
MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the RZERC teleconference call on 17 July 2017 at 17:40 hours local time in Prague. We have on the call Duane Wessels, Kim Davies, Kaved Ranjbar, Brad Verd, and Peter Koch. We have apologies from Carlos Martinez, Jim Reid, and Russ Mundy. We have Howard Eland as absent, and on behalf of the Staff – Steve Sheng, and Mario Aleman, myself – doing the call management. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name and speak clearly, not only for our transcription, but also for audio quality. With this, I would like to turn it back to you, Duane, and we can now begin the call.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Mario. So, the first order of business on the agenda is to review the Action Items from our previous meeting. So, Mario, do you have those Action Items?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, hi, Duane. This is Mario for the record. On the Action Items, we have the following, and they have all been completed by now. And the first one is the Staff to share a clean-version copy of the Latest Procedures document with Duane Wessels. The second one is the Staff to discuss the latest edits of the Procedures with Duane Wessels, as well. And the last one is the Staff to open a Doodle poll for the next RZERC meeting on July 17, 2017. As I mentioned before, they have all been completed, and now I turn it back over to you. Thank you.

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.

the groups that have delegates to RZERC, so there may be some differences there. If I remember correctly, Russ said he was okay with this text.

Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. Can you hear me?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, we can hear you well.

PETER KOCH: That seems to work. Thank you. So, I had a conversation with Russ about this issue, I believe, in – where? – Johannesburg, and my concern there before that – and partly still is – was that with this remark in the Procedures document, we are trying to address an issue that is outside-facing, and it's not really an RZERC internal procedure. It is something that would set the RZERC output in relation to other groups' output. So, we had a longer discussion, and our homework that we both did was come up with a one-sentence suggestion to converge on how we could express this in a way that is appropriate for a Procedures document, so for an internal document. I must say that, after we sent the mutual sentences across, we probably both dropped the ball, so from my perspective, the discussion between Russ and myself stalled a bit – and I take blame for that, of course – but there was, at this very point – because really, a Procedures document should just do internal things.

DUANE WESSELS: I sort of see your point about internal versus external, but on the other hand, I guess I feel a little bit that this paragraph is useful as advice to ourselves, as a reminder that RZERC, as a whole, doesn't have to come to full consensus, because one of us, as a delegate, may have to disagree with RZERC, as a whole. That's sort of my take on why this is in the Procedures document, I guess.

KAVED RANJBAR: That can also be added in our consensus [inaudible] how we define the consensus, because, for example, in some other groups, they have [inaudible] which people are delegates [inaudible] as an example, they say that if there is not full consensus, the report will include that. So, if there is a minority, even one person is against, that can be included in the report. Then, it will be a [inaudible] issue.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, we do have something like that in the Consensus section.

KAVED RANJBAR: Yeah, so I think that's good enough.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Kaved, your point is that this is covered in the Consensus section and it doesn't really need to be in the introduction?

KAVED RANJBAR: Yes. I really need to check the language again, but I think that that's covered. I had – since Peter is online – I had a short chat with Peter, also, a few days ago when I met him. So, one of the things which I think is important is to understand that, based on the text, we are delegates to RZERC, which means we are representing our constituencies. So, I'm not sure if everybody – if that's clear for everyone. So, maybe we need to clarify – which means that whatever positions people present here – not [inaudible] but if there is a real issue, they are representing their constituents, not their own [inaudible]. If, for example, Peter is saying something that [inaudible] CCNSO's position, which I think – yeah, it's not clear here, but the use of the word “delegates” implies that [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. [CROSSTALK] Go ahead, Peter. Go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Sorry – where is the word “delegate”? I'm looking at the Adobe Connect here, and I think that's the second page – top of the second page –

DUANE WESSELS: It's taken from the charter – in the composition, it says “the Chair or Delegate of the SSAC,” “the Chair or Delegate of RSSAC.”

