
STEVE SHENG: I started the recording. Let's start this meeting. Good day, everyone. Today is August 13th at 16:00 UTC. We will have an RZERC teleconference talking about the ICANN study. So far, we have Duane, Kim, Russ, Peter, Kaveh, Jim joining us, with Mario and myself. Did I miss anyone? We have not heard from Brad. Who else are we missing? Howard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Blanking on his name. Our ASO rep.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Carlos Martinez.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Carlos, thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. With that, Duane, I'll hand it over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Steve. I'll quickly review the agenda. It was there on the Adobe Connect screen for a while, but it looks like it was being reentered maybe. I'm not sure. Essentially, we have two items on the agenda other than the usual review of the minutes. We will talk about the proposed root zone management evolution study. For that, Ed Lewis

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.

has joined us as a guest today. We'll talk briefly about our response to the KSK rollover which has been submitted. That's basically it. Does anyone else have something they'd like to add to the agenda before we get started? It doesn't sound like it.

So, let's start with the administrative section or let's start with the action items from the previous meeting. Mario, are you prepared to do that or would you like someone else to handle that today?

MARIO ALEMAN:

Yes. I have them with me. This is Mario. Hi, everyone. For the action items that we have for this call, the first one was to staff to publish the minutes, transcript, and audio recording from the 25th of June 22 teleconference. The second one, Duane to share a final draft version of the RZERC response on the mailing list. Next, staff to invite the OCTO team for the next RZERC teleconference call. [inaudible] the root zone management to [post the study]. The final action item that we have is Mario to send a Doodle poll for the selection of the next teleconference call. All of these action items have been completed. Over to you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thank you, Mario. Mario's e-mail, he sent out minutes for review from the last meeting. I sent him one small typo correction. Hopefully, everyone else had a chance to look at the minutes. Does anyone have any comments or concerns about the minutes from our previous meeting? It doesn't sound like it. So, we'll [inaudible] the minutes as approved and I'll ask Mario and staff to publish those at their convenience. In the chatroom, there is some discussion about some

strange sounds on the audio. I don't hear it. I'm assuming it's okay to proceed. I'm just waiting to see what's being typed in the chat. Steve or Mario, do you have any suggestions for the audio quality? Should we ask folks to reconnect or should we proceed? What do you think?

STEVE SHENG: I think, if people can, please dial in with the conference bridge. We can try to provide – there are some local numbers, I think. Let me see. Let me just quickly double check that.

MARIO ALEMAN: Often it's best to dial in to the phone bridge. The Adobe Connect has been having some technical issues lately. So, if you're feeling some audio noise [inaudible] through the AC – I have no audio issues on my phone.

STEVE SHENG: Can you hear it now? Can you acknowledge that and let me know you're on? Peter, can you hear us? Kaveh?

PETER KOCH: I am on Adobe. I can hear you. I just have this occurring sound, but I think I can live with it. I tried to dial in, nonetheless.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, thanks. I can hear you perfectly. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah, I'm here.

STEVE SHENG: That's Kim, right? Jim Reid, can you hear us? Who has just joined us?

ED LEWIS: This is Ed. I'm on the phone now. Can you hear? I'm on the phone.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ just joined the phone line. I'm trying to disconnect the audio from Adobe at this point.

STEVE SHENG: Give me a minute. Let me work with Jim to get him to the phone bridge. Who has just joined?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter again.

STEVE SHENG: Hello, Peter. Let's give it a minute for Jim to join. Hello?

JIM REID: Can I be heard now?

STEVE SHENG: I can hear you, Jim.

JIM REID: I'm on the phone, disconnected from the Adobe on speaker setup.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Are we ready to proceed, Steve, do you think?

STEVE SHENG: I think so.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Let's proceed with agenda item number four. I'll just talk briefly about this. We submitted our response to the board regarding the KSK rollover. I assume everyone read the messages on the list. Thank you, everyone, for making that happen. Also, on the list, I did suggest that we have at one of our future meetings – not this meeting, but probably in our September meeting, let's have a longer discussion about that, sort of a debrief about how the process went and maybe if we need to consider any changes to our processes for these sorts of work items.

So, I'd like everyone to please think about that. If you have suggestions or feedback on how the process works or didn't work, please have those ready for our next meeting and we'll be able to devote some quality time to that. For today, I want to spend most of our time talking about the next item on the agenda.

