is the contact data. The only real difference is in a Thin registry, the registry does not have any contact – does not even accept contact data and doesn't display it, whereas a Thick registration, it does have contacts and displays the contact information. So I think Roger makes a good point just for clarity. There's nothing wrong with the definition, but making note of the contacts would help provide clarity. So I agree with Roger's comment.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I think that's good. I think we should do that. We'll add right here "add contact information."

Okay, next item is Thick. Any comments on the Thick? It's more of a lengthy definition.

[ROGER CARNEY]: Dennis, do you have Marc in the queue?

MARC ANDERSON: I [have a feeling] you can't see when we raise our hands in the queue.

DENNIS CHANG: You know what? I think I will do it this way. Let me see if this – yeah, now I can. When I go into the presentation mode, [I can. How's this?] Yes, go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Seeing the definition, there are lots of definitions and ways to define Thin and Thick, and I'm not sure this is the one I would have taken. My one concern about this one, I guess, is that you say "domain name for which the Registry Operator maintains all the registration data elements that enable it to comply with WHOIS." I have to say, I disagree with "maintains" there. The Registry Operator really doesn't take on responsibility for maintaining the contact data elements. That's still a responsibility of the registrars. The registrars maintain that information and just pass that information to the registries who then have a copy of that data. But just to say registries maintain that data really isn't accurate, in my mind at least. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Francisco suggested "stores." Does that work better?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, that's definitely better than "maintains."

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Okay, Joyce asked a good question: “Why are we defining the terms? Are we starting over?” We’re defining the terms because we’re preparing the consensus policy language that we will be posting for public comment. As we discuss what we’re doing with Thick and Thin registrations throughout the policy, we thought it was important that we come to a common understanding that IRT can explain to the people who may be asking. That’s why. Joyce, is that understandable why we are taking the time to do this now?

Any more on Thick Registration? We can follow up. Go ahead, Steve.  
Steve, go ahead.

STEVE METALITZ: Sorry, I was on mute. Can you hear me now?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

STEVE METALITZ: Did you look at the definitions of these terms in the working group report that led to the consensus policy? I’m just wondering if it’s necessary to reinvent the wheel here.

DENNIS CHANG: Fabien?



FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, thanks, Steve. We did look into the report, and we're familiar with it. The way it was described, it wasn't defined per se. There was just an explanation of the difference between the two, and so I believe we've gone this way as to be the most precise as possible in the consensus policy.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I didn't expect to spend a lot of time on this, but I think it may be worthwhile. We may choose not to use it for our consensus policy language at the end, but at least for the IRT here there shouldn't be any disagreement on these terms.

Let's talk about the Existing Registration. We talk about existing registration quite a lot, and we wanted to make sure that this definition is what we mean by that. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: My only question is about the "pending Create status." Is there a time limit on how long a registration can remain in that status, or could a registrar in effect delay moving to Thick by keeping registrations in pending Create status for up to nine months?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hi, Steve. Yes, I think that depends on registry policy. I have to confess I don't know what is the policy in .com/.net. I don't even know if they use pending Create.

STEVE METALITZ:                    Maybe Marc can answer that.

DENNIS CHANG:                    Yeah, is Marc still on?

MARC ANDERSON:                  Yes.

DENNIS CHANG:                    Yeah, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:                  I'm not sure I understand exactly what you're asking. So .com/.net does not have a pending Create status, so it wouldn't apply there; .jobs does. I guess in the case of .jobs, it doesn't become a registration until the pending Create request is approved. I don't think that answers your question, but am I getting warmer, I guess?

STEVE METALITZ:                  Well, yeah. I mean, it makes sense because I think as I understand it just from reading the description of the EPP codes, this would mostly be used in registries that have a Sunrise period. Of course, .com and .net never did and it's long over for .jobs. So I'm just wondering what else this is being used for and whether it would be possible – do we need to say the “pending Create,” or is that really a null set?

---

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, to your point, I would say it wouldn't apply to the Sunrise. Any Sunrise TLDs are using pending, right? So this is a valid model there, but they're all Thick from the start so I don't think it applies there. As far as .jobs though, I'm not sure I'm following exactly where you're going there. But, yeah, I can't think of a use case offhand where we'd have to call it out specifically, but it's a fair question.

