
DUANE WESSELS: Welcome everyone to RZERC's regular meeting here in Barcelona at ICANN63. I have a feeling this may be kind of a short meeting, but nonetheless, we'll go through the agenda. There's really only two sort of topics of substance that we can discuss today. One is related to our KSK Rollover response document and the other is about the request from OCTO on Root Zone Management Evolution. Mario, I'll ask you to conduct the roll call, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Duane. Welcome everyone. In the room we have Peter Koch from ccNSO, we have Brad Verd from RSSAC, we have Russ Mundy from SSAC, and Kim Davies from PTI. And on the bridge we have no one.

DUANE WESSELS: You forgot about me, Mario. Duane is here.

MARIO ALEMAN: Oh, apologies, and Duane Wessels, chairing the meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thank you. So, I already briefly reviewed the agenda. Let's move on to the Action Items from our previous meeting which also, I remember correctly, was quite short.

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.

MARIO ALEMAN:

Thank you, Duane, this is Mario for the recording. The Action Items from the last teleconference call on 13 August 2018, haven't been approved, because our meeting in September was rescheduled. So the Action Items from that teleconference was Mario to publish the minutes, transcript and audio recording from the 26 July 2018 teleconference.

The second one, Staff to add agenda item "Discussion on KSK Rollover Work Items" for the next RZERC teleconference.

Staff to schedule a teleconference for the RZM Evolution Study Work Party.

And the last one, Mario to confirm RZERC members' availability for the next teleconference.

That being said, all of these Action Items have been complete, and let us know if you have any questions. Back to you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thanks Mario. So, is it true that the August minutes have not been posted, right? So you will post them for us following this meeting, right? Okay. So, one thing on our agenda today is, we haven't had really a chance to follow up on our work from the KSK Rollover document. I don't know, I guess I'm interested in the committee's appetite to revisit this document, not the document itself, but the process of publishing the document.

So, just for the record, we had a little bit difficulty coming to consensus on this document. In the end, we did have consensus and the

document was published on time and sent to the Board. Obviously the KSK Rollover happened and we're not aware of any negative consequences of that, so all that is behind us. The topic that we may want to talk about today is whether, you know, going through the process of producing that document, did we learn things that maybe would lead to revision of our procedures or how we do things, or that kind of thing, maybe we need to talk about what consensus means for RZERC and how we deal with dissenting opinions.

I'm interested to hear from other people because this has been a few months now, and maybe the way we were feeling at the time, maybe we feel less passionate now about this. But anyway, I'd like to open it up for discussion from other people if they want to have that discussion now.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Duane. This is Russ for the record. It seems to me that we have at least a good basis to work from in our current procedures document. The document that we had the request for and that we had to handle fairly quickly will hopefully be an exceptional case, as opposed to something that, we didn't actually end up having to make a response to the OCTO, but we did have the opportunity to work through it in a more time reasonable sense. So I would hate to see us make substantial changes as a result of what we had to do for the KSK Rollover, just because of the time was so compressed in which we had to respond to that.

DUANE WESSELS: Brad?

BRAD VERD: Not to contradict what you just said, Russ, but I feel like the more time we have, the less consensus we have. The more time we sat there and we chewed on things and we got stuck on things, and we were unable to come to a consensus. It was disappointing.

DUANE WESSELS: One of the things that I wanted to mention also in regards to the KSK Rollover document that we did is initially the plan was to produce a number of documents much like we see out of SSAC and RSSAC. And then as we came to the deadline, we had some sort of dissenting opinions, and what not, and there was a proposal, I believe by me, to sort of change the nature of that document from just a straight document to more like a letter from the Chair of the committee, which we didn't end up doing in the end, but I guess I'm again curious to hear from other members of the committee if now, in hindsight, do you think, did we make the right choice with the style and the format of the document that we produced, or should we in the future consider maybe having more choices at our disposal? Sometimes it's a straight document, sometimes it's a letter.

