

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: One quick question, are you planning on using any video this time or just screen projection?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are having a screen projection. Are you able to see our display?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes I am.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: OK, great.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That was Howard joining.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello Howard, welcome. We also have Jim.

KAVED RANJBAR: Hello everyone this is Kaved.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, welcome back Kaved.

---

*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.*

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Duane, we only have an apology from Kim, and I believe we have the rest of the people on the line. Let us know when you'd like to start.

DUANE WESSELS: So, the only one we're maybe missing at this point is Carlos I think.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. Let's go ahead and I'll call the meeting to order and I'll ask Mario to do the formal roll call please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you Duane. Welcome everyone to our [inaudible] conference call, on Tuesday 22nd May, we have on the line Duane Wessels, Jim Reid, we have Brad Verd, Howard Eland, Kaved Ranjbar, Peter Koch, Russ Mundy, and on behalf of staff we have Steve and myself Mario doing the call management. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mario, there is somebody on the call with just a telephone number.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, I believe it is Brad.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: OK, hey Brad.

BRAD VERD: Hello, yeah, I don't have Zoom working.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Lucky you.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you Mario, so welcome back everyone to one of our regular meetings. We've been off for a few months, nothing really to do, so we're back now and have a couple of things to discuss today. We will discuss a proposal for a root zone management evolution study, and we'll discuss a board resolution about the KSK rollover, and then at the end we'll talk about future meetings. Before we get into that, I'll ask Mario to go through the action items from our previous meeting which was in December. I know those minutes have already been posted, but I'll ask Mario to go through the action items now.

MARIO ALEMAN: This is Mario, thank you Duane. I am going to read the action items actually from our last meeting in December. The first one was staff to post the minutes transcription, audio recording from 20th November 2017, and that has been already posted online. The minutes have been distributed over the mailing list. That action item is complete. The second one is for staff to work with Duane and make statements of interest available in RZERC website, that action item is also complete.

---

We have everyone listed on the website, and the last action item we have is staff to work with Duane to discuss internal archive repository in future RZERC member appointments. I believe actually the member appointments, that is a work in progress actually we're still discussing with Duane, and the internal archive with RZERC, we have just completed that action item and we can have, actually, all of our documents in the cloud. Over to you Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: OK, thanks. The December minutes have already been posted, I believe, right? We did that via email.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, that is correct. The minutes were distributed over the mailing list last January, and we provided actually a comments by February 5th, we didn't receive any comments, so we published those minutes online, you can find them on the website.

DUANE WESSELS: OK, so with regard to the action item about the appointments, that's still something for myself and staff to do. I know some of the appointments are essentially annual, so it's likely that some of those are coming up soon and if you know that you are appointed annually, you may want to have a conversation with your appointing organization about whether or not you'll be willing to continue or so on, and Mario I will take a closer look and have more for the next meeting.

---

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, so let's move onto the meat of the meeting. RZERC received... or I received an email from Ed Lewis, who works for the ICANN office of the CTO about this proposed root zone evolution management study. You should have seen this in the email on the list, the background on this is that this came out of a working group that was working on the... before the NTA or IANA transition, when that working group was discussing this topic, RZERC did not exist yet. So this came from a point of time when RZERC was not fully formed or even considered, but the idea is that after the NTA transition there should be a study to examine whether or not NTA's exit caused any problems or is anything lacking after that oversight went away. The office of the CTO has a pretty well formed document discussing the need for the study, they're asking RZERC to comment on the scope of the study, and the timing of the study. The study itself would be conducted via a third party, it would go out for RFP, be awarded to a third party, which would sort of be managed by the office of the CTO, and any recommendations from the study will likely be directed to RZERC. Since much of the focus of the study would be on the root zone management partners, or which Verisign is one, I point of largely [inaudible] myself from this discussion, I would like to open it up for discussion and input from other RZERC members on what we've received from [inaudible] on this proposed study. Jim, I see you have a hand raised.

