
[Call starts at 00:03:39]

STEVE SHENG: Thank you everyone. It's two minutes past the hour, let's start the meeting today. Mario, would you like to do a roll call?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, hello everyone, welcome to the RZERC Teleconference on 4 April 2017 at 17:00 UTC. On the call, we have Duane, Howard, Jim, Kaved, Kim, Peter, Russ, Trang and Brad. On staff, we have Kathy, Steve and myself, Mario Aleman, who is managing the call for today. Am I missing somebody or is everything okay?

STEVE SHENG: Thanks. Are we missing Carlos?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, we're missing Carlos Martinez and we don't have apologies from him.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, let me see if we can try to (inaudible). Okay, I just want to quickly do a Chair announcement and then I will pass this over to Duane. As you know, Duane is elected as the other Chair. His term starts March 2017 and as agreed by the RZERC in the election procedure his term will end either at the close of the first RZERC meeting, after the two-year anniversary of the Chair's appointment, or the Chair leaving the RZERC. So, with that, welcome Duane, and I hand it over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks a lot, Steve. And this probably goes without saying but I trust everyone here will keep me honest and make sure that we're doing things by the book. Next item on our agenda is to review the agenda and we've already had some discussion about the word "vote" so I notice that that's been changed in the online version here. And I actually will talk about that a little bit later when we get to the Procedures document. But at this point, does anyone have any amendments or concerns about the agenda today? Okay, it doesn't sound like it. Then we'll proceed with this agenda and next, Mario, can you review the action items from our previous call?

MARIO ALEMAN: Absolutely. Thank you, Duane. I am going to read the action items and the decisions made actually on the last teleconference call on 28th February 2017. On the decisions, we have RZERC approved the Chair Duty and Selection Procedure Document. Members approved the migration of the website from (inaudible) to the regular ICANN site. Publication of RZERC material should be open and transparent. Exceptional cases will be discussed. RZERC agreed to be a committee to consider issues raised to the committee by its member, PDI staff or CSC. No informal gathering in Copenhagen is needed.

On action items, staff to publish the minutes from 28 February 2017 teleconference. Kathy to circulate (inaudible) tutorial on the mailing list. And Kathy to open the (inaudible) poll for tier selection at 1:00PM EST 20 February 2017. Staff to migrate the draft RZERC website to

ICANN.org. And the staff to work with the RZERC Chair on the implementation details of transparency discussion and present a formal proposal for RZERC at its next meeting. Staff to work with RZERC Chair to determine the date and time of the next meeting. This is a brief summary of the action items and the decisions actually taken. Back to you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, we do need to approve these minutes but we also need to discuss the little issue which also was just raised on the list, in that these minutes still have this word “reactionary” which we previously decided to re-word that item, I believe. So, I don’t know, do we want to approve them pending that little edit? Or do we want to wait until the next call or until they can be sent out via email?

BRAD VERD: If we can do it here I think it will be great.

HOWARD ELAND: This is Howard. I’ll make a motion to approve the minutes with the pending edit.

DUANE WESSELS: To be clear, I think we had agreed on using the text that Kim Davies had provided, correct?

RUSS MUNDY: That, or similar text. I think Kim and I had similar proposals but I'm not sure. But generally using the term "issue", I think, was what we decided to do and not even say "reactionary". I think it was something like "address and react as appropriate to issues..." etcetera.

JIM REID: Could we clarify what the text is we're agreeing?

DUANE WESSELS: I'm sorry, Jim, what was that?

PETER KOCH: I definitely see a new version different from what was circulated on the list but probably that copy went only to me.

BRAD VERD: Peter, you sound like you're a million miles away.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I'm sorry about that. I had to dial in and that works a bit awkward here. I haven't figured out what's going wrong. Is that better now? Is the sound better?

BRAD VERD: It is better. You're still far away but it's much better.

PETER KOCH: Okay, I'll try to improve.

DUANE WESSELS: I tried to find the text that we were talking about last time but I failed, I found the wrong thing.

RUSS MUNDY: I just typed some text that might work at the beginning of the sentence that's currently in there, if folks wanted to look at that, I think that was the kind of thing we agreed to on the mailing list.

KIM DAVIES: So, I just typed in what I sent to the list. It's Kim here. I think someone made the comment I say "issues" twice in the two sentences so, it can be wordsmithed further, I just think it was just more not to assume the reader had the same understanding of passive or reactive that we do.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks Kim. So, yeah, I think Kim's is good. So, we have a motion from Howard to approve, pending this edit.