DENNIS CHANG: So if it just causes more confusion, should we just take it out? If it's "pending Create" status, it's not registered, right? So it's not an existing registration. That's what I'm hearing I think.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, that's correct. That's why I was suggesting perhaps we should remove the word "registration" from the definition and call it something else. Maybe "existing domain name" or some other term that people think fits better.

On the other hand, what you just said, I don't know what people think, particularly the registrars. If we remove the notion of names in pending Create status from the definition, then that would mean I think that a domain name that is in pending status let's say on April 2018 and then moves to [okay] status or some other status that is not pending Create, so [pending Create status] is removed and let's say on May 1, 2018, it could have been created without the Thick data with the pending Create status.

---

Then when it's moved from the pending Create status, then the [inaudible] will have to add the information. That's why we were trying to consider that case and say the moment you submit the Create operation is when you have to – that's what [inaudible] when you have to put the data.

I understand from [Michael] this is [only meant] for .jobs, not for .com and .net, so it should be a small number of cases. I think we can either change the name or update the definition to remove the concept of pending Create from there. I don't know what's the preference from the IRT members.

DENNIS CHANG:

Marc, do you have a preference?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. I was not following initially but, Francisco, thank you for the additional detail. That helps. And, yeah, I think you make a good point. Yeah, so let's just say on April 20, registrar submits a .jobs domain request that goes into the pending Create status. Then Employ Media who is the Registry Operator for .jobs, it's up to them to approve or reject it, right?

If on the 20<sup>th</sup>, the registrar submits the request without Thick contact data and Employ Media approves it before May 1, then it's not an issue. If they approve it after May 1, then that becomes an issue. You wrote it this way to account for that use case and basically give registrars up until May 1 as a grace period.

---

Yeah, based on that, I understand why you put it in there and I think it makes sense and I'd suggest leaving it in there just to make it easier and more consistent for registrars on when their effective date is for that. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so Marc is suggesting that we leave it in there, and Francisco is saying: "We should call it Existing Domain Name or something else that does not include the word Registration." Okay, so you mean take this out?

[FRANCISCO ARIAS]: Yes, and also from the name itself.

DENNIS CHANG: This one?

[FRANCISCO ARIAS]: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: [But we used Existing Registration throughout the document.]

[FRANCISCO ARIAS]: Yes, so we should name it Existing Domain Name, right? That's what we [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay.

[FRANCISCO ARIAS]: I'm suggesting we call it Existing Domain Name through the rest of the...

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so as we go through the rest of the language, we should remember to call it consistently and say "Existing Domain Name"?

[FRANCISCO ARIAS]: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Got it. Okay, everybody okay with the terminology definition?

Let's move on. Again, reminder for the timeline, we're going to get into some candidate requirements language. "By 1 May 2017, Registry Operator must provide to all Registrars and ICANN documentation reflecting the system changes concerning relevant OT&E available."

We're talking about 1 May here – this diamond – Registry OT&E Opens. We expect that certainly by then the documentation should be available, and it can be provided. Is that okay? Comments? Marc, go ahead.

---

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry, that was an old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. Well, do you think this is okay? I think this is redundant, so I'm just going to delete that.

Okay, no comments then we're going to move on the next sentence: 1 August, 2017. Registry Operator must deploy an EPP mechanism for registrars to migrate registration data forward existing registration.

So we're talking about 1 August, 2017. So we're talking about this point here, this timeline. So on the same day we have couple of things here, and we broke it out into two different sentences, line items because one is EPP mechanism which I believe we already have. So there shouldn't be anything new. I'm not sure whether you have to do something new there but the last bullet here we call it the Alternative Bulk Transfer Mechanism and this is what we were talking about in terms of file transfer and this is when I asked the registry and registrar to work out the system and IRT is not going to be involved in designing the interface or the transmission mechanism but simply handle it this way.

Is the IRT okay with this bullet, this requirement for registry and registrar, okay with this? Go ahead, Jody.

JODY KOLKER: I don't know, I wish Theo was on, but I'm not sure how relevant this is anymore. I just know that we won't be using a Bulk Transfer Mechanism to do this and it's going to be done by a one-by-one basis. So I don't

---

know if it's worthwhile for the registry to have to develop that if no registrars are going to be using it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, my understanding was that somebody was going to – was it Theo?