Having said that, I guess I'll open the floor for brief comments, but really I'd like to save the substantial comments until our next meeting. It doesn't look like we have any at this time, so thank you for that.

We'll move on to number five on the agenda, which is the response that we're going to give OCTO on the root zone management evolution study. It's why we invited Ed Lewis from OCTO here today to participate in our meeting. Just so everyone is on the same page here, there was a small work group formed to come up with some response and some questions. I believe Russ and Peter, you were on that. Howard was also on that, but Howard is not on our call today. We had talked about having a written response ready to give to OCTO, but I don't know if we're quite there yet. Perhaps Russ or Peter would like to spend a little bit of time talking about what sort of questions we would be posing back to OCTO or what sort of additional information we would like to have from them regarding this study. Peter or Jim, would one of you be willing to do that?

RUSS MUNDY: I can. But, I think it might be good to hear Peter first. I don't remember how many of us were particularly vocal in our meeting. Peter, do you want to go first or do you want me to?

PETER KOCH: Can you hear me?

RUSS MUNDY: I can hear you fine.

PETER KOCH: I'm sorry. I'm in both audio lines now and I'm confused myself. Sorry about that. Russ, why don't you just start while I try to get back to the document? Then I can chime in later, if that's okay for you.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Sure. That's fine. We had a bit of e-mails. We did have some written material go back and forth. But, what seemed to me to be the biggest concern in terms of the work group itself is that it was not clear from the draft statement of work that we saw or the draft plan and study that how big or how broad the study was intended to be and how wide the risk assessment was intended because there almost seems as though there's some conflicting information within the document where, at one part, it's asking to examine the process, and in another part, it talks about it needs to be constrained to evolutionary changes and it does make some risk statements, but no one could really seem to get a good clear view of what the broad intent was.

Peter, would you agree with that general description?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, absolutely. I could just add one phrase I think that we used in our discussion is that, on the way, translating the CWG output into something that can be operationalized. We felt that some of these translations might have been a bit difficult, so that was the reason for not being able to find a clear one-to-one mapping there. You already mentioned the constrained versus openness and so on and so forth.

And scope of the study. I think we wanted to discuss this from here and keep it informal in a way, even though we are in recording, but we didn't want to send too much of formal communication back and forth, but instead try to clarify this with all the people involved at the table or at the call.

RUSS MUNDY: It's sort of like sitting down with a cup of coffee in Starbucks and, "Hey, let's talk about what's really intended here."

PETER KOCH: Yeah, indeed.

RUSS MUNDY: So, I think at this point, it might be good to just get feedback from Ed, both in terms of what Peter and I have talked about and what's the vision that he thinks this is really going towards.

ED LEWIS: Shall I?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Ed, please go ahead.

ED LEWIS: So, let me throw in some of the background of how this [task] came to be, something that I had to forward over – that I forwarded over to

RZERC with this question. I wasn't in the room when this all came up. the CWG was a process that I was not involved with, but there were people who were. People come out of there had an idea of what they wanted to study.

We went through the process of taking what we thought had to be studied and going down the path of formalizing this. They came to me. I began to wonder what was the intention of the study.

Now, in the discussion to ... I'm not really being clear right now. There's basically inside ICANN organization, this bounced around a bit before it came to the RZERC.

But, one of the things that came out of the discussion is that, apparently, people who were involved with the CWG process had an expectation of the study that ... The study came out and it was proposed prior to the idea that RZERC would be formed. In 20/20 hindsight, it looks like this is the kind of thing that RZERC would actually be more of a leader of than the ICANN Organization. So, I think this is part of where the confusion begins, that this request from the CWG document is something saying we want to look at the ...

We have the way the root zone is being done today – today being 2014, 2015 or whatever – and after 2016, there won't be the NTIA and we're restructuring how the root zone is going to go. Is the result of that restructuring going to still be sound? Is it going to be a good [inaudible] right way to do things? I think that was the intent of the study when it was requested back in 2014 or 2015.

Now, when I was handed this task, we had actually gone through the process ... We had a formal work statement that was possibly an RFP thing, but it sounded more like this was kind of a critique of the way things are today (today being 2018). I wasn't sure ... We weren't sure that we really wanted ... It's not like we're trying to grade and make sure that ... The functions being done today by the root zone maintainer contract held by Verisign, it's not to grade performance of that. It's basically to see: are we doing the right thing?