BRAD VERD: This is Brad. I remember Kim's language, thank you for sharing that, Kim. And the one comment or the one thing that I think that we had talked about as a group was it says "reporting on issues raised by its members" and then it said "PTI staff or the CSC", while both of those are members, we had agreed to remove that, I thought.

PETER KOCH: This is Peter. I believe that is a verbatim quote from the Charter.

JIM REID: Peter, that text is (inaudible) and I think it also is within RZERC's remit, so the reporting could be issues that we raise or by the PTI staff or the CSC or perhaps by anybody else for that matter.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so I'll suggest that we proceed with the text that Kim has provided. Howard has made a motion to approve the minutes pending this edit. Will anyone second?

RUSS MUNDY: I would like to raise a point to amend. "As appropriate", I think we agreed needed to go in there to give us an escape clause. I just retyped it in with adding "as appropriate", which if we, the RZERC, feel these issues aren't something we should consider, analyze or report on, we can say that. So, with that amendment I'll second Howard's.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Russ. Anyone object to the motion and the second at this point? Okay, great. So, we can take that as done, I think. And Mario, you'll modify the draft minutes and then publish them, correct?

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. Yes, we will do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, great. So, let's move on to Item 6 in the agenda which is Implementation details on Transparency. We've talked a little bit about this already and I met with Mario and Steve in Copenhagen to hammer out some of the details. I'll read out to you some of the decisions that we've come to. I think you'll find them acceptable.

So, all meetings will be recorded and the recordings will be published to the RZERC website when the recordings are available. Transcripts will also be published of the recordings, when those are available. Minutes will be taken by staff and submitted for approval at the following meeting, and after approval they will be published on the RZERC website. Mailing lists, subscription to the mailing lists will be restricted to members and staff only but the archives will be public. One thing that we maybe need to discuss is what to do with the mailing list archive up to this point.

So, we've been using the mailing list, perhaps not everyone working on the assumption that those archives will be public, currently those archives are not public. So, one easy proposal is to essentially clear out the archives right up to this meeting and make them public starting now. The other option would be that we would each, I guess, have to go through our history, our previous messages, and ensure that we are comfortable with making those older messages public.

JIM REID: I think we should just publish everything. But publishing (inaudible) before. Talking about the stuff that's been published and put on the mailing list up until now is give people a couple of weeks to think about if they want to review what's on the mailing list to date and decide if they're comfortable with it being published or not. I think we can just go ahead and do it, but the individual members of the committee probably need to get a chance to review the contributions and decide if that's appropriate or not. But my personal feeling is just publish everything from day one.

DUANE WESSELS: Any other opinions on the mailing list archive? Are people willing to do that or maybe they don't care.

KIM DAVIES: Kim here. I don't feel strongly.

DUANE WESSELS: Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Duane. I guess my suggestion would be that we set a date and unless, you know, two weeks or something in the future, and unless someone notifies yourself or Steve or some other staff that there's a problem with it, that we at that point release all of our archives. That will give people time to look, and anybody that might be uneasy, and if there's a problem with the release of all of them then we pick a date,

maybe from that date at which we set the cutoff and say everything going forward from there will be public. And my sense is that we should be able to decide if this is an acceptable path at this meeting and then the only thing pending is if anybody wants to object.

DUANE WESSELS Okay, thanks. So, what I'm hearing is that we'll set a date within two weeks. Looking at the calendar that would be April 18th. So, unless there are specific objections, on April 18th, the old messages archived will be made public. If anyone has particular concerns with something on the archives they need to let myself or the ICANN staff know before then.

JIM REID: Then Duane, could I ask Mario, or whoever's taking minutes, to actually record this as an action item so we don't overlook it.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, thanks.

MARIO ALEMAN: Absolutely, thank you so much.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Now, one last thing I want to talk about under Transparency is who should participate in the calls on the mailing list. And we had this discussion a little bit already when it was proposed to add some staff from the ICANN (inaudible) Office and we decided not to do that at that

time. But I would propose that the calls and the list be limited to RZERC appointees and ICANN support staff only. Currently, we have one ICANN staff person who I believe does not fit into that category. Trang, you're on the call, is that correct?

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes, that's correct.

DUANE WESSELS: Russ, go ahead. Is your hand still up?