JODY KOLKER: I'm not sure if it was Theo or if Theo had moved onto something else. I think it might be something to discuss on the mailing list just to make sure.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. Okay, so you're right if it's not required by anyone... Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Certainly that would be work on our end, too, to implement for a Bulk Transfer Mechanism, and so if it's something that registrars are not going to use, if they're just being utilized EPP, I'd hate to go through implementing something that's not going to be utilized or would be very lightly utilized. So if we could confirm that it's necessary. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely. I agree. The difficulty with the IRT members who are looking at the interests of the registrar is that they sort of have to think about all cases. But if we can come up with a scenario or anyone who would want one, then we wouldn't put it in as a requirement.



---

We'll follow up on the e-mail with you. Shall we move on to next item?  
So starting on 1 August, 2017, registrars may – and this is a may – provide complete Thick registration data to Registry Operator upon creation of new domain name registration, and registry must accept the creation of new domain name registration.

So 1 August, 2017 we are here. Again, right here in this point, and what we're saying is registrars can start to move data and registry must accept. So it's a "may" for registrar and "must" for registry. Is that clearly stated? Somebody want to speak or...? Okay, then let's move on.

Starting on 1 May, 2018, registrars must provide complete... Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Sorry, my reading's a little slower than you're going through this. I'm reading through this starting on the 1 August, 2017, "Registrars may provide complete Thick registration data to Registry Operator upon creation..." So registry must accept the creation of new domain name registrations. I guess that's kind of what we do is accept the creation of new domain name registrations. I think what you're trying to say is the registry must accept the creation of Thick registration data with new domain name registrations and we can going back to what we said earlier, I mean the real difference between Thin and Thick is the existence of contacts at the registry. So I think what is really happening is starting 1 August, 2017, the registry must accept the creation of contacts in support of Thick domain name registrations.

---

So really the key there is on that day, 1 August, 2017, registries must support contacts, really all contact operations for registrars.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, if we say Thick registration data, that's clear, right? Instead of saying contacts. Okay. So that's 1 August, 2017, thank you.

Let's move to the next one. "Starting 1 May, 2018, registrars must provide complete Thick registration data to Registry Operator upon creation of new domain name registrations." So 1 May, 2018. Let's go to 1 May, 2018 is here. I think that is our policy effective date. Is that the same? "Must provide complete Thick registration data." Yes. This is new registrations. So basically it's a policy effective date, right? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

I agree with what you have written here, but I think what's going to happen on May 1<sup>st</sup> 2018 or I think what we're expecting to happen as far as the transition from Thin to Thick here, is we're expecting on 1 May, 2018 that the registry will require contacts. Again, from Thin to Thick it comes back to contacts. And so from a nuts and bolts perspective, on 1 May, 2018, the registry will require registrars to associate contacts with domain name registrations, otherwise the registration will fail. Without getting too much into the weeds, that's really what's going to start happening on 1 May, 2018 is that that stops being a "may" and it starts being a "must" with the enforcement happening on the Registry Operator side.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a really good point. I just added that one sentence. Go ahead, Francisco. Did you want to speak or no?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: No I think you already covered my... Perhaps my [association] probably should be a separate requirement but we're getting to the details.

DENNIS CHANG: I think I see it as a same requirement [inaudible].

FRANCISCO ARIAS: It's okay. It's fine.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That's fine? Okay. So we got that capture "1 May, registrar must provide Thick registration data and Registry Operator must require Thick registration data." So we're covered on both sides.

Okay. Shall we move on? So here's more language. This one is covering transition of existing registration now. We're talking about starting 1 August, 2017, and at the latest by 1 February, 2019, "Registrars must migrate to the Registry Operator all data available in the registrar database for all sponsored existing registration to allow them to become Thick registration."

---

So what we're referring to is this 18-month bar beginning on 1 August and ending in 1 February of 2019 – the 18 month transition period. And what we're saying here is that at the latest – you can do it earlier – but at the latest it has to be 1 February and all data must migrate and all data that pertains to the Thick registration, of course.

Any comments here? It's the same thing that we've been discussing all along but we're just trying to put it into a concise policy language. Comments?

Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Would it be easier just to remove "existing registrations" and its definition and just say "Thin registrations"?

DENNIS CHANG: I see.