---

JIM REID: Yeah, thanks Duane. I am not sure there's a need for this quite yet, quite frankly. It's probably premature to look about what the post NTA look like since pretty much nothing has happened, significant since then. I can see the OCTO needs for a justification for doing a study like this, I am not sure the timing of it, is it really necessary now? Maybe there's some other pressures on [inaudible] and ICANN, that this is part of the whole NTA transition arrangements that they have to have a study of this nature. But I'm not sure there's any real value in it at the moment, if it was carried out.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks Jim, I have one bit of information about the timing. So, in the proposed study documents that we have there was no timeline proposed. I think that OCTO is interested in doing this, just because they said they would, it was recommended via the transition document, but there is no proposed timeline at this point.

JIM REID: Yeah, I can understand OCTO wanting to get this particular thing done and dusted and out of the way. If that's the case, then sure, why not. I have no objection to doing the study at all, but I am not sure it is going to have any meaningful results, other than just maybe swapping some of the align problem.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. Thanks Jim. I don't remember whose hand was next. Did you see Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes it is Russ next, please.

DUANE WESSELS: OK.

RUSS MANDY: Thanks. I was one of the people from SSAC on the ICG, but this recommendation actually was one that was embedded in the CWG names proposal. It became part of the... what was referred to as the ICG integrated proposal. I agree that there was no real timeframe for it per se. I am in agreement, generally, with Jim's comments earlier that I don't know that there's that much information or activity that has necessitated, or we get a lot of results from doing a study at this point. There was one question that I had, that I had not had a chance to go explore the answer myself, because it might be out there, that was in the set of information and statistics that PTI maintains and reports to the customer standing committee. Are there indicators in any of those data points that would give any indication of information relative to seeking some of the answers that were identified in this study? My sense is I think there might be something or some, but I don't have enough knowledge myself, perhaps someone else on the call does. Thank you.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks Russ, that's a good question. I don't... my sentiment is about the same as yours. I think maybe there would be, but I don't know. I think Peter was next?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, Peter is next.

PETER KOCH: Yes, hello everyone, good evening, good morning, good something. I am not sure I fully understand the scope of this study. I did read the excerpt of the CWG output that inspired the study, but I'm wondering whether it is really narrowly focused on the three parties involved in the changes, and I think the current description could be a bit improved in that direction. It says, interviews with stakeholders, and I would assume that in this case, mostly TLD operators are stakeholders, and then mentions that the mandatory groups to interview are actually the three parties involved again. I am not really sure I understand what it is. I was also going to say what Russ already mentioned. RZERC has in its charter a task to liase or at least coordinate or cooperate with the CSC, to the best of my knowledge, while there is a report out from a CSC review on work and all the CSC reports, I am not aware of any particular issues, but that doesn't have to preempt the study, so I would not see a reason to postpone it, even though it might not be... there might not not be an immediate need, but if it's on the agenda then we might want to work on improving the scope and focus. Thank you.



---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Alright, thanks Peter. Howard, go ahead.

HOWARD ELAND:                    Yes thanks. Hi everyone. So, the point that I took notice of was in section 3 in the scope of this study. I think one reason why this might be valid now, in this day and age of, you know, constant attacks and what have you, is potentially looking that, to see that, they can see if there are holes in the process, to see if there are risks involved with the way the process is currently set up, or what have you. From a risk analysis and potential mitigation perspective, I think maybe this might be good. I don't know, when was the last time such a risk analysis was conducted, but the way that it's framed at the beginning, it sounds to me like that's other things that they are looking for. The only other thing I would notice, I actually taking a little bit of exception to the last sentence in section 3 where they say, if it's not going to be cost effective to do, to rewrite something because it's wrong, then we shouldn't do it. If risk analysis shows that there is a flaw that is significant enough to warrant a complete review of a process then I think cost should not necessarily be the thing that decides whether or not that happens. So, I have a little bit of an issue with that last statement. Not that they would even find anything, but if the study should, I don't think that should... well we'd really like to fix this process, but it's really expensive, so we're just going to leave it in there, you know, internet beware. I think that's a mistake. So, those are the only points I would say about it. As far as, should they conduct it or not, I am again, from a risk analysis perspective I think it's good, I'd be fine with them conducting this now. Those are my points. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Alright, thanks Howard. I didn't see who was next, sorry.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    We have Jim and then Russ.