RUSS MUNDY: I'm sorry, I had my mute on. I'd suggest that we also leave the option up to the Chair inviting non-members, if needed, for discussion of a particular item. And at this point I'm not sure what that particular item might be, but it seems to be something that we can do in both SSAC and RSSAC to leave that up to the Chair. So, if there's something that does need a non-member present in the meeting, we have the already designated method of making that okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, I absolutely agree. And the Procedures document, which we'll talk about a little bit next, it already has some language to that effect. So, yes, thank you for pointing that out. Kaved?

KAVED RANJBAR: Hi, can you hear me? So, in addition to what Russ said, I think we need to have a policy for observers, because other than the ICANN staff which have been requested to observe, if you are going to have face-to-face meetings, in ICANN meetings especially, I'm sure we will get a request for observers. So, we can either leave it to the Chair or say it's open to observers or not, but I think it's good to have a policy for this.

JIM REID: -- of the Chair and leave it to that.

HOWARD ELAND: This is Howard. So, I think it's important in the case of an open meeting that we have a distinction between observers and participants. The difference being, of course, that you don't get a microphone if you're an observer. And you no longer have the ability to hum.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Kaved, I had a little bit of a hard time understanding you but I heard you talk about having an observer in the meetings. Did you have an adjective before the word "observer"? Did you say impartial observer, or something?

KAVED RANJBAR: No, I just said observers, because it will happen, especially in face-to-face meetings, we will receive a request, so I think we just need to have a policy. Whatever it is, we can leave it to the Chair, and just say we need to have a policy.

DUANE WESSELS: So, you mentioned face-to-face meetings. But are you still talking about the monthly conference calls that we would have? Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. I was going to say we can treat the potential face-to-face meetings and the monthly calls differently. I fully agree with Kaved that we need to admit observers in the public meetings. And we could do that during the conference calls with the microphone regime that somebody else already suggested. So, I have no strong feelings having no observers during the calls as long as they only observe.

DUANE WESSELS: So, just so I understand. I hear, I think it's Peter and Kaved saying, that in addition to making our recordings public there's also a need for observers on the calls? Jim, go ahead.

JIM REID: I think we're overthinking this again. I don't see the need for observers to take part in any conference calls that we take part, but if someone feels that they need to take part in the calls they're welcome to do so at the discretion of the Chair on the clear understanding they're there as observers only. The problem I've got is if we have large numbers of people taking part in these things, the logistics are going to get very complicated. They're already quite clumsy as they are just now with just nine or ten of us on the call. If we end up having large numbers of observers I think these difficulties could get even greater.

So, I say, we just publish the minutes, we make it as open as possible, and if anybody feels a compelling urge to join in one of our conference calls or a face-to-face meeting, they contact the Chair, we publish this information, and the Chair can invite them to attend as an observer, and leave it at that. Whether it's a public meeting or whether it's a conference call, I don't think it makes any difference. That should be the procedure. And I don't think we need to go into a great deal of detail about the distinction between the two and making this overly complicated.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thank you. Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Duane. I wanted to point out that there is a way that you can set up conference calls so that there are observers that can only listen if they want to hear it in real time, but not actually say anything in the conference call. I don't remember the exact mechanics of it but that was something that was done for the ICG Activity and I think what they actually had was two separate phone numbers that the observers were given one number to call into and they could hear everything on an ongoing basis but couldn't speak.

And the members were given a different access code or phone number or something where it was a full bridge kind of connectivity. I don't know how hard that is to set up but the possibility I know does exist because it has been done for other groups. So, if we want to leave ourselves some flexibility, we can include these kinds of things in the

procedure if our support staff and technology are still agreeable to handle this. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Go ahead, Peter. And then I think we should perhaps close the mic line and move on to the next topic after Peter.

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you. So, I'm not completely sure I understood Jim's contribution. What I heard was that he said he saw no difference between the conf calls and face-to-face meetings. However, for the face-to-face meetings we probably don't have a useful option to have a closed meeting and then observers by invitation only. That would be a bit of overkill to me. Again, I have no strong feelings about the observers during the calls. We don't know whether there is any demand for that. As a suggestion of compromise, we could continue as we do with no real-time observers and then watch for community input and set this as a review item in six to twelve months from now.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. So, I think what we'll do is, myself and Steve and Mario will take all this feedback and incorporate it into the Procedures document that we're drafting and probably have something to say about observers, especially in the case of face-to-face meetings. And then we'll present the procedures as a whole to you at a later meeting. Does that sound okay?

PETER KOCH: That's fine with me.