ROGER CARNEY: To be honest, it doesn't matter when they were created or how they were created or anything, what we're saying is every Thin registration needs to be moved. I don't know what everybody else thinks. It just seems easier to read to me.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I like that. Everybody okay with this? Instead of saying “existing registration” just say “Thin registration”? That’s what we’re talking about. Go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So the use of – [we are changing] the name it should be existing domain names, but the important bit about using that concept is because it’s related to the date when the create happened. So if we use Thin domain names as proposed, we will have to add also the part about when the create for that [inaudible] happen. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Not really. So when you “existing registration” it’s broader than Thin registration?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes, so it also encompasses when the domain create happened. Remember a few slides ago we changed the name from existing [inaudible] to existing domain names. Those are names that are created before 1 May, 2018.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Yes, but during this time don’t they all have to be transitioned regardless? No?

---

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Names that are created after 1 May, 2018, they have to be created Thick.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, of course. Yes. So are you saying that the Thick registration data has to transition, too? Is that what you're saying?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: What I was saying is if we don't want to use "existing domain name" and change it to "Thin registrations," then we will need to add the bit about when the create happened.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, that becomes a little more complicated then.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I would say we got the input so let's there be one then [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. So let me just make –

JOYCE LIN: I have a question on that one, too. If you said the registrar must migrate to the Registry Operator all data available in the registrar database. You know some registrar might have some extra information in their database for each domain name registration. I think that we are just

---

required to migrate those contacts for the domain that – how should I say this – that require [inaudible] the Thick registries.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, we thought about that case actually. That’s why we added this “allow them to become Thick registration” but maybe what you want to say is “require them to become Thick registration.” Would that [inaudible].

JOYCE LIN: Or the required field by the Thick registries, not all the available [inaudible] in the registrar database. That could be a [part]. That could be anything that’s not related to the Thick WHOIS or anything. Or required field of the Thick registry. Right?

DENNIS CHANG: Wait a minute...

JOYCE LIN: Or you can [inaudible] of a domain name registration to a registrar. Not migrate to the Registry Operator all required fields of a domain registration to the Registry Operator. Or you can say [all of the] domain name registration to the Registry Operator.

DENNIS CHANG: Is that what you’re suggesting?

JOYCE LIN: Yes. If you don't really want the registrar to [inaudible] everything. That is obvious.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. We thought about your case, so we discussed it here. We certainly don't want to imply that you have to hand over everything you have, but only those information that required to make a Thick registration. So go ahead, Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Sorry, I think you already covered the point and just it's like a different way. By the way, I think I made a slide on that but didn't make it to this slide deck. You can think of this as a Venn diagram. You have one set – all the data available in the registrar database. And you have another set which is the set of fields that make a registration be Thick. And you put those sets together and the intersection, that's what the registrar have to give to the registry. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely. It makes sense to me, but I don't think you were asking the question to me, though. Anybody else have comments on this? But that is the intent. I think we all understand the intent, we just need to make the language clear.

Okay, I'm going to do something with this later. Let's talk about this. Next item then.



---

Starting 1 May, 2017 until 1 February, 2019 – We’re talking about the same duration – “Registrar [inaudible] shall provide transition progress metrics to each registrar every week.”

So this is something I think we did discuss this before, I remember. But any comments on this? The registry have to provide metrics to the registrars, right? So the registrar knows how they’re doing. This is basically trying to measure how we’re doing and of course for the duration of the period ICANN needs this information. So registries have two things to do.

JOYCE LIN: What does the metrics included? Each registrar is 100% completed, or 30% completed [on] this particular registrar? Is it a whole picture of everybody or just individually addressed to that particular registrar? What I’m saying, am I getting a report from Verisign saying that each registrar ABC has completed 30% and registrar XYZ completed 20%? Is that what the metrics are going to be look like or just a [inaudible]?

DENNIS CHANG: If you are a registrar, then you’ll be getting the information about your own.

JOYCE LIN: Okay.

---

DENNIS CHANG: So each registrar gets their own information on how they're doing.

JOYCE LIN: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: ICANN gets everything.

JOYCE LIN: Okay. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: That's the intent.

JOYCE LIN: That makes sense, yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: I just want to caveat I was not on, I was on PTO last week and so I missed last week's discussion and I'm not caught up on my e-mail yet. So I just wanted to caveat that I haven't seen [on] the discussion and conversations about the registry reporting that's been proposed and

---

discussed, so I'll just caveat that and say I'll get caught up and read and comment on that as soon as I'm caught up. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That's fair. So we'll go ahead and follow up with an online [inaudible] conversation and we'll continue. But I think idea and intent is clear, right? So was there anybody who wanted to speak. We have five minutes left, or four minutes left. Go ahead.