JIM REID:                         I think Russ was before me.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Maybe that was an old hand, I'm not sure.

RUSS MANDY:                     It is a new hand. I wanted to respond a little bit to some of Howard's comments and some of the other earlier discussion by others that the scoping laid out isn't as tight as it might be for things of this nature, and I don't remember who, maybe it was Howard, asked or suggested that it would be good to do a risk assessment as they wasn't sure when the last one was done, and I'm sorry we don't have Kim on the call with us today, but it is my opinion that there has never been a risk assessment done on the overall root zone management process, because the last time there was a major redesign was prior to when doing risk assessment, risk analysis, had really come into [inaudible] and it was tied to the root zone automation work, which was I think was tied to or was a result of the 2012 contract between NGIA and ICANN. It wasn't really a risk analysis per se, it was, we got to figure out how to automate

---

this and make it work right. I don't perceive that that was the intent of this, at least that's my opinion based on the view that I have from being an ICG purchase, but in terms of what... is it a wise and sensible thing for the organization of ICANN to be thinking about doing. I would be generally in agreement with it, with doing such a thing, and performing a risk assessment, but I don't know that it fits exactly, this piece of work. So, that's kind of my response to Howard's thoughts in the risk assessment space. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks Russ. Jim go ahead.

JIM REID:

Thanks Duane. Thanks everybody else. I kind of agree with pretty much everything that both Russ and Howard have said, if this work has to go ahead, maybe the work has to be much more clearly scoped in terms of, is it going to be a risk assessment being done in this? So, what sort of risks are we assessing? Is it the process for generating the root zone, and transmitting that to the root servers, or is it something else, for example checking the [inaudible] of those that are making changes, saying on behalf of the TLD operator? I am not quite sure where the boundaries quite lie, and I think some clarity about the scope is needed, as Peter was talking about earlier. I would also take issue with some of the aspects of the scoping study as well. The third bullet point says security, does the process ensure the intended root changes follow ICANN policies. That seems to be more of a stability thing rather than a security issue. If we are talking about security, we're talking about

---

things like authenticating the requests and making sure there's no potential for bad data to be injected into the system somehow, or some definition of bad data. So, I'm not quite sure what they meant by security here, and maybe the security needs to be teased out separately to the issue about the process follows ICANN policies, that doesn't seem to be a security consideration, per se. But onto the actual thing later on, Howard is quite right to say that, if the study recommends a radical redesign of the system, that's not going to be acceptable. I think that's quite wrong, and also the previous sentence in that paragraph says, recommended changes must be evolutionary in nature. Well again, that's for whoever does the study to decide, whether evolutionary changes, or revolutionary changes are required, and that's not something that should be predetermined in either the scope of the study, or in the remit for whoever is actually going to carry out. I am little bit concerned about that too, if the study goes ahead. Are we just doing something that's going through the emotions, when the outcome has already been predetermined by the people who have commissioned the study. That gives me a little bit of a cause for concern.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks Jim, Peter you are next. Let me respond to something that Jim just said about the evolutionary. I think the reason that's in there because I think that OCTO is undertaking a separate study that's focusing on revolutionary nature, I think that's why that is in there, but we can get clarification on that, for sure.

---

JIM REID: Thanks Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. So, while we're talking about the scope. Going back to the CWG recommendation, there is a lot of talk about unauthorized process changes, and the likes. So while we haven't seen them, there is no immediate trigger, it is of course prudent to make a risk assessment and extend the risk assessment to those scenarios. However, I do not see that reflected, very much, in the scope of this study. In essence, the security bullet point, and we talk about security or stability, but the security point only talks about the intended root zone changes, and doesn't mention unintended or unauthorized changes at all. To add what Howard and Jim said, if you look at the section 3, there's only like three bullet items and a sentence about the scope and the rest already goes into constraining the solution space, so there is kind of an imbalance, that I would agree, needs to be addressed and if there's a second study underway then it would be good to know the whole picture of studies that is to be scheduled to assess what this particular study might do, or how we could improve the scoping or the output. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. Jim go ahead.