So, there's a little bit of confusion here in terms of the scope of this all the way around. I think that's one of the reasons I think RZERC is a good place to discuss this.

Russ, you mentioned the idea of scope. I think you hit on one of the issues that came in here because what was sent over to RZERC said that we wanted to do a survey. We were suggesting a study. I'm not sure if I used the right verb here. Suggesting a survey that would talk to the IANA functions operator, talk to Verisign, and talk to [inaudible] about how this is being carried out.

In the thing that was handled to me, the [who we were going to talk to] included everybody in the world, pretty much – ccTLDs, gTLDs, and users. We decided that was way too ... That's a very large study.

So, I think what's coming out of this is that we have this CWG proposed study that was proposed ahead of the committees that have been put in place to manage the process, the RZERC, [inaudible] and so on. We're trying to find out ... We want to meet that requirement. We want to tick that box, in a sense. We want to make sure we meet the needs of

what's requested from the process. We're looking for – ICANN organization, we're looking for guidance on ... The RZERC probably has as good of view, or maybe better view, of what the scope of this really should be.

I think that [inaudible] the idea of this is to just look at how things are being carried out today. Are we doing the right thing? Are we being safe? The question about whether or not, in the long term, we want to do a whole different way of doing the root zone is another matter. In fact, [inaudible] revolutionary and evolutionary studies.

The revolutionary study is to just ... If we had to do it all over from the start, we want to answer all those other questions out there. That's something down the line. The evolutionary [inaudible] what we have today. If we can modify here and there to make it a better system, what will we do? Or are we doing it the right way now?

What we've lost, in a sense, is the oversight from another body here. Is that a big loss? Have we replaced that loss? Have we encountered that change in the process? Are there other bottlenecks? Are there issues that we should have reviewed here?

So, I guess the question to RZERC is it seems like it might be prudent for the community in general to take a look at the way the root zone is being managed post-transition and decide whether or not it's being done in the most optimal way right now. There are better words, actually, written down here. I didn't reread everything to make this a nice statement. But, what does RZERC think we really ought to do in the study to keep this in the sense that we don't want to make major

changes to the way things are today. We have contracts in place for a couple of years. Are we doing the right thing within the confines of what we have built? Does that help in any way?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. It really does help me as far as getting a better view of how this came and evolved inside the ICANN Org. Is that also clarifying for you, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I was going to say what Ed just explained would probably also explain some of our confusion

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: Sorry?

DUANE WESSELS: I think somebody was unmuted there, so go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Okay. I was going to say that what Ed said explained a bit the confusion that we ran into reading the document and that confirmed most of our speculations the reasons why they've been – especially the part where, Ed, you said this is almost was an RFP. Then, for some reason, of course,

you tried to put boundaries to what the potential applicant or contractor would do and constrain the nature of the solutions.

Some of us had a bit of difficulties to understand when there is a boundary at that end what should actually be researched and what would the minimum outcome be, so to speak.

Or if you go further down in the scope of the study, what we talked about, the process. The process part talks about individual stakeholders. The document didn't completely say who it deems to be stakeholders, except that the final sentence in the process section says that we require interviews to the ISO, ICANN and RZM. We weren't sure whether there were more stakeholders like they were mentioned in what you said, the various TLDs and maybe others.

Nothing completely surprising. We agree on the confusion a bit. The question is how do we get there from here?

RUSS MUNDY:

One other thing I'd like to just mention for everybody's information, and it really is just an informational comment that we did talk about in the work party discussion. That was that some folks felt that the structure that's currently in the proposal is constrained in a way that isn't quite well-formed, especially if there is a need for a relatively broad scope risk assessment or risk management approach to the problem, where there would be ... It would encompass the things that I think are identified in here, but it would be intended to be bigger where the effort would be to try to, first, identify the set of risks that are involved in the whole

root zone management structure and process, and then look at how those risks might be appropriately mitigated.

I want to, again, emphasize this was nothing that even the work party said this is something we should do and certainly not an RZERC statement, but it's something that because there has been across the industry, such as emphasis on a risk management approach, something that we did talk about in the work party.

Ed, did you want to make a comment as to whether or not a risk management study has ever been thought about from what you've heard in processing this through in the internal ICANN.Org structure?

