DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so we're back to recording for the RZERC meeting here, and we're moving on to do agenda item number 5, which is preparation for the public meeting, which is on Wednesday. Right before the meeting here, Mario sent out an email with some draft PowerPoint slides - if he could bring those up, we'll go through those real quick. I guess it was a PDF file, wasn't it.

MARIO ALEMAN: [UNKNOWN]

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, you want to display it on- yeah, let's display it on Adobe Connect.

So, how much time do we have for our public meeting - an hour and a half? Yes, yeah, okay, so the plan is we'll go through these slides, and then we'll take questions from the audience, assuming there is an audience. [LAUGHTER] If people show up and want to ask questions.

MARIO ALEMAN: Whether you have a [UNKNOWN].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. [LAUGHTER] When I scroll, do you guys see them changing, or?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so, this is pretty straight-forward - slide back - here's a summary slide. This was all done by Mario, by the way, in preparation. The overview slide has some text from the introduction of the charter, pretty straight-forward, we can just read this to people if they don't already know what RZERC is.

The next slide shows the membership, and I think you may have seen - there's a minor correction that Jim and Carlos are swapped here, but other than that, as far as I can tell it's correct. I think everyone's names are spelt correctly now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [UNKNOWN] question. Did Jim send an email about [UNKNOWN] himself from the membership list, because he [UNKNOWN] IETF.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, so, on that slide it says IETF is Carlos, and ASO is Jim, we just need to swap those.

UNKNOWN: Oh, he said Mario, but he meant Carlos.

UNKNOWN: Yeah.

EN

DUANE WESSELS: He meant Carlos, yeah.

We'll spend a slide talking about the types of meetings we have - regular meetings and public meetings, and describe our transparency, how everything's recorded, our archive is open. I don't believe that we actually have the link to the main archive on the RZERC website at this time, right? I went and looked for it and I didn't see it. But, anyway, that's something we can work on later.

UNKNOWN: Okay, sure.

DUANE WESSELS: I know it's up, I just don't know if it's easy to find.

UNKNOWN: Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: We'll talk about what RZERC's procedures say about consideration of proposals. Of course, note that has not been [UNKNOWN] yet. The next slide is current status - I want everyone in particular to look at the second bullet here to make sure that it accurately captures what we're going through right now, which is currently connecting a hypothetical evaluation of potential topics and scenarios. Does that make it clear that we're not actually considering actual scenarios, or actual proposals at this time?

PETER KOCH: Sounds good, [UNKNOWN] to what end we're doing these evaluations [UNKNOWN] factors, to produce guidance on [UNKNOWN].

DUANE WESSELS: Sure, yeah, okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think the purpose is helpful to state in advance, instead of waiting for people to ask for it.

DUANE WESSELS: Did you capture that?

PETER KOCH: [UNKNOWN] it's also guidance for us, doesn't it also serve for the committee internal- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: Sure, sure. It's a really check, sort of, where everyone's head is at. What we're thinking.

PETER KOCH: [UNKNOWN]

EN

DUANE WESSELS: The last slide is contact information, so, one of the things we talked about in our previous meeting is to mention some specific topics from our things that we're considering, so, I think we could insert some slides here - and I've got some suggestions for some of the specific topics we could include.

Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. Could you scroll back up to where, further in the beginning, do we have some specifics about our charter besides - let me just see - I want to read what we're saying we are, which is the extract from the charter, because what I was thinking is that if we have the overview here, It might- I don't know if we want to include the picture that Brad just provided to us before or around when we're looking at what we're doing right now - identifying possibilities. I don't think we want to get hugely specific, but it'd be nice if we could be a little more specific, I think, about what we're doing and- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: About what sort of things RZERC maybe has to consider?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, yeah, because the overview doesn't, I don't think, make it - well, it's not what I would call abundantly clear. If you read the words very carefully, they are in there - the distribution of the root zones - but people won't really see that, or catch it. At least in my mind, it makes

good sense if we can gently feed this to the community, that we're looking at the distribution, and the provisioning side of things.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Does that make sense?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I see your point, because we don't want to give people the impression it's overly broad, or really narrow, or whatever, we want to give them the right sense. I think the diagram does a very good job of that. My one hesitation would be that we've only talked about that diagram today, and not everyone is here, but, to me, it's a really great graphic, and pretty non-controversial, I think.

Brad, do you remember was that graphic included in any of the formal responses from RSSAC?

BRAD VERD: Not a formal response, it's directly stolen from the tutorials.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, it's in the tutorials.