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, next let's move on to Item 7 which is a discussion about the Charter. Myself, I quite like the current Charter, except for, there's in my mind one little issue which is in the opening paragraph we have the word "content". It says "RZERC considers changes to the content of the Root Zone". Where's that word at? The first sentence under "Purpose", it says, "The Committee is expected to review proposed architectural changes to the content of the DNS root zone..."

And this language is, of course, spreading out to other things like our website and our Procedures document. So, I would propose either to strike the word "content" or perhaps change it to something like "operations" so that it says, "proposed changes to the operation of the DNS Root Zone". Peter?

PETER KOCH: So, before we start proposing changes I'd like to understand what the protest for the changes is. My understanding was that the Charter had undergone wide community review in the ICG phase, that we may or may not have the authority to change the Charter and how much community involvement do we have to engage?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's an interesting question. I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head. I don't know if those other committees feel like they own our Charter or not. But we'll try to find out, okay? Mario, let's take that as an action item to find out who gets to change the Charter. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Two points. One on the Charter piece. There are other CCWG's, specifically around the (option? @ 00:34:45) one where there's a whole discussion on whether or not they can change the Charter or not. So, I think there's precedence out there. Regarding the word "content", I would like to understand the issue with it or the challenge with the word, or the wording, right now. I believe that word is in there for a very specific reason.

If you change it to what you suggested as "operational", then that completely, in my eyes, changes the scope and that goes into Root operations, Root Server operations, anything operational. Whereas, my understanding of this committee was to replace essentially which was NIST's role in the pre-NTIA days and it was the content of the Root Zone. Record types, signing the zone or if you were adding a key, things like that were in our purview and not operations of the DNS Root Zone.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, but then the rest of that sentence talks about hardware and software components.

BRAD VERD: Right. I know in RSSAC we've created a document. We took an SSAC document and there's two sides to it. One has RSSAC on one side where the Root Servers are and on the other side where, let's call it, the provisioning system for the Root Zone, there's hardware that runs that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, got it. So, my issue with the word "content" is that it could mean the day to day minutiae changes which clearly should be outside of our purview. I'll go on to somebody else.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, just one follow up there. "Architectural changes to the content", not minutiae changes, not day to day operational changes, architectural changes to the content. I think that's key.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Duane. Yeah, I was just doing a quick search of some of the IANA transition material and to see if there were specifics in there that were addressing Charter content. And I'd suggest that's something that needs to be done with a little more care and precision than just running a couple of searches here that I did. But I think that there are a number of statements both in the ICG Report that went to NTIA, and in the NTIA

response to that report, and I think those are the two primary documents, that need to be looked at.

They do use slightly different wordings so, looking carefully there would be the right thing to do. I'd like to raise another point for consideration and that is there's been a fair amount of discussion in both the ICANN venue and in the IETF venue about the Namespace, what is the Namespace, and so forth. And I think this can go in for clarity purposes that we can put "the ICANN DNS Root Zone" in that sentence, even though we're an ICANN committee, but it would make it perfectly clear that we're talking about the ICANN DNS Root Zone as opposed to these various other naming things that exist in the world and sometimes get confused with what we're talking about here.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, thanks. So, I think that this topic is big enough, and the Charter is big enough with enough background documents, to say that we probably can't do this in this meeting. And I would be in favor of either having a sub-group or put it to the list or some other mechanism. I mean, we're still on the word "content", right? So, I think it involves a more in-depth study. I'd like to see folks go through some of the background materials in a more formal way and based on those come up with proposals for how we might make changes to the Charter, if any. And it sounds like there are enough people that have qualms with one piece of it or another in multiple areas. So, I'm wondering if our

time isn't better served taking this to either, like I said, another meeting or the list or whatever and reserving our time for the group meeting proper for other things.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think you're right. It's getting out of control quickly, isn't it? Thank you. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. First, I'd like to agree with what Howard said. It's just this is a long-term thing, which in my mind suggests that we only propose carefully discussed changes and then not one at a time, but if we find that there are clarifications necessary to the Charter, we discuss them and bundle them and then submit them for public review as the committee was reminded by Trang.

I have one response to Russ and I'd like to disagree with that suggestion to add "ICANN" in front of "DNS Root Zone", that there is only one Root and that we should not necessarily support some IETF fantasies or other confusions by doing this. To Duane actually, my question would be, had there been any confusion already about the "content" phrase, and could we address that in a different way? And then one reminder, I think in one of our very early talks we already gave us the action item, even though that might not have been formalized as one, to think about what architectural changes actually might turn out to be. So, we will have to chew on this "architectural" in some way. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thank you, Peter. So, we'll take these (inaudible) back and, as I said, study what it takes to change the Charter and consider if we need some kind of study group, as Howard said. Alright, let's move on to the next topic which is the Procedures document. So, with the help of Mario and Steve, we've begun to draft a Procedures document for RZERC. I believe that we've used the RSSAC Procedures document as a starting point and then have been editing and culling as necessary.