PETER KOCH: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Okay. Oh, yes, there, now. It's – okay. Yeah, sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, we have input on that. Let's scroll down to the section on meetings. And – this was a comment from Jim Reid about how this section was sort of unnecessarily long and complicated, and could be simplified. So, I did attempt to simplify that and shortened the sections that describe the various types of meetings, sort of moved text around to say how the meetings can be called. Currently, what I have in the document says that regular and executive meetings may be called with 14 days' advance notice. I thought that 14 days was too short for a public meeting, so it says, I think, 30 days. Yeah. 30 days for a public meeting, which is assumed to be like a face-to-face at an ICANN meeting. I hope that this satisfies Jim's concern, but happy to take your input in Jim's absence, I guess.

PETER KOCH: Just a quick thought, and perhaps this is something I can ask Steve or Mario to do. Just checking that 30 days aligns with how early scheduling will be done for public ICANN meetings. I'd hate to say that and then find out that ICANN will only publish its schedule with less notice than that because of [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: I'll check that.

DUANE WESSELS: Did you hear that okay?

STEVE SHENG: I'll check that, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

Okay, so the next change is in Section 3.3, which is about meetings and transcripts. And again, I felt this could be simplified. I forget if Jim made this comment also – I think, previously, under each type of meeting, it said, "This meeting will be transcribed," and then it repeated later, "This meeting will be transcribed," so this was just moved into a new section and sort of consolidated. I apologize – a lot of these changes are just formatting changes – no real content change.

PETER KOCH: Duane?

Yes, Peter?

PETER KOCH: So, this is 3.3 – just I'm making sure I'm on the right page. Right?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Okay. So, the second bulleted item – “The Committee may, by consensus decision, choose to not publish confidential discussions or sensitive topics during separate executive sessions.” A verb seems to be missing there – like “sensitive topics discussed during separate sessions,” because the decision isn’t necessarily in an executive session.

DUANE WESSELS: So, I didn’t exactly – I know which section you’re looking at, but I didn’t exactly follow, so you can either – I guess – try to explain it again, or if you want to just send new text, that’s fine with me, too.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I was trying to make sure I understand what the gist of the message is, here. So, the Committee should be able to say that for a confidential topic or something that we discussed during an executive session, we reserve the right not to publish. The text, as it stands, reads that the Committee may decide not to publish it *during* that session. We mean to – not publish – to withhold as a *result* of the session, right?

DUANE WESSELS: I see what you’re saying. I can fix that.

PETER KOCH: Okay, cool.

– was the “result/content of the session,” sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I think the next real substantial change is – oh, let’s see – probably Section 5.4. I assume you can see these edits, here. I think this was a suggestion from Jim – I think he provided this wording about reaching consensus regarding the initial report. I think this is fine. Peter, any comments about that that come to mind?

PETER KOCH: Sorry, I was muted. No major things, I believe. I’m just wondering, in the final paragraph – “to the requesting body, the ICANN Board, and posted on the Committee’s website” – the letter is okay – but is there any other requesting body except the ICANN Board?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, the charter says that proposals may be brought to RZERC by any of its constituent members.

PETER KOCH: Okay, yeah. Okay, fine. But that’s not a body. Anyway, I guess the polishing can be done later.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

PETER KOCH: If you mark that in some color for clarification –

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I've noted it.

PETER KOCH: Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: So, let's scroll down to the Conflict of Interest section, and I think here, it looks like there's maybe a lot of changes – you remember previously this was in an appendix, and I moved it into the main body and tried to make it quite a bit shorter. Yeah, so that appendix is gone, and you can read what it says now about the conflict of interest.

I feel like there still may be some cleanup to do in this text because it uses the phrases “conflict of interest” and “disclosure of interest” a little bit interchangeably, but that's probably easy to solve. Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I was stumbling across the same – has this already passed ICANN Legal, or is the idea to do that with the final output?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't think anyone has proposed – I haven't heard the idea to run this past ICANN Legal, I guess. Is that standard procedure, do you think, for a Procedures document?

PETER KOCH: That, I don't really know. I was just wondering, this whole conflict of interest thing probably needs, say, lawyers' in addition to engineers' eyes, to nail it down correctly.