BRAD VERD:	RSSAC does the tutorials which are happening today and tomorrow, actually. Obviously the [UNKNOWN] sponsors 'how it works' programs, and one of them is how the root works - that slide is in the tutorial. It has been- [OVERLAP]
RUSS MUNDY:	Maybe- Maybe we can get a couple of slides from- [INTERUPTED]
BRAD VERD:	- has been since the inception of RZERC, because we thought it important to draw where we saw the roles.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. So, Mario, can we make sure we add that graphic.
MARIO ALEMAN:	Mhmm.
BRAD VERD:	RZERC was not around to consult on to see if you agreed or not. [LAUGHTER]
DUANE WESSELS:	[LAUGHTER] Okay, that's a good suggestion, thanks.
	So, Jim, I'll catch you up a little bit - we're going through the draft slides for the public presentation.

JIM REID: Okay-dokey.

DUANE WESSELS: You should have them in your email?

JIM REID: I have.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah? Okay. We're also all watching the monitor reconnect, here.

JIM REID: Okay. I was just wondering if we were actually going to discuss anything about that survey that we had done in the public meeting, or is that just something that- [OVERLAP]

DUANE WESSELS: That's something, we're actually just getting to that, actually.

JIM REID: Really.

DUANE WESSELS: So, in the draft slides here, the slide number 8 - which is titled 'Current Status' - makes a mention of that evaluation of potential topics, and we're amending that to explain why we are doing this exercise.

Then, also I'm suggesting that we add four slides in here, at least four different topics that we have considered from our list. One of them is the location of root servers, which everyone agrees is out of scope. I tried to pick ones that are non-controversial and that people are already aware of, right?

Number 2 would be changes to RSSAC 002 metrics, which was mostly out of scope, in the survey.

The one that was really mixed was adding more TLDs to the root zone. That's one where we did not have agreement, but I think that's an okay one to include in this, because that's obviously a topic on a lot of people's minds.

And, the last one was the root server naming scheme, or, considering alternate naming [UNKNOWN] which is, according to the survey, mostly in scope.

BRAD VERD: If I may, I think that's a perfect example related to a concern that was raised earlier, about the whole system. So, that discussion started in RSSAC, but we've done a document stating there needs to be more work, but the intention is, from that, that this ultimately would come to RZERC, before anything was implemented. That has been the discussion in RSSAC.

EN

So, we would make a recommendation to the board that would include [UNKNOWN] RSSAC. I think that's a good example- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: Do those examples sound okay to everyone? Should I go through them again, or?

PETER KOCH: No, no, that's okay, I was just wondering - I have used the example of the introduction of the [UNKNOWN] as something that would have been RZERC's- [INTERUPTED]

JIM REID: I think that's an easy one-

PETER KOCH: - that's in the past-

JIM REID: - everybody gets it.

DUANE WESSELS: We can include that too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We want to add a slide into the presentation?

EN

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I can work with Mario to work out whether one slide, or many slide, whatever.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. So, this also makes the point that it was overseen by- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, do we want to make that point stronger in the text - that RZERC is filling in the role of NTIA oversight?

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING NEGATIVE RESPONSES]

RUSS MUNDY: I would not be surprised if people asked that question, and I think it's perfectly fine to respond if somebody asks, but it would almost be baiting the audience. [LAUGHTER]

JIM REID: I think something that's possibly worth suggesting as well, is having nothing to do with regular, routine updates the TLDs, for example, the changing of TLD's [UNKNOWN] record set.

DUANE WESSELS: Right, right, right.

JIM REID: Just make that very, very clear, in case anyone's got any doubt about it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

BRAD VERD: So, we've just listed, like, seven slides now. Maybe we don't need that many. It's not- [INTERUPTED]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [LAUGHTER]

DUANE WESSELS: I've got five, I've got five topics.

BRAD VERD: [UNKNOWN]

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Okay.

BRAD VERD: If we added the day-to-day operations.

EN

MARIO ALEMAN: [UNKNOWN]

BRAD VERD: I don't know, I'm just saying we don't want to- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: So this, I mean, Jim's suggestion is different than what I was covering, the sort of things, specific things from our survey that we did.

BRAD VERD: Oh, okay.

DUANE WESSELS: But, Jim's suggestion is good, it's just- [INTERUPTED]

JIM REID: In terms of the overall charters and what this group's all about. Some people may have the perception, you know, that RZERC is taking over from what NTIA used to do, and NTIA did authorise, and have some kind of oversight over those changes to an existing TLD's delegation. RZERC does not do that.