The current draft that we have that we've been working on has, in my mind, maybe a little bit too much overlap between what's in the Charter and what's in the Procedures. So, it sort of exists in two places, not that that's bad but it could lead to complications. So, that's something that I plan to look at a little more closely. To bring up a couple of specific things that came to my mind as I was reading through the draft. Let me read through these and then anyone can ask questions on any of them.

So, there's a section about appointments, and I think Steven actually raised this before, that maybe it would be good to stagger the appointments to RZERC so that there's not a lot of turnover at the same time. I'm not sure how feasible that is, since these are all inward facing appointments and we have other committees appointing to RZERC and we may not be able to really control their schedules. But open to opinions on that. In the draft, there is one place where the word "vote" appeared and it stood out to me as well, because of course, RZERC is designed to be a consensus based committee. However, I do note that we do have at least one occurrence of a vote already which is the vote for the Chair so, the Procedures document may need to talk a little bit about voting.

There's a section on the types of meetings that RZERC will hold and currently we're talking about three types of meetings. One is regular meetings, of which this is an example. Another is public meetings, which I think it says something like public meetings are expected to take place face-to-face at ICANN meetings. And then the third is like an executive meeting. I think the current text calls it an emergency meeting but I would maybe argue that executive meeting is a better description of it. The transparency items that we talked about, those are detailed in the draft Procedures document. There's a long section on consensus, definitions of consensus, which I believe, Steve, you said that was copied from a GNSO document, is that correct?

STEVE SHENG:

Yes. All other ICANN communities use the word "consensus".

DUANE WESSELS:

Right. So, in this text there's something like five or six different types of consensus. I've personally found it to be a little bit complex, of course, I've never spent any time with a GNSO so that was all new to me. And then lastly, the one thing that stood out to me was, when talking about how RZERC would receive proposals from its members and other people. I don't think we as a committee have really talked yet about what the output of that would look like. For example, would RZERC produce numbered documents the same way that RSSAC does and SSAC does? Or, would our responses and our outputs look different somehow? I don't know. So, that's the list of things that stood out to

me. I'm happy to take discussion on any of those from you. Jim? We can't hear you, Jim.

JIM REID: Can you hear me now? Good, thank you. I've just got to say, Duane, I think we should try (inaudible) here is on principle of least surprise. So, we should try to follow established practices that other ICANN committees do for publication of reports and documents and whatever. And let's not try to be cute by trying to reinvent the wheel.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so that's in reference to the last item about the output of our committee, correct? Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Duane. On one of your earlier points, in terms of staggering of membership, I don't know that that's something that we as an RZERC can have any direct control over. So, I think that at most we can publish on our website what the current term end dates of all the members are and just tell everybody what that is, and informally maybe ask the committees, but I don't think we can do anything formal in that space at all.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yes, so, agree with Russ actually, and in terms of the advice of the documents, we can follow examples of the other committees to the extent that they are comparable and I think, especially SSAC has a wider audience and has the mandate to initiate advice, where we have a very strong focus and are supposed to give specific advice to the Board after public consultation. So, whether or not we have numbered reports, I guess that's partly an implementation detail, and it's important to look at the output queue. I'd suggest that we prioritize and work on the other topic that you brought up, how would we (inaudible) input or how would we react input or accept issues to be (inaudible).

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, great, thank you. Howard, go ahead.

HOWARD ELAND: Just to the point on the intake process. To me, I think this can stay pretty informal. We have it outlined in the RZERC Charter where things are coming from, specifically from members, PTI, CSC, so, because that is a pretty tight group I don't expect to necessarily be overwhelmed and I think at least I don't see an overarching reason to try and define a rigid procedure for an intake process. Not right now, I think we've just got to wait and see how it goes.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thank you. So, the draft that we're working on, it does already have pretty good text around receiving proposals for consideration. It

just doesn't have a lot to say about how we respond back, what format that takes, so, that was my concern there. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Duane. I guess I'd suggest that at this point, since procedures can always be updated and we don't know what our output should look like. I would suggest we just leave it pretty flexible and as we learn more then we update as needed for our procedures to match the reality. We don't need to let our procedures drive us up front, thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Well, thanks everyone for that. I think we should probably use the remaining time to talk about schedules and dates for future meetings. Previously we were meeting on Mondays. Was it the third Monday of the month, or something like that? We could try to get back to that schedule or if that didn't work for people we could, I guess, go back to the doodle poll and come up with some other dates. Does anyone have thoughts at this time on future meeting schedule? If we return to the previous schedule which is monthly Mondays, that means we would have a call in two weeks, which I don't know if you want to do that or not.