ED LEWIS:

I don't think we had a specific discussion about a risk management structure. I forget whether or not – and I'm going to be honest. I didn't read this before the call. I don't know if risk management ... Risk management in this document, I remember that, the analysis of the risk to make changes.

I'll say this. If you think the risk assessment needs to be better addressed, I would look forward to seeing that comment in the written response. What I'm saying is go ahead and discuss it. The reason for this is that – and my assessment of all this work ... [inaudible] involved with here. Had the RZERC been formed before the CWG made the recommendation, RZERC may have had a bigger stamp on the problem statement that's documented. I would say that's probably one way to look at this. The CWG recommendation is out there. ICANN Org feels the need to make sure that we fulfill the requirements coming out of

the transition document. But, we're really doing this for the benefit of the community. If there's a better thing that needs to go in there, I would say go ahead and talk it over and then let us know what is felt there.

It's hard for me to say what's the most [inaudible] word here, but I would say that it is ... I would just say it's a good discussion to bring up, a good topic to let us know what you feel.

DUANE WESSELS: Brad's had his hand raised for a while. I'd like to let Brad have a chance to speak.

BRAD VERD: A couple things based upon everything I'm hearing here. This might just be me, but I feel like we're conflating a whole bunch of things into this topic. First, let me just ask a clarifying question to Russ. Russ, when you say in the work group, you're talking about the CCWG work group on the transition that led to this action item right now, correct? Just for my education.

RUSS MUNDY: No. Brad, I'm sorry that I didn't make it clear. I was talking about RZERC work party with Howard, Peter, and I. That was the work group that I was referring to.

BRAD VERD:

Alright. So, you guys had a discussion on risks in the current root zone distribution and saying that we should address that or you were trying to get clarification from OCTO if we needed to include that? Sorry, I'm trying to piece this all together because I feel like we're all over the place.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah. It really was a discussion that was driven by the content, I think primarily in the scope of study area where it talked about some of the risks and cost-benefit, risk analysis, cost-benefit and so forth in trying to identify this shift from three parties to two and just how broad and what made sense.

To the best of my knowledge, and you're certainly in a much better position to know whether or not something like this has ever been done – and where it came up, I think it was Howard that raised it in the broader risk management perspective. If there has been any examination of the whole root zone management process, for changes and additions and deletions, to look at as a whole, are there risks in there? If there are, what are they?

What we saw in this description in the text for the scope of study was a much smaller question to look at a real little part of the whole. And if the whole is going to be looked at, then it's silly to look at the little part of the whole first. And when I say whole, I mean the big picture kind of thing. If there is going to be an effort to examine the whole big picture at some point. That was really the discussion.

ED LEWIS: Let me just add to that, if I may. This was a discussion we had. It was kind of towards what would a full scope thing look like, not that we were suggesting to actually do this. We didn't really come to a conclusion because we had a full span of things that may or may not be in scope and that was part of the confusion that we now try to address on this call.

BRAD VERD: So, we introduced the confusion, correct?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, I think we, in the work party, would say we were confused by the content of the document that laid this out.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Let me try to think of how to word this. Russ, you were on the CCWG committee that led the document that has this question in it, correct, about reviewing the root zone, the RZM process?

RUSS MUNDY: I was following it very closely. I was not the official designee to the CCWG. I was following it very closely.

BRAD VERD: Okay. How this was conveyed to me early on was this was a review, based upon the transition document of the existing RZM process to see

if it's working right or working okay. I don't even know what the right term is. I don't remember the term in the document.

Now I feel like ... While I think this is a good discussion, to have a risk analysis discussion on the whole thing, I don't think this meets the needs of OCTO's question. Ed, you're saying you want to get this question answered so you can get these transition documents behind you. Are we overstepping that question by increasing the scope? Should we answer the immediate question and then have a follow-on that could be an RZERC effort or an RZERC question, so to speak, around a risk management approach or whatever else people feel is good?

ED LEWIS:

It's possible that we'd have a series of what we want to study in an ever-growing scope. I could see this as ... Part of this is to make sure we ... The reason why we're pushing on this is to make sure we don't forget about accomplishing what we promised to do. I don't know if "we" means Org or the community, to be honest, at this point.