PETER KOCH: This is Peter. Thanks, Duane. First I think that you as the Chair did the right thing when you found out that there might not be consensus to invite the dissenting voice, which in that case was myself. It was a

minority statement because that's exactly what the charter suggests, and I had explained later why I did not follow that invitation for specific reasons. Now in hindsight it appears, if we look at the responses from other ACs, that this response was hard to get to, not only in our committee, but elsewhere, as well. And it seems to have been, how do you, unprecedentedly contentious, at least in one other advisory committee. So, with that in mind, my decision might have looked differently. But that doesn't mean that the Chair did anything wrong.

I would also hope that we would have a chance the next time, well, let me put it another way, I think the way we came into the game was less than optimal, being asked, where we hadn't had a chance to respond to this before, given that the KSK had started before RZERC came into existence, and so on, and so forth. So this was special in multiple dimensions. So, we probably don't have to repeat an exercise based on these plans, and I think it will be better next time when we get one of the questions from the Board or any entity in the community.

Still, I think that our handling of this as a group, the handling of these issues, I wouldn't say it's bad, but it surfaces to mean that we might still not have a complete agreement at what level of granularity we are supposed to deal with these things. Maybe we're reading the charter, the mandate to look that all the parties have been involved which is kind of more an oversight function. And from that perspective I think we might have still gone a bit too much into detail in the response, for probably good reasons, and with good reason and all good intentions, but I think we might want to address the question of the clarification of the mission, not necessarily pressing, but think about this without anything on the plate.

So, we don't have to react immediately, but check what is the thing that people had in mind in the beginning. And that might lead to another topic. So, in the course of the RSSAC review, members of the committee may have noticed that the RSSAC review also mentions RZERC and mentions some perceived confusion regarding the may or may not be overlapping missions of both committees, that there is something to clarify there, and then several people who were part of the CWG gave their own versions on how they had thought of designing this RZERC thing, and they weren't necessarily completely in agreement, either.

So that's something that, well, we should work on or we should signal to the relevant part of the community, whoever that is, because we don't really know. The CWG is gone, RZERC is not a bylaws committee, so we're hanging a bit in the vacuum, as we say.

DUANE WESSELS:

Let me ask a followup. At this point, RZERC has no formal business to conduct, right? There's nothing for us to consider. So one option is we could go back into our hibernation mode. Would you recommend that or would you rather not do that and spend some time fleshing out these issues that you bring up?

PETER KOCH:

I'm not eager to have the committee conduct meetings for the purpose of conducting meetings. On the other hand, the next time we have something in front of us, we may or may not, all that I said before, setting it aside in terms of what the preconditions might look like, it's

probably better to discuss these fundamental issues without any pressing question on our plate. Whether or not we give us some time to let this settle or find some more appropriate timeslot during the upcoming, whatever, six months, I'm not eager to address this immediately, but we better do it before the next question arrives in our input queue. And I'm not considering the OCTO question one of those questions, I think we can deal with that, and have been dealing that already.

So, sorry for not giving you a clear yes or no response, I think it's an important thing to do. It's probably not pressing, but we could also have information discussions around what do we think would be next thing the community asks us to do. And we know that people have been discussing frequencies of KSK Rollovers, and given that the KSK which started before RZERC came into existence, was done without initial involvement of RZERC, the discussion around repeated KSK Rollovers may well be something that is within RZERC's scope. So, that's to wait for an issue to arise, anyway. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thank you Peter. Yes, Kaveh, please.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I think there is a more -- and maybe I have to reread the charter again, but there is an underlying question in what you said, which is, is RZERC supposed to be a reactive organization or proactive? For example for the frequency of the KSK Rollover, we might have ideas, but is it on us to come up with a bit of a proposal or advice or something, or should we