BRAD VERD:

I would suggest we go back to monthly, Mondays, or, what the schedule was.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Jim, go ahead. I don't know, Jim, if you're speaking, you're muted, we can't hear you. You had your hand raised for a second there.

JIM REID: I was just going to say I think the next meeting's probably at least four or possibly six weeks away.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, we could do that, we could try to return to this schedule where it was the third Monday of the month or the third week of the month and then just skip the one that's in two weeks. Is anyone opposed to...?

JIM REID: --meet for the sake of a meeting. So, if we don't have anything on our agenda I think we should just let things lie. So, unless there's a clear need for us to meet because we've got agenda items to discuss, I think we can let this thing go for a while. And maybe work to look at one or two issues around the things we just talked about with, for example, the Charter or perhaps Procedural things, but if there's nothing there to discuss let's not have a meeting where there'll be nothing to discuss.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. Russ, go ahead, are you going to tell us about Tuesdays?

RUSS MUNDAY: No, I can do either Monday or Tuesday, but personally Tuesdays are a little better for me at this point. But what I was going to suggest is that

we also look at the date of the next ICANN meeting and whether or not we think we want to do either a meeting there ourselves or ask for a public session or anything of that nature. I have no objection to not meeting until six weeks from now but that is getting close enough to the ICANN meeting. I don't know if we could get, on the agenda, if we decided we thought we should be on the agenda.

DUANE WESSELS:

So, if my Math is correct, six weeks-ish from today would be mid-May. It might actually conflict with the GNSO (inaudible) and the ICANN DNS Symposium meeting in Madrid. Then the month after that is June which is getting close to the ICANN59.

BRAD VERD:

Do it the week after the symposium. It doesn't have to be six weeks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. So, if everyone's okay with Mondays, I know Russ said Tuesdays are better, but if everyone's good with Mondays let's go with that for now. I will work with Steve and Mario to send out an invite. I guess we'll have to pick either five weeks or seven weeks, so we'll pick one and float it out to the list and then go from there. Jim?

JIM REID:

Thanks, Duane. I just wanted to suggest a doodle poll to do something for the week of May 22nd, so why don't we just set a doodle poll for that week and then pick the (inaudible) that week?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so if you like May 22nd, we'll just go with May 22nd. That's a Monday, that's when we were—

JIM REID: No, I'm saying pick a day in that week beginning May 22nd so we do a doodle poll for that week and we pick a day that works out best for everybody.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. But why wouldn't we just do Monday? Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: The question would be, can anybody not do Monday of the week of the 22nd, regarding that. I have a question regarding Russ's comment about having a public meeting or a public session in Johannesburg. I have no objection to it but I see no point in doing it. Right now, we're just doing procedures. Oh, thanks, Steve, Joburg's a policy focused meeting so we wouldn't have it there anyway is I guess what Steve is saying. But maybe an action item, Duane, we could take when we should have a public session at an ICANN meeting, have that as a discussion point, because I don't believe we should have a meeting just to have a meeting unless there's something that we're actually doing.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I'm inclined to agree with that.

JIM REID: My suggestion would be maybe somebody, probably it's going to be you, Duane, since you're the Chair, perhaps goes to Johannesburg to explain what's happened with RZERC to date and say we'll maybe have a public session at the next ICANN meeting. But that's just a suggestion. I don't see there's any need for us to have any kind of physical meeting in Johannesburg.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And just as (datapoint? @ 01:01:57) so far nobody has asked me what's going on with RZERC. I don't know if anyone else has been asked what's been going on with RZERC? Okay. Well, we're at the end of our time. We'll take the remaining items to the list. I think by default we'll shoot for our next teleconference call on May 22nd. And don't forget, you all have an action item to review the mailing list archive and I think that's it. Anything else before we close, Steve? Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: This is Mario for the record. I don't have anything else. Unless, Steve, would you like to mention something?

STEVE SHENG: We'll publish the minutes and then just continue to iterate.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thank you very much everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]