JOYCE LIN: The first or second paragraph there, I don't think that you need – sorry I [inaudible] – registrar must migrate to the Registry Operator or require [fields] of the domain registration. I don't think you need the “to the Registry Operator.” It's kind of duplicated.

DENNIS CHANG: You're right.

JOYCE LIN: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

JOYCE LIN: To allow them to become the Thick registration. That should be good enough.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, you're right. Go ahead. Was there anybody? I had more slides prepared but as expected I think that this conversation took the time it should have taken, so I'm going to skip the next few slides which were the open items that we were going to talk about. But we can do that next time. So go to the next steps.

So we're going to continue developing this consensus policy language and get agreement on each component in the path of putting together the whole document.

Next meeting is on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Next week Tuesday, obviously at the same time and as proposed. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: You'll be circulating a draft of these prior to the next meeting, is that correct? Rather than wait until we get to this meeting and now we have to start wordsmithing the thing.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. I understand, yes. Let me try to do that. Go ahead.

KRISTA PAPAC: If I could just add one thing here and I'll let you respond to Steve, but Steve and everyone, it's a point well taken about wordsmithing on the fly. What we're trying to do here and I'm not sure maybe this isn't a good idea or maybe it doesn't work well for the IRT, but we were trying

---

to just get kind of an initial read on some of these terms so we could pull... concurrently we have a document that we're drafting that would be the draft consensus policy that we would share with this group but we kind of wanted to talk about some of these ideas and concepts with you and then try to incorporate that into a draft that we could then share with you guys to do the actual wordsmithing.

So I'm not sure what you think about that and maybe this is a good time to ask that question before Dennis responds, but Dennis, I'll leave it kind of up to you. I just wanted to provide the background as to why we took this approach.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, thank you, Krista. Precisely. We wanted to make progress as fast as we can so before we actually put together the whole document, the components that we can identify which we thought was important we wanted to get agreements on as quickly as possible. Any feedback?

STEVE METALITZ:

Just to say that it's always better to have something in advance and then we can actually be prepared to give you some well thought out feedback. That's all.

DENNIS CHANG:

Right. Completely understood. Let me see what I can do. So next meeting we are going to continue and... Go ahead, Marc.

---

MARC ANDERSON: I agree with Steve and Krista, if I can do that. I agree with Steve, if you can provide anything in advance we can provide more meaningful comments. I struggled a little bit to keep up and read and comment during today's call. But I also understand Krista's point and I think she's trying to be... it sounds like you're trying to make sure you're on the right track and you have the major concepts right before you put pen to paper. And so I understand and I think that's fine. So I'm kind of agreeing with both of you. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: We're sort of experimenting here as we go, too. We do want to make progress but a lot of things to do and a lot of things to think about and people look at things very differently we notice.

So we'll have our next meeting. Are we in agreement that we're going to have continued to the weekly meeting until the end of September? Can we go ahead and schedule that? Everybody okay with this? Krista, do you have something? Steve? Marc has agreed. Steve, did you want to speak?

STEVE METALITZ: I'm sorry [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, great. Then I'll go ahead and schedule the rest of September, same time, same date, and I'll see if I can put something out on a more regular basis in advance via e-mail or the community wiki. I would like

---

to use the community wiki page more as an ongoing tool for the IRT. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: When you say you're scheduling meetings through the end of September, does that mean you don't plan to put anything out for public comment until the end of September? Because I thought that our goal here was the 1<sup>st</sup> of September to get something out for public comment. I may be mistaken about that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. The 1<sup>st</sup> of September doesn't seem likely at this point from where I'm standing. Do you?

STEVE METALITZ: I think it depends on whether you're seeking the perfect or the good. So we could continue to vet this figuratively, or you could put something out and move the process forward. [Inaudible]. Okay. I'm just saying if I'm mistaken this is another milestone missed, right?

KRISTA PAPAC: Hey Steve. So the main milestone is to be able to put something out by January so that we can meet the implementation timelines, and while yes, we were targeting having publication in early September, we still think that the key milestone of being able to notify contracted parties of this implementation for the next implementation cycle we still find that

---

to be achievable. So how does it go – losing the battle but still on target to win the war or however that goes.

STEVE METALITZ:            Alright, thank you.

KRISTA PAPAC:             But I understand your concern. Yes, thank you.

STEVE METALITZ;           I've got to sign off here, but thanks everyone.

DENNIS CHANG:             Okay, thanks everyone. I'll see you next week then. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:       Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**