wait for someone to ask us? I think that's, KSKS frequency, rollover frequency, something, but there are many other issues which I'm sure we can form opinion. But at least personally for me it's not clear. Maybe it's clear in the charter, but for me it's not clear. Are we reactive or proactive, supposed to be proactive?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I think you're right. We're all figuring this out as we go, so I think it's not obvious. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks Duane, Russ for the record. Right, and one similar type of question to 'are we supposed to be proactive or reactive', in what we do and handle and respond to, are we supposed to be doing coordination of whatever answer and position an individual member takes that consenting organization, or are we supposed to speak strictly as a body itself, as individuals from those organizations that collectively our view is X on topic Y, as opposed to here's topic Y, do we have to go back to the groups that were affiliated with it and make sure that they're in agreement with a position and then come back and argue for that position within the group.

And I think that's completely vague in our charter, and I know we've had at least a couple of discussions. I know Jim and I have had discussions where we do not see this the same way. So, I think it's an area that would be good to try to at least get more of a sense internally to this group of what we expect amongst ourselves and with our sending

organizations, before we have a time pressing kind of thing we have to answer.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, okay. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: One observation I would make on the last point is I think, at least what was intended, was that RZERC wouldn't necessarily have all the skills or knowledge to address the issues that come across its plate. It's a place where we make sure issues don't slip through. But substantive work is noted, like within SSAC, RSSAC, or one of those individual bodies, this is the place to catch it. Now, whether at the end of that it then comes back and as you said, you argue the position, that's not clear to me, but I feel that this is more of a body to say this needs to go to these places for additional work.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, I think, yes, I agree. I think the intent that is my understanding when this was formed, I think the intent was that. And if you take the intent, then I think that answers both questions, because in that case we would be a reactive organization because work is coming from somewhere else, we are just a filter to make sure something is not missed, and I think it also answers Russ' point, because in that case, we are not representing our constituency or community behind us, they just appointed us as experts, and they say hey, make sure nothing is passed

by. So if we agree on that intent, I think that automatically answers both those points.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, I could follow, especially with respect to one of the favorite charts of mine that's come out of the RSSAC realm, is the chart that shows the root server pieces and then the provisioning pieces, and says, you know, here's this hard line in between, and RSSAC is dealing with the root server operations pieces and at least as I understood from the transition activities, one of the, if not the critical function associated with RZERC was to at least have some other group looking at the provisioning side activities, they wouldn't necessarily replace NTIA, but sort of, kind of, roughly have another group of people focused on that.

And so from that perspective, one could also say that RZERC is a parallel with RSSAC, because it's looking at two different portions of the overall root server operational system and it's unclear how SSAC is supposed to be speaking anything that's security and stability in the internet, SSAC says stuff about it, they feel like. So, that's not as clear a relationship, but I don't know, it's a question I think we need to work on to make sure we do come to a good understanding, because one of the things that changed during the development of the transition was the name of this group, yeah, and that may also have been an intentional exchange.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thanks everyone for that discussion. I guess we will continue to have these sorts of discussions for a while, and maybe once some of the other committee members join, they will have opinions, also.

PETER KOCH: Let me put it in a positive way, one consistent part of the contributions or memories of the founding individuals from CWG was exactly that what Russ mentioned, that they had in mind something that would fill the NTIA function of approval of things, rather than going into details looking at the development process, the decision making process, and so on and so forth. For that, of course, the question is, and you said we're designated as experts, but experts for what? Experts for technology or experts for process, or experts for multistakeholder involvement? That's one thing to look at.

The other is the charter is up for renewal I think five years after the setting up of RZERC, it would be in 2021. We could ask for an earlier review, but given that there are so many review running right now, that might stress some resources and we might not get that input that we want or a committee that would really go back deep into all the details.

DUANE WESSELS: Can I ask for clarification there? What I hear you saying is the way to get your charter updated is to go through an ICANN review process? Is that what I'm hearing?