---

JIM REID: Thanks Duane. It's just to build on what Peter just said. I mean if there is this other study that you mentioned Duane, it would be good to see where the boundaries between the study we are discussing now and this hypothetical other study, where the boundaries between the two. If there's a point to doing this particular study, and the revolutionary study is the one that's going to get more emphasis or more support inside ICANN, what's the point?

DUANE WESSELS: I think the thing we need to decide next is, how do we want to respond to this request. It sounds like we have some sort of mild consensus at this point that, you know, there's not necessarily opposition to this, we're not sure that it's necessary at this point in time. If it were to go forward, RZERC would like to see the clarification of the scope. Do we want to send a response back to OCTO saying that? Or, do we want to propose something more specific regarding the scoping? Go ahead Peter.

PETER KOCH: That was my micro second earlier, yes. I would try to ask for clarification. While I do agree that the recommendation from 2016 mentions such a study, it is prudent to, at some point in time pick it up and actually conduct it. However, the scoping and some of the details aren't clear enough and the OCTO team, or whoever came up with this text had some things in mind that they should have a chance to elaborate on, to enable us and the rest of the community to comment a bit more in depth.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. Thanks. Jim.

JIM REID: Thanks Duane. I think that something that you proposed just a few moments ago Duane, is fine as far as I am concerned. Yes, it would be nice to have a bit more clarity on the scope and the stakeholders and all the rest of it. But, I am also wondering what kind of role RZERC should have in this whole thing. I mean, are they needing us to veto the proposal or change it in some way, or are we asked to see if everything is a good idea or not. I am really not sure why we've been asked to discuss this, what kind of input we can have into the study, or what difference are we going to make. If ICANN or OCTO has managed to go ahead and do this kind of study, they're going to do it regardless of whether we say it's a good idea or not.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I am not totally sure about that. I think that OCTO will value RZERCs input. I think we can steer it, sort of as much as we're willing to, but this is all new and it has never happened before, so, there's certainly some uncertainty there. But, in my conversations with Ed Lewis from OCTO team, he was very keen to have our input. I don't think... like I said at the start, I don't think that, you know, we're being asked to drive the study other than to provide this initial input and I think the recommendations would be directed towards RZERC. Howard, go ahead.

HOWARDS ELAND:

Yes. So, if... I think, I am kind of stuck on Jim's point of, I understand they want input, but input in what way? Is it yes, this looks great or not. Is it, yes you should do it, no we shouldn't do it. Or, is it, given the texts that we have, here's how we think you can improve this report, or how we think this report ought to be conducted because, either this document is too generic, or it is not granular enough to really to be substantial enough to make a comment. So, maybe some questions come back. I do think if this is our one... if we only have one shot at the whale here, I think it [inaudible] at least what I'm hearing from other folks who say, if you wanted to do some kind of risk assessment, do a risk assessment. Don't, as Peter was saying, don't constrain it out of the gate, don't just let the information take you where it's going to take you, do a full risk assessment. Don't do kind of a, half shoddy report that checks the box.

DUANE WESSELS:

OK. I don't think we necessarily have one shot, I think we can iterate back and forth on this, but that's a good question that we need to find out the answer to.

JIM REID:

Duane, sorry to interrupt for a sec. I think the questioning would be, what would we mean and meant by one shot. I took that to mean as this could be like a one time study that might never be repeated, rather than how we deal with this particular issue in front of us right now.



---

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. When he said one shot, I interpreted it as, do we get one chance to provide our input to the study. I think we'll have back and forth.

JIM REID: Yeah but my question would then be, is this a once in a lifetime study or not, in that sense it's a one shot thing, if we don't get this right, we are never going to revisit this stuff until 10, 20, 50 years from now.

DUANE WESSELS: That doesn't sound likely to me. I think that really, the impetus for this is this old recommendation that directed ICANN to perform this study, so they want to do it, they want to check that box. I don't think that precludes any future studies which could be initiated by RZERC, or by again OCTO, or somebody else.

JIM REID: OK.

DUANE WESSELS: We should try to wrap this up as we have other things to talk about, but I think Russ was next and then Peter.