If the CWG request is to be a smaller study, then let's stick with that. However, if RZERC feels – and this is totally up to RZERC. What I'm guessing, personally, this is in the scope of the committee. If you want to look at the wider-ranging questions regarding the process of generating the root zone, I think that would be a good thing for the community to have.

I'll let you know that there is another effort to do a more radical review of how things are done with the root zone for longer term that's bouncing around and may or may not come to light in the next year or

so. So, there are efforts to look at the future root zone generation. All that [inaudible] RZERC should be—

BRAD VERD: Just for clarification, those are efforts within OCTO, right? Not efforts that have been asked from the community to OCTO. Those are organic within ICANN.Org, correct?

ED LEWIS: I would say they're not formally coming from the outside. I don't know that OCTO ... I would say, speaking for myself and some people I work with, I don't think we have agendas for the future of this, but we have our eyes out for new technology. We have eyes out for things out there. It's going to be a balance, but we're not going to go off. I don't think anyone is going to go off and just spend money studying something because we thought it was a good idea. The more input we get from the outside, to OCTO that is, the wiser we'll be spending our resources in doing these studies. Does that answer your question?

BRAD VERD: Not really, but that's okay.

ED LEWIS: I don't think there's any burning desire within OCTO to change.

BRAD VERD: Nobody in the community has come to you and said what is the evolutionary work that needs to happen around the root zone? RZERC is root zone evolution committee or review committee. I'm just kind of curious if it came from the community or if it's organic within OCTO. It sounds like it's organic, so thanks.

ED LEWIS: Alright.

RUSS MUNDY: Brad, did that help clarify what the RZERC work party was talking about in that space that you had asked earlier?

BRAD VERD: I mean, it did. I feel like ... Obviously, I wasn't in the discussions and that's quite all right. I just feel like we need to be careful not to try to boil the ocean. How do you eat an elephant? You eat an elephant one bite at a time. Break off different pieces and let's go after it. But, let's try not to do it in one sitting. That's all.

RUSS MUNDY: I think we can say that part of that discussion that we had in RZERC work party was that if there was a big full scope kind of risk management review or study or whatever of the full process, then if this was going to be done first in the near term, how would they relate? Gee, does it make sense to do this little one first? Maybe yes, maybe no. Those kinds of discussions.

I don't remember if others in the work party had heard this or not, but it was after or during the ICANN meeting where the Adobe Connect was shut off for the rest of the meeting because of security problems. There was one or two board members that asked about, "Oh, gee, what about our root zone management system? Has there ever been a risk management thing assessment looked at that?" People were talking very much informally about that, but it wasn't something that the group imbedded out of total [inaudible]. Just a little bit of [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS:

Jim has his hand up. Jim, would you like to go ahead please?

JIM REID:

Yes. Thanks, Duane. I'm a bit confused about something Russ just mentioned a couple of minutes ago. He was talking about a big study into risk analysis, on a big risk analysis exercise. I'm not sure [inaudible] because, in the document so far for this, this study should include a risk analysis and cost-benefit analysis [inaudible] history and possibility of such problems [inaudible] infrastructure.

So, I'm [inaudible] where the [inaudible] really what's proposed in this document would help me. But, what seems to be being talked about in the context of the document in front of us and this bigger all-encompassing effort and where the distinction lies between the two. I really just [inaudible] understand what we've got here, what we're trying to assess.

DUANE WESSELS: Ed, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think this is really the question that ... I mean, this is why you want input from RZERC. This is the crux of it. You want RZERC to provide some guidance on the scope and what should be studied and what shouldn't be studied. Is that basically it?

ED LEWIS: Yeah. One of the questions here is, within OCTO, we [inaudible] RFP for it and study. The question I had reading that was, well, who was the beneficiary of the study? Who's going to get the results and make changes if need be?

One of the questions for RZERC is ... One thing that would help us – and I don't want to put words into RZERC's mouth in any way. But, RZERC could say, "We want OCTO organization to conduct a study to look at the root zone the way it's being done today for the efficiency, robust, and security," are the three things that are in scope of the study.

When the result comes back, I would imagine that this would probably go back to RZERC to say to ICANN, "Here's how we need to [inaudible] the root zone to make it a better system." Better being in quotes and all that kind of stuff.