PETER KOCH: That's a very interesting question. So, the charter says that it is up for review after five years, whether this is a usual ICANN review, again, given that this is not a Board committee, or at least not a bylaws committee, this is another detail to check, and I don't think we have a

clarified charter update process. Surely the committee could make that suggestion, but the question is who would approve that? First choice might be the ICANN Board, but then again, through the genesis of the committee, there are some details to be clarified, and I think that is probably much, much more a process issue than we want to deal with.

So, the nature point of this five year review, the scheduled one, and we could ask for an earlier one, but my point was that too many people are a bit exhausted by all these reviews and not necessarily excited about this particular committee, if even the committee can't really agree with what's going on.

The other aspect is that we might need to get a more structured input than go talk to people in an informal way from those who designed this in terms of what they had in mind and if they look what we've done so far, if that was not strictly an assessment, but getting some ideas whether that was what they had in mind when they set up the committee. Which is short of a review, but some other input, I don't know what mechanism we have at our hands but we all have can grab people and can talk to them. That would still be on an informal level. I see Kaveh nodding.

DUANE WESSELS:

But it also seems to me that if RZERC itself felt compelled to update its charter, if it could do that and then put it out for public comment, and that would probably be one way to update the charter, it would pass.

PETER KOCH: I don't know, it looks natural, but we...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The RZERC charter is not enshrined in the ICANN bylaws, so I think the review process would be less onerous than other review, for example the CSC and IFR which is part of the ICANN bylaws. So I think the exact mechanics, we can work internally to see how to best conduct a review in a lightweight process. So, that's my input on that.

RUSS MUNDY: One of the things that I'm a little reluctant to bring up, but I'm going to anyway, and that is most of us on the committee are also involved with RSSAC and are very familiar with RSSAC, and in that context, there have been questions asked about, well, what will become with RSSAC after this whole change occurs. Does the same question need to be applied to RZERC? So in theory, with whatever gets set up for the root server operators also have an impact on the provisioning aspects. I think it's a question we need to think about.

BRAD VERD: It's certainly not in the scope of the document, it's just not there. So my initial answer to you is no, if the community wants to involving that and make that change, then that would be a conversation that we would have, but as 37 sits today, the answer is no.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I would agree and I think the charter you referred to, all of the intent for [inaudible] chart which is all operations, so not the root zone provisioning, so I don't think -- and that we had no intent also to go there, so I don't think any of the work on 37 will provoke looking at the [inaudible].

RUSS MUNDY: So, I would also argue from my interactions with a large number of people around ICANN, except for the folks in this room and the folks in RSSAC, and a few people in SSAC. Most people, they see it on the slides and it just kind of goes over their head. They don't even realize there's a difference, and so I would expect that there will be some at least community discussion about that when it's going through that process. So that's why I was a little reluctant to bring it up. Because I agree, Brad, it's not in the document as it sits.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Steve?

STEVE SHENG: So, I guess reading through the original charter, the design of the RZERC is designed to be more of a reactive committee that responds to requests that's brought about by its members. So I think if RZERC wants to change that, that needs to be a serious discussion, you know, from reactive to proactive, that's a big change. The second aspect is, as Kim mentioned, the RZERC is more or less designed as a conduit, the members as a conduit to pass the information and gather the expertise

and the information back for discussion. But in order to fulfill that role, there are a couple of operational issues.

So for example, does your appointing organization have procedures for you to take the information back and then you can gather the input and come back? And second, are you able to command the attention of your appointing organization? For example, in this case with IETF, how would you command the attention of the IETF and say there's an issue that needs to be studied, and what's your opinion on this, right?