RUSS MUNDY: Right, yeah. It was before you- [OVERLAP]

EN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: it was before Kaved- [OVERLAP]

RUSS MUNDY: I raised the point earlier, about the charters and how things have been divided - that at this point there's not a group that is responsible for that full, broad picture that the NTIA used to take. I asked the folks here just to keep that in mind, and think about it [UNKNOWN] problem, not trying to focus or change anything, but I think you make a very good point in terms of when there was a change in an actual TLD delegation, that was something that NTIA very much got in the middle of.

JIM REID: That's probably the kind of thing that NTIA's- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: I don't think that's fair, but, whatever. [LAUGHTER]

JIM REID: I think, well- [INTERUPTED]

RUSS MUNDY: Well, it was undisputed then, you know, but, any time there was- [INTERUPTED]

EN

DUANE WESSELS:	They were there to make sure that due processes were followed, not to…
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	Yeah.
BRAD VERD:	It was undisputed, [UNKNOWN] there was never a change to the [UNKNOWN]- [INTERUPTED]
JIM REID:	No, no, the fact is they were involved in those delegations changes, NTIA had a role to play in that - for most people, that was probably what they think the NTIA's real role was [UNKNOWN] the root system was. So, we have to make it clear that that NTIA responsibility has gone away, because NTIA is no longer involved in things, but the bulk of those TLD delegation changes has not come to RZERC as a result of that change. That, I think, is an important point to get across.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	In a way, I'd frame it that it's positive [UNKNOWN] transition. The community recognised that there was a need to oversee big changes in how the root zone [UNKNOWN], and RZERC was created as a result. I think- [INTERUPTED]
JIM REID:	I hope someone's making a note of that. [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think you can credit NTIA as being the genesis of the stewardship transition, but I don't think we should focus too much on who did or did not do it in the past. I don't know your view on that, but [UNKNOWN] comprehensive.

PETER KOCH: I also don't think we should emphasis what we're not doing, so.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, look for an update from Mario or myself in the next couple of days that you can review before Wednesday, because I want to get this right for our fist public meeting. Please review it if you see it.

MARIO ALEMAN: They want to me to submit the slides at least 24 hours before the press, okay, so.

DUANE WESSELS: Does that mean no changes after- [INTERUPTED]

MARIA ALEMAN: No changes, because they will be posted.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

MARIO ALEMAN: That's the problem.

DUANE WESSELS: A harsh mistress!

UNKNOWN: [LAUGHTER]

PETER KOCH: It's a rule, it's not the law.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [LAUGHTER]

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING SPEACH]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [UNKNOWN] it's a process - processes can be ignored.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. So, could you go back the agenda?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's fine.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, I'm going to declare that we're done with topic number 5, the presentation with the public meeting. Next, I wanted to talk a little bit about the discussion that Peter and Jim had on the mailing list. Jim, I believe you said something like - Peter, suggested numbering documents, and Jim, you suggested something like 'if we get to that point, we're doing something wrong'. I just wanted to point out that the charter does say that we will number our work documents, so.

JIM REID: Yeah, but I think if we're going to have a situation where we have very frequent changes to documents we've produced, so there's version 4, version 5, version 6, version, 7 - that suggests we're probably doing something wrong.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

JIM REID: So, if we get to that point, we should make a mental note to think about what's going on. That's all.

EN

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, okay.

JIM REID: I've got no objections whatsoever to doing any kind of logically simple scheme for numbering of documents, that's a no-brainer, I'm just saying if we end up having a huge frequency of rapid changes to these documents - lots of version of them - we're probably doing something wrong. That was my point.

DUANE WESSELS: I understand, okay. Then, Peter - you had a specific request to archive the chair selection document. Right?

PETER KOCH: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Which - is it there already? Or not there already?

MARIO ALEMAN: You want to pick it up?

DUANE WESSELS: No, Peter's suggesting to keep it.

PETER KOCH: Well, the question is how we deal with this, since we don't have numbers yet, and we don't have a status attached to them, but, since we copied most of the text and then made some careful adjustments that we discussed, like, the time window for voting, or something, We now have two documents on the list, and outside reader could not know which one is which, because we don't have numbering, we don't have obsoletion marks on anything in there.

So we should keep it some way, it should be available, for historic purposes, I don't know, but we should make clear that this is the current document - maybe we can just split the list? I don't know, I'm open to suggestions. I just wanted to make sure- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: So your point is that it's confusing for someone going there the first time. They wouldn't know which one is in force.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, exactly.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Can we simply just remove those two? Keep it for internal [UNKNOWN], and if we needed it, we can [UNKNOWN].