So, I think that's kind of where ... I would feel much more comfortable if it was clear who was going to benefit from the study as much as how it was being conducted. I think that would be part of the words I'd like to hear.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Ed. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you, Duane. I was trying to reiterate that, yes, we had a discussion about the formal risk analysis kind of thing, but this wasn't really a result of this. My understanding is that this was at the far end of a potential scope.

And I heard some confusion. Jim voiced a bit of confusion on how to understand this. I have to share this confusion still, given that the CWG output sets a triggering event which is the NTIA's oversight role going away by means of transition, and then potential checks and balances no longer being in place.

Now, within that context, some of the sentences in the CWG output need to be read with a grain of salt, which puts the whole effort into a smaller context than what might have been read by now by others on the call or by people not in the work party that we would have thought a full risk analysis is needed.

I don't even read that hourly CWG statement. But still, that is the part of translation that I mentioned earlier that might have been a bit difficult in terms of particular wording. When it comes to risk analysis, some people think small, some people think big, some people think pragmatic engineering, some people think formal whatever framework to be applied. That's the part that we are still not really clear about, from my perspective.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Peter. I think it's probably time to wrap up the discussion here and talk about moving forward. What we had planned previously was the [inaudible] working group would come up with a written response and deliver it to OCTO. Do people think that's still the right way forward here? Ed, is that something that you're ready and willing to receive from RZERC?

ED LEWIS: Yeah. One of my [inaudible] progress is to hear back from RZERC on this. I'm waiting patiently, or impatiently – patiently, rather – to see what guidance. Again, I really want to make sure that we spend our resources wisely and don't go off and study the wrong thing.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, thanks. We've had a good wide-ranging discussion here, but I'd like to give what at least I think is what I believe was intended by the CCWG names for this. I think it was much closer to the [inaudible] scope that Peter was just describing a little bit ago, that it really was intended to be ... There were three parties previously involved in the root zone management process. After the transition, there's [inaudible]. is this now working effectively or are there some things that should be corrected? Restricting it specifically to look at an examination of going from three parties to two parties. I think that would fully meet the CCWG names [inaudible]. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Very good. Does anyone have an opinion [inaudible] to that? Unfortunately, Howard is not on the phone. I don't know what Howard would say. Does anyone on the call – would you advocate for the larger scope study or does everyone kind of agree with Russ there? Jim?

JIM REID: I think the smaller scope, for some definition [inaudible] still unclear to me. It's probably the [inaudible]. If you look at what's the bottom of page two, which is quoted I think from a quote [inaudible] from the CWG document, it's fairly clear from that what the scope of the study we envisage is going to be. I think given the origination of this [inaudible] came from, that should really constrain the scope of what this initial study might be. And the [inaudible] something on a more radical scale being perhaps [inaudible] was nothing concrete on the table at the moment to look at that.

So, I think we should look at [inaudible] this particular document that's been copied from [inaudible] bottom of page two and the start of page three of the proposal, if we can call this thing a proposal, which is looking at please stop shifting this thing around [inaudible] which is looking at [inaudible] elimination [inaudible] improve the robustness of the [current] operational arrangements. That seems to be fairly clear [inaudible] to me, and I think that's probably what we should be [inaudible] for the moment. And if there are further studies to be done, we can kick that can further down the road and deal with it once it's [inaudible] what these further studies are all about. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Jim. Since we're running short on time, I'm going to suggest that we wrap this up and we'll take today's conversation back to the work party and I will urge them to finalize some written response that we can deliver to OCTO and we'll go from there.

With that, we'll move on to the next item on the agenda which is really just selection of the next teleconference call. Our default schedule would put us on September 17th which is okay with me. Jim, your hand is up. Is it regarding the schedule?

JIM REID: No, it was [inaudible]. I assume that the work party's deliberation will be discussed with the rest of RZERC before we go to OCTO or anyone else.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, absolutely.

JIM REID: Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Regarding the next meeting, can we plan on September 17th? If anyone is unable to make that date, please notify Mario. If we have enough people that can't make it, maybe we'll consider a different date.

Any last-minute business before we adjourn the meeting today?

Okay, thank you, everyone. We'll adjourn the meeting and we'll be in touch regarding the next steps for the feedback to OCTO. Thank you very much, Ed, for your time today in joining us and we'll look forward to talking to you again.

ED LEWIS: Thanks, a lot.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, everyone.

PARTICIPANTS: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]