RUSS MANDY: Sorry, I got the mute here. Just to remind folks again where RZERC came from, it has been viewed from a lot of people, conceptually, as the

---

replacement for NTIA, and the whole root zone management process structure, and so, when ICANN was asked to look at doing this study. At least in my view, the original intent was that the whoever does the study, it was not intended to be a big full on risk assessment, I don't think it was intended to be a big massive effort to identify shortnesses, and so forth, in the whole overall process. Now, as I said earlier, I am not at all opposed to doing such a thing and I have had conversations with board members about things like that, because they were raising the question about what are the critical systems that ICANN has, and so forth. I don't think study was to do this, I think it... and the reason that we're being asked by ICANN, I believe, is that we would be in some manner, a part of the study because since nobody really know for sure, what NTIAs role and job was, nobody really knows for sure what the RZERC job is, and somebody said we need to make sure that there aren't any problems when we replace this organization called NTIA with an organization called RZERC, which didn't even have a name when the study was put out. I think it should be very constrained, I think, in terms of what gets examined here. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Peter, you get the last word.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you. I was going to support the perception that this is entering a dialogue, rather than having one shot at a response and then the thing is going its way. First of all, for a couple of formalities in our charter, and so on and so forth, because actually the evolution hasn't even taken

---

place. So I would consider this a very early warning by ICANN staff, or the OCTO team in particular, and then we could always invoke ourselves comment on whatever we see happening. So, instead I suggest actually, however we communicate back, we send the subliminal or explicit message that we understand that this is kind of a dialogue going on, it doesn't have to be very long, but as long as we don't have clarity it is unclear what is really asked of us, and then we go back [inaudible]. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks Peter. So, it sounds to me like the next step for us it to write up our thoughts and send them back to the OCTO team, I am wondering if anyone would be willing to volunteer to help draft some words? If not, I can certainly do that, but again I want to sort of distance myself as much as I can from this, being a little bit of a conflicted party. Is anyone willing to help draft a response?

MARIO ALEMAN:

Duane, this is Mario. I will also be sharing the note from this meeting, just after we finish, since I'm taking these down. So [inaudible] for anyone.

DUANE WESSELS:

OK. Russ?

---

RUSS MANDY: I don't want to take the lead on first cut, but I see Howard's hand also up, I am happy to work this with somebody. I have too many ideas already in my head from ICG days, I wouldn't want to let that influence it too much.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thanks Russ. Howard are you also volunteering a little bit?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, unlike Russ, I am completely uncluttered in my brain space. I will be happy to help. The minutes will help immensely though.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. Yeah. Alright, I think Peter in the chat also offered to help. Mario, if you can take note of that and then work with these folks to draft a response, that will be great.

MARIO ALEMAN: Absolutely, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Howard, your hand is still up. Is that leftover, or something new?

HOWARD ELAND: Sorry that was an old hand.

---

DUANE WESSELS: No problem. I am going to close out this topic and then I'm going to hand it over to Kaved to talk about the board resolution on the KSK rollover.

KAVED RANJBAR: OK, hello everyone. Basically, not much to say. I sent also the link to the full resolution. The board is... there is going to be a resolution, in the board meeting before the KSK rollover, but before advising the org to basically go ahead with the rollover. The org has already published the plans, the board before advising the org to basically go ahead with those plans, wanted to get advice from the advisory board, is that normally advise the board on root zone and security and stability matters, which is basically RZERC, RSSAC, and SSAC. So, basically the board has sent that request to RZERC, it's completely no remit to say whatever we want to say. You can say we don't find it relevant, or [inaudible] engaged, or if we have any technical input or anything, I don't know how the form I will leave to the group, and to Duane, but if you have input, you can also, you have a chance to bring it back to the board. The only thing to mention here is, at least if we want them to stick to the published plan, we need to give them the feedback before 10th August, because then there is time needed for OCTO to revise it, send it to the board, the board needs to have it for two weeks, then in September they can actually vote and advise the board to do the rollover on October 11th. If you really want to give advice but still stay with the current timing, you should do it before 10th August, that's all I have.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you very much Kaved for that. Russ, I see you have a hand raised, go ahead.