PETER KOCH: Steve, what do you mean by remove? I mean, I would retain the links, but, maybe under a different section.

STEVE SHENG: Which one are you talking about? Sorry. Chair duty and selection procedure?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. No, the… I need to get to the website, sorry.

STEVE SHENG: It seems like we should add numbers, then if they're obsolete, we should say that they're obsolete.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, so we have latest updates, and- no, document archive and links. So, we have the final charter - we can argue whether that's an RZERC document or not, because we don't have power to change it, but that's a different discussion. We have chair duty and selection procedure, which is- [INTERUPTED]

STEVE SHENG: That one's also the- [INTERUPTED]

PETER KOCH: - which is also the [UNKNOWN]. Then we have the operational procedure, which is either obsolete or supersedes the previous one. We

don't have any information about this- [INTERUPTED] I don't mind which way we do this.

DUANE WESSELS: So, it would satisfy your requirement if we just marked it as obsolete on that list, or, would you rather have two sections?

STEVE SHENG: Well, we can, in the document, we can say 'please go to this section of the operational procedure'.

PETER KOCH: I would rather not touch old documents and- [INTERUPTED] reopen them. Go ahead, sorry.

STEVE SHENG: May I suggest a motion, or whatever the right word is, what the formal thing is - I don't know how formal we are here! That we label the selection procedures as obsoleted, right here on the thing, and maybe put it across the documents, like a watermark on the document, I don't know how we obsolete them, but obsolete it, [UNKNOWN]. Then start numbering the documents.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

PETER KOCH: So the procedure will be 000? [UNKNOWN].

KAVED RANJBAR: That's what we do in RSSAC, and we have no problems.

DUANE WESSELS: I think ICANN has common procedures in other communities, kind of thing. [UNKNOWN] for everyone.

RUSS MUNDY: So we have to pick one - my pick is RSSAC. Having dealt with the SSAC approach, and what the IETF has done over time, and the RSSAC approach - at first I was not real keen about our current RSSAC approach, however, I think it's now, in reflection, the best of the set, so, I would agree with Kaved, the structure that we… Wasn't it you who designed this RSSAC numbering?

KAVED RANJBAR: Yes.

RUSS MUNDY: So, we use the same thing here, that- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: The documents have a number and a version.

RUSS MUNDY: A document number and version, yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: And then the date changes, if I remember correctly, on a new version. The base number remains the same when a version changes, then the increments and the date of that version changes.

PETER KOCH: So, for this particular thing, we could actually say that both document number 0, and one is version 1, and one is the other. I could live with other approaches as well, [UNKNOWN]. We should make sure that we get a number on the other document as well, otherwise we have an un-numbered document in the archive, and that confuses people.

RUSS MUNDY: Well, yeah, we can just class them as obsolete and minimise the changes, because…

PETER KOCH: Oh yeah, we don't go back to the document to edit the numbering.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, great.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I think we have a way forward on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I just make sure - the chair duty and selection procedure, they'll be marked obsolete? And then we gave the [UNKNOWN] procedure [UNKNOWN] the number 000, and the version 1. Is that the agreement?

DUANE WESSELS: That was my understanding.

RUSS MUNDY: We've had two versions of the operational procedures, but the first one- [INTERUPTED]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just the first one.

RUSS MUNDY: Just the first one, yeah- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: And we've had one that's- [INTERUPTED]

RUSS MUNDY: It's obsolete, it's just going to be in the obsolete- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: No, the one that we're marking obsolete - I don't consider it a procedures document. It's only referencing the chair- [OVERLAP] We had to write something down to elect the chair- [OVERLAP] Yeah. To me, it's pre-procedures. To me, not really worthy of a number, because we didn't have the procedures at the time. [OVERLAP] It was a root server [UNKNOWN], yeah.

PETER KOCH: Can I make a suggestion to - because we like designing by committee right now, so that staff like Mario and you can capture this, as in, in the minutes, and then we send this, and then we can think about it, and then do that. Maybe next time, because I don't think that another two weeks will hurt anyone. Sure.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thank you. So, we'll call that item number 6 on the agenda, and, right - number 7, any other business. I had one thing that I thought of recently that I'd like to bring up, which is - for the procedures, we all need to do our disclosures of interest statements. So, I've asked Mario and Steve to help us, remind us, and stay on top of that and make sure we get those done some time soon.

That's my only other business item - anyone else have something to bring up?

RUSS MUNDY: I do have a question for you - could we feel free to use our other statements?

DUANE WESSELS: I would think so