And the third one is, you know, sometimes navigating through your appointing organization to get the relevant expertise, that itself sometimes requires time and is challenging. So I think even if RZERC was to remain as a reactive committee, those issues need to be sorted out, so that you can truly engage a broad level expertise and make a recommendation to the Board. So, those are the three things I thought of. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thanks, Steve. So I think we should maybe close out this topic and move on to the next, which is the request from ICANN OCTO about Root Zone Management Evolution. So, in case you missed it, it's been a few weeks now, I received an email from Ed Lewis, stating that they wanted to withdraw the request for RZERC's advice. The reason given was that they looked at the charter and decided that they didn't follow the proper procedures in bringing this to RZERC, because OCTO is not one of the listed organizations that the charter says would bring work to RZERC.

So, I thanked him for that and at this point that is sort of off of our plates. I have mixed feelings about this, and I would be willing to hear other persons' thoughts on this, as well. I'm happy to share mine, but maybe someone else wants to go first.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Russ, for the record. Although technically what they said, I think, was bureaucratically correct in pure statement, it would be very easy and I think appropriate for OCTO as an organization to hand it to PTI and say you're a member of the RZERC, go introduce this to RZERC as an item to look at. Now, whether or not organizationally that makes sense within ICANN, I don't know, but in fact, the charter says any member of RZERC can introduce items and PTI is a member of RZERC.

DUANE WESSELS:

My interpretation of that part of the charter is not that that was an exclusive list, it was more of an example list. I would interpret it to say that the requests aren't required to come from only those organizations, but would probably come from those organizations. And also, I should mention that I did ask Ed Lewis if they intended to resubmit this request via proper channels, and he said they had not decided yet whether they would do that or not.

RUSS MUNDY:

Kim, I wasn't trying to put you on the spot.

KIM DAVIES:

No, I was actually about to say the exact same thing. I think the heart of this is, is this something that we feel is in RZERC's bailiwick to review, and I think the answer is yes. And without having had an in depth discussion as to why it was rescinded the way it was, it wasn't quite my area of focus, but that is a requirement of the IANA transition to do that work and it is being coordinated by OCTO because they have the most appropriate resources within the broader ICANN org to do it, but it's not because they're kind of like [inaudible] from PTI or this kind of stuff. It is a requirement associated with PTI's operation that this will be done.

DUANE WESSELS:

So, while I'm certainly a little disappointed that the request was withdrawn, I'm also, I guess, kind of equally disappointed in ourselves that we were not able to get something back to them in a timely manner. The request came in to us in April, May timeframe, something like that, and that woke us up out of our hibernation and we met a couple times, and we had a little work party, and then, absolutely, the KSK Rollover was in between there, but still, I would very much like RZERC to get to the point where we are much more nimble in responding to these things and it felt to me like we were dragging our feet.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks Duane, I understand and I share with that frustration or disappointment. I would say that OCTO needs congratulations for finding this face-saving exit, face saving for everybody, of course. But then again, since we now know about this, anyone of us could bring it to

the attention of the committee and we could still work on a response. Whether that would be so well received, I don't know, but we could check that in advance, we could repair that mistake, in a way, if we wanted to.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks. Anymore comments? Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, I agree, we really kind of fell on our face with that one, because it was a relatively simple one, and yet we couldn't get a good collective answer together to send back to them. And I think where we kind of fell down was not so much in terms of the specific particulars of the detail of that statement of work, but which pieces of the statement of work did we want to criticize the most, and in what way, and ask for clarification. But we were all over the board in terms of what we were trying to get back to them with. So, we need to figure out how to move these things through more quickly.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, one of my particular frustrations was that we had a work party and that work party met maybe once a month, and it felt like every meeting we went in a circle, we rehashed the same things over and over again. So, I guess one thing I would propose, going forward, is maybe a faster cycle of maybe weekly meetings, or something like that, so that we can keep it fresh in our minds and not have to waste time rehashing

everything. But that remains to be seen for future work, I guess, if that's realistic.

The other thing I struggled with a little bit was I sort of felt like maybe, being from Verisign, I was potentially a conflicted party, and so I kind of withdrew a little bit from that work party, and I was hoping other people would sort of take a more active role, and in hindsight, I don't know if that was the right decision, or not. So, those are my thoughts.