RUSS MANDY: Yeah thanks Duane. I wanted to let folks know that the SSAC will be, has started a work party to decide what, if anything, they want to advice on, on the same resolution. So, as things from past become available, I am happy to share what I can with RZERC. I have not had a chance to talk to Brad. I don't know if RSAC is going to undertake to try to put something together in terms of a response or not, so...

BRAD VERD: Discussions are still underway in RSSAC.

RUSS MANDY: OK. Thanks Brad. So, anyway I will provide what makes sense or what I can from SSAC. Our objective in SSAC is to, at least have [inaudible] scoping of what kind of response we want to make, by the time of the meeting in Panama City, so in a little over a month from now, hopefully, I'll at least have something that I can provide to RZERC in terms of the general discussions base that SSAC is looking at. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks very much Russ. Peter go ahead.

---

PETER KOCH: Thank you. I was just sharing the observation that while the rationale for the board resolution explicitly mentions RSSAC and SSAC not having commented by now, which was addressed by the previous speakers. RZERC is not mentioned in the rationale at all, so again I'm not completely sure what is asked of us, especially given that one of the tasks of RZERC would be, or would have been, mind the past tense then, to make sure that all parties involved or concerned have actually had a chance to raise their voice, which most likely is the case in this case.

KAVED RANJBAR: Peter, just a [inaudible] about not being mentioned in the rationale, I can assure you that that's basically an administrative issue. Because I remember how this was added, and I know exactly what happened here. This is something that I will bring back to the board ops, but what would have been added is not different, because basically this is copy paste from charters from each one of these, so the idea in which simply was the board, part of this group they should ask, and we also discussed we might get... we don't have any operation here, so no advice, which is fine with the board. [inaudible] organization in [inaudible] recommended to the board to go with the three organizations, RZERC, RSSAC, and SSAC.

PETER KOCH: OK Kaved, thank you for the clarification.

DUANE WESSELS: Jim go ahead.

JIM REID: Thanks Duane. Kaved, does that mean the board would be more comfortable if RZERC gave some kind of formal response back?

KAVED RANJBAR: I don't think I understood the question, was the board... I think the board expects a response, but whatever the response, we are comfortable with, is [inaudible] accept I guess.

JIM REID: OK, but what I mean is, if RZERC says nothing, is the board going to be concerned about that? Or, is the board looking for RZERC to give them some kind of statement which would give them a warm feeling?

KAVED RANJBAR: Actually, I think I really don't know [inaudible], I guess we have to ask Steve or Mario, because the board has formally not asked RZERC for a response. I think RZERC has to respond, I don't think you can just say nothing, even if you don't want to say anything, I think you should document that and say, we don't want to respond to this request. I think we are obliged to provide some answer to any request, and the reason is just for completeness, I mean, for the [inaudible] follow, I guess basically the same plan from last year, is just now additional measurements set in place, and the board thought before telling org, just discovering another basically, or going through another measure to make sure that everyone who actually wanted a chance, or needed a chance to comment, has a chance to comment as this is something

---



---

which obviously [inaudible] everything. So, that's why this was also proposed.

DUANE WESSELS: Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MANDY: Thanks Duane. I believe that because of the way that this was written and it explicitly sent to RZERC, and the wording of the resolution itself, RZERC must respond with something, and a response to the board could be that RZERC has no advice to offer beyond well just everything looks fine. Or it could be that, we want to provide advice in one space or another, but the issue as Kaved was saying is to make sure that all of the potentially impacted parties from the KSK rollover, have an opportunity to provide an input to the board on whether or not to proceed. Obviously the make up of SSAC and the make up of RSSAC is different than the makeup of RZERC. So this is an opportunity for the membership of RZERC to have RZERC speak as an entity itself, even if it's, we have no further advice. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks, so, I went through all of the different documents that ICANN has grouped into the one spot there. I do actually, I am not going to iterate what it is here, because I don't want to bring that into a rat hole,

---

or make it into an action item or anything, but I do see some areas where things could be improved, or things could be optimized or clarified. But I don't necessarily know if we want to take that on or not. I mean, I think if we're going to look at this, we should really look at it and not just give it a glancing blow. But, I don't know... it sounds like we have to do something, and if we're going to do something, I think we should pour our hearts into it and see if there's anything. I know for a lot of folks, this is, I'd say not the first time they've looked at this. But, maybe with some fresh RZERC hats on, maybe we can find some ways to either improve it, or at least improve the documentation or what have you.