UNKNOWN: I think the question is whether this Committee wants ICANN Counsel opinion on it. I think there's a requirement for that, but if they can provide useful advice that we can consider – I'm sure one of the Staff could do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I guess. I don't know. I've never heard of it before. So, maybe we can – maybe I'll follow up with Steve and Mario about their ideas.

UNKNOWN: Well, does anybody believe that this needs ICANN Legal to review?

UNKNOWN: Needs? No. [CROSSTALK] lawyers –

PETER KOCH: I think, too, the wording – like, "statement of interest," "conflict of interest," "declaration of interest" – might sound very similar to us, but it's probably as far apart as IPv4 and IPv6, in engineering terms. That's one of my concerns. The other is that the requirements are – compared to what the GNSO, for example, does – seem to be a bit excessive to me, as in the stock ownership and the rest of them.

DUANE WESSELS: So, the charter uses the phrase “conflict of interest” – I think maybe “disclosure of interest” – maybe you could remind me, Steve. I think you copied this text from maybe somewhere else. Did this come from a different Procedures document where they talked about disclosure? Is that why we sort of have this difference?

STEVE SHENG: That’s right. So, the ICANN standard is “disclosure of interest.” And this text was originally from the SSAC Operational Procedure, which was heavily borrowed from the GNSO Procedure, but abbreviated version. So, that’s where the text comes from.

DUANE WESSELS: So, we find ourselves in an awkward position, because the charter says – uses one phrase, but the standard within ICANN is some other phrase. But – I don’t know. I’m not sure how much to worry about that.

STEVE SHENG: Do we need that much detail [inaudible]?

DUANE WESSELS: I think we get to choose how much detail to put here, and I’d be happy to –

STEVE SHENG: [inaudible] objected to some of the level of detail –

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Peter, would you like to –

STEVE SHENG: [inaudible] we believe it should be.

DUANE WESSELS: – would you like to read this later and suggest edits to this section?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I can do that. I guess that would be an Action Item in the minutes somewhere, so I get a nudge?

STEVE SHENG: Yes. We will assign all the Action Items to you, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thank you so much. Not! I've made a note, thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, as I said before, I still wish that Jim could've been here, because I think he has – well, I know he has strong opinions about this. And Jim's opinions are sometimes at odds with Peter's opinions, so I would still like to email the both of you the current copy of the

documents, and identify places where either of you feel that it needs changing, and then ask you to come to agreement, maybe before our next call. Does that sound reasonable, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Sorry, I was muted again. Yes, sounds reasonable. Will do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. So, I think, Mario, we can close this document from the Adobe Connect and probably go back to the agenda.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hi, Duane. Yes, we're moving back to the agenda. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: So, next section on the agenda is Any Other Business, and the only other business I'm aware of is to agree to the date of the next meeting. By default, it would be August 21, and on my calendar, that's a very good date. Does anyone have any reasons why we should not meet on October 21?

UNKNOWN: August.

DUANE WESSELS: August 21, sorry. I see in the chat that Peter says it's good for him. So, let's proceed with that, and I'll ask Steve and Mario to make sure that

it's clear in the minutes, and that we get this date in front of the others who were not able to be on the call today, so they know. And with that, I believe we can adjourn until next time. Yes? Okay?

UNKNOWN: Thank you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, hi, Duane. This is Mario, for the record. I would like to add something else to the "any other business" – that I actually forgot to mention that we can't approve the minutes because we haven't shared them with you yet. It actually happens that the audio quality was inaudible, and we're basically rebuilding the minutes from the transcript. So, we'll be sending them shortly by tomorrow or in two days, so that you can just properly approve them.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. You will send them out to the list – to everybody. Is that right? Or are you going to –

MARIO ALEMAN: That's right, yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Very good. Okay, see you guys later. Thanks a lot.

UNKNOWN: [inaudible]

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, everyone. This meeting has been adjourned, and I would like to remind to please disconnect all remaining lines. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]