STEVE SHENG:

The other thing I observe is the working group model that we inherit from the SSAC and RSSAC, where those committees are much larger and you have a smaller subgroup, you still have like 10 people. And then even if half of them show up, you have 5 people actually doing the work. Where RZERC is much smaller, and we divide into a subset and then people don't show up, then we have only one or two people actually doing the work. So given RZERC's size, perhaps we abolish this subcommittee sub-working group model and just the whole group work as a whole to work on a response, so that's one suggestion.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, that's good, thanks Steve.

RUSS MUNDY:

One other suggestion that I might make, because we certainly had problems of this nature in SSAC where different people would show up, and on a number of topics it's a once a week meeting. So the frequency was much higher, but one of the problems was different people would

show up, and then you'd have the consensus of the people on that call be different than the consensus of the people from the previous call, and so we end up kind of bashing our heads against the wall with a changing consensus point.

And I fully agree with what Steve says, we're small enough, we should try, if we can, to do as many of these for a committee as a whole, and try to do, not just a recording, I think a recording would be very good for each of these meetings that we have on calls, and at least some amount of notes that are then sent out to each, to the whole committee, and then when the next meeting occurs, that the things that were agreed to in the previous meeting will stand, unless someone can present a good argument against it.

So that might help make progress go forward a little more quickly, because I certainly know in SSAC we've had agreements that everybody thought on a call was agreed to, didn't get written down and sent around to the entire committee, and then the next time things went poof.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, that's a good data point, thanks. Okay, so any last discussion about that evolution study? Yes, Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN:

One question, should we keep that correspondence and documents on the website? Regardless it was withdrawn?

DUANE WESSELS: I think so, I think it's appropriate.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so on Wednesday is the RZERC open information session. Mario has sent around a slidedeck. I've given him a little bit of feedback on that. I think you wanted to go through it here with everyone, is that right, Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, that's correct.

DUANE WESSELS: It should look very familiar because it's essentially the same deck that was presented in Abu Dhabi a year ago, with the addition of maybe one more slide, talking about the things that we've been working on since then. It's a regular meeting timeslot, so an hour-and-a-half, which I think we're going to have a very tough time filling. Just waiting for the slides to upload here. So, here's the agenda, we've got these five topics, this is all familiar from the last time. I don't believe the first five have changed substantially, have they, Mario? From the previous presentation?

MARIO ALEMAN: Not really. They're pretty much the same.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, maybe we can zoom through them here. Look for occurrences of ICANN60, if you see any.

MARIO ALEMAN: This slide actually shows the topic of the agenda, which is actually the overview.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so here's some language from the charter, and so on. Next is the graphic that we've all come to love. There's quite a few different versions of this graphic floating around, I know. The one that's in the RSSAC 037 is very nice, it's a little prettier, maybe at some point we can update that. I would, if you could get it, I would use that one. Like Brad said, it was professionally designed. Okay, the one in the 037 Report is very nice.

BRAD VERD: I was going to say, if you want to do that I would send it to the group, make sure everybody's cool with it, but it was done up with graphic artists versus, you know, boxes and lines.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so a brief slide on what is roughly In-Scope versus Out-Of-Scope for RZERC. Membership lists, unchanged since last year. The slide that talks about our types of meetings. The slide that talks about the way

that RZERC is transparent, recording, minutes, and so on. Again, more language from the charter, I believe.

Consideration of Proposals, and then this is really the only thing that's new, talking about the current status. I believe even last year we had this on there, we had the Operational Procedures completed? Maybe not, maybe, I'm mis-remembering. But anyway, that's an accomplishment. The KSK Rollover advice, as mentioned here, and lastly there is a bullet and sub-bullet about the Root Zone Management Evolution Study and that the request was withdrawn.