DUANE WESSELS:

OK thank you Howard. I've been trying to sort of, think about what, you know, what our choices are in terms of how we could respond. One choice is we could say, you know, thank you for asking us but we have no further advice on this, so basically opting out politely. We could say, we support proceeding with the rollover as documented, as described. We could say we support proceeding with the rollover with some caveat's, maybe as Howard is saying, some better documentation, or some better processes, or maybe a different time. Or, we could say, we don't support proceeding with the rollover at this time. So I see sort of four options. Does anyone else see different options, or not like any of those as possibilities? Peter.

---

PETER KOCH: Yes, I think we have at least one other option which is looking at the process and then find, or share what we see in terms of participation. It's obvious that the whole consultations did not result in many voices being raised, that is...

DUANE WESSELS: Do you mean the public comment?

PETER KOCH: Yes exactly. This is not necessarily anybody's fault, except that... but still it could indicate some white spots on the landscape, so to speak, in terms of do we reach our stakeholders. Then this whole question of, policy making on the fly and so on and so forth. I am not completely convinced that RZERCs role is making yet another assessment, especially given that we have an SSAC and an RSSAC representative on the team. My understanding of the charter is that one of our rules is making sure that everybody had their chance to speak. That would indicate in the direction of maybe what would could be done to improve that situation. Again, no blame on anybody.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thank you Peter. Howard go ahead.

HOWARD ELAND: I almost want to channel my inner Jim here and say, what exactly was the ask? [inaudible] it's not thoroughly clear to me, you know, is it just... are they looking for the blessing? Are they looking, here's how, if we

---

were doing it, here's how we'd improve it? Is it, does RZERC feel that the community has had an adequate say, or are there other areas, as Peter mentioned, are there other constituents that they should make sure that they are doing active reach out to, that they currently haven't? Or what have you. I'm not exactly sure what the ask is, but... Mario, can you scroll up on the document a little bit to the top of this. So, a little bit further.

JIM REID: Stop there.

HOWARD ELAND: So, this is... basically these three short paragraphs are the ask, and really it's the last one. It's a very open ended question for advice on this updated plan document. That's it. I read this obviously, before we start, but it was, again to me it was, what would you like us to advise you on? I mean, I guess that's where I'm coming from. There's a lot... there seems to be a lot of different paths we could walk down.

DUANE WESSELS: Kaved, go ahead.

KAVED RANJBAR: Yeah, so to [inaudible], I think, so first of all thank you for feedback, this is something I can bring back to the board, so when they write a solution. This is actually good feedback, so make sure they will hear next time. This one is specifically advice on this plane to tune that, as I

---

mentioned in September, the board is basically planning to ask ICANN organization to go ahead with that plan and implement. So basically, [inaudible]. Board is asking all of these two bodies, before making that, asking org to do that, is there anything they should consider or RZERC and RSSAC and [inaudible], all the record considerations are there. That's basically the ask.

DUANE WESSELS: OK, thanks Kaved. Jim, go ahead.

JIM REID: Two quick points, my gut feel is, we should probably send a response saying we have no advice to give. [inaudible] concerns that Howard based a moment ago, but on that particular thing, the second point that we've just asked Kaved is, did you make those concerns knowing through the ICANNs public comment period? And if not, why raise them now?

DUANE WESSELS: Howard, I think that was a question for you. I don't know if you want to answer or not, but I think Jim was asking a question of you.

HOWARD ELAND: Oh. Sure, I mean one of the things I don't want to do is, you know, if folks have said, alright, what does everyone think, community wise? And, apparently anybody says anything, and don't think the right thing to do is circle back and say, does anybody really really have anything to

---

say. I wasn't suggesting that we try and do something like that. My question is more along the lines of the... this was derived from Peter's comment about charter and such, and about making sure everyone is adequately represented and what have you. If we feel that that is the case, then I think Jim is exactly right that the answer is, nope we're good. If not, if we feel it's that or we feel like we need to make some comments of, we feel that there's an area of clarification or improvement here or there, obviously this is our one chance to do it, because you know, it sounds like we have until August and then we're done. Does that answer your questions Jim, I am sure it did?