So that's there, and in the interest again of full transparency, this is not a secret, it's on the mailing list and on the correspondence part of our website. And that is it. We still have time to update these if we need to, before Wednesday. So does anyone see any reason to update or correct, or anything? You have copies in your email if you want to go through them again more closely, I guess. Peter?

PETER KOCH: So, I was wondering, I'm not sure I saw the action that we had been working on, like the KSK Rollover you mentioned?

DUANE WESSELS: It's the second to last slide, the bolded one there.

PETER KOCH: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Just for clarification, when is the RZERC meeting? I'm sorry, I'm working a bunch of schedules so I'm just trying to balance.

DUANE WESSELS: I have it at 10:30 on Wednesday, I don't know the room number.

PETER KOCH: 10:30 to 12:00, Room 127/128.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

PETER KOCH: Which collides with the DNSSEC workshop.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, we can make it short, and maybe even if nobody shows up, we can make it even shorter. Alright, any last comments about the slides or the presentation? If not, let's go back to the end of the agenda, Mario, and we'll finish it up. So, I think one lingering administrative item is the Staff have sent out emails to appointing organization contacts asking for confirmation and dates and things like that, and looking at the spreadsheet, I think we're still missing three, myself being one of them. I'll try again to talk to Mr. Kane and get him to do that. You're one, Russ, I'm one, and Howard.

MARIO ALEMAN: No, you're fine. We're missing ASO, Carlos Martinez.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, you don't have the one from SSAC yet. You don't have SSAC's yet?

MARIO ALEMAN: No, not yet. We don't have SSAC, we don't have ASO and we don't have Verisign.

RUSS MUNDY: I'll bug them again this week, they were supposed to send it after our work party.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thanks. So, let's talk about the next opportunity, well, first of all, let's talk about, should we have another meeting in a month or so? Do people want to meet? We have no official business to conduct, we could take a break, or we could meet sometime in November. Any opinions, preferences?

RUSS MUNDY: Let me suggest that we not meet again until after the first of the year and then we try to develop on the mailing list some of the issues we talked about earlier in the meeting and then target, say, I don't

remember when in the month we've been setting our regular meetings, it was like the second or third Monday, or something like that?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, this is Mario. It used to be during the third week on Mondays.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Russ you suggested to do some work on the mailing list. Were you thinking to do that in the meantime or do that work after the first of the year?

RUSS MUNDY: In the meantime, discuss the items we were talking about earlier, which are really kind of back and forth iteration kind of things, and you know, it's the time when a lot of people are doing holiday and vacation time, it's easier to respond to email, as long as we don't forget to. But yeah, try to develop the agenda based on the earlier topics.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks for that suggestion. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Actually I wanted to suggest a bit more of a relaxed agenda, because if there is no real items for discussion, then why should we meet? My suggestion to aim for Kobe, to meet face to face, and if something develops in the meantime, obviously we will discuss and then we can always set up a meeting. But if we want to set something, like pencil

out something, my suggestion is Kobe for face to face, and obviously in the meantime we will try to develop the agenda and if we need a meeting, we will meet. But otherwise I don't think we will need a telephone meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: So, I don't remember at what point you entered the meeting, but at the start we had a discussion about, should we work on some of our administrative sort of outstanding issues, like some of the problems we had with the first document. That would be the only reason that we would continue to meet, is to discuss our charter, discuss our purpose, and how we would conduct our work.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Those are peripheral actually, because normally they're documented and people have more time to elaborate, so yes, I entered the room exactly where you left off.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I would like to support Russ' suggestion, including this tentatively scheduled meeting on Monday of the third week in January, and if we two weeks in advance don't have anything to discuss there, we cancel the meeting. But I think we better have it in our calendars.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. So let's do that then. Let's get it on people's calendars sooner rather than later, Mario, and then we'll hold that for a potential January meeting, and if we need to cancel it, we can. Okay, that's it, unless there's any last minute business, we can adjourn and go about the rest of our business. Thanks everyone.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you. This meeting has been adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]