JIM REID:

I hope so, yeah thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

So, let me ask this. Does anyone feel like we need to discuss this before our next meeting which would take place in about a month. We have this August 10th deadline, which gives us about two more meetings to come to consensus on this. Should we sort of table this until our next meeting, or do we need to work on it before then? Peter.

PETER KOCH:

I think we should not really drop the ball. I am not convinced that, sorry, nothing to say, is the correct response, even though it might be formally acceptable. I would suggest that we work on this, on the mailing list, and then in the next call see how far we got and if we didn't make any progress in any direction or cannot agree, we may need to schedule

---

another meeting. I guess the mailing list is under utilized at the moment and we could converge there better than waiting for the next meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: OK. That's good input, thanks Peter. So, I'll plan to have this discussion on the mailing list and be a little... for the next meeting we'll have some more preparation. Russ, go ahead, quickly.

RUSS MANDY: Yeah, I suggest also that RZERC members that have a need for coordination with their sending bodies, undertake to make sure that the sending bodies know that RZERC has been asked this question, and so if the sending bodies want to provide any input, we can start collecting that data also.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, very good point. Thank you Russ. Let's close out this topic and spend our last few minutes talking about our next meetings. As everyone knows ICANN 62 in Panama is coming up next month, at the end of June. I've requested ICANN staff to reserve us a meeting slot, in case we would like to meet. I think it would be helpful to know who would be there in person, and who would not. Mario, can you conduct a quick roll call on that? Or maybe you can type in chat, or something?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, absolutely. Just let us know if anyone will be participating. We have a tight agenda, actually, because it is actually a policy meeting and so

---

we'd like to schedule to see actually when people arrive and when people leave, just to coordinate and try a reservation for a meeting room. So maybe we perhaps, I don't know to start with, Brad and Jim and Carlos, to see, first three.

DUANE WESSELS:

I think people are doing it in the chat. I'll coordinate with Brad, since he is not on the chat. We've got Carlos [inaudible]. It sounds like a lot of us will be there. Howard won't be there. Quickly next question related to Panama is, we should decide if our meeting in Panama would be a regular meeting, which is to say just like this. Closed to the public but the transcripts are available. Or should it be a fully open public meeting. Opinions? Peter.

PETER KOCH:

So maybe, it is hard to tell. We need a working session for one of the responses, I'm not sure we want to confuse the public so to speak, or whether that public meeting can actually be useful work session, I am not convinced. But then again, we don't know whether we need that working session.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah. Jim.

JIM REID:

I agree with Peter, I am not sure we need a working session, but we'll see what happens after the discussion on the list. I am also sceptical



---

about the need for a public session in Panama, it is not so long ago that we had a public session so, if we're planning to do this once a year, maybe the meeting towards the end of the year in Barcelona might be more appropriate if we feel the need for a personal meeting, and I would be inclined to not make a decision about having a public meeting for Panama, but if the group feels that's appropriate, then fair enough, I'll go with the flow.

DUANE WESSELS:

OK. Thanks Jim. We're going a little bit over so I'm going to skip to the last item which is, scheduling our next meeting. We tentatively agreed to meet, I think it's the third Tuesday of every month, which would put us at June, or third Monday of every month, which would put us at June 18th. Which is a week before Panama. Would folks like to meet a week before Panama, or just postpone and meet in Panama instead? Alright, I am hearing no opinions, so I'll suggest to... Russ, do you have an opinion, quickly?

RUSS MANDY:

We are that close to Panama, I think unless something comes up, as we can always schedule a telecom, if we need it. I'd say let's just plan on meeting in Panama.

DUANE WESSELS:

OK. Thanks. So we will tentatively plan on that. We have some work that we'll take to the list and our next regular meeting sounds like will be face-to-face in Panama for most of us. Is there any last minute

---

business that anyone has to discuss before we wrap up? Alright, doesn't sound like it. Thanks everyone for joining us today and we'll see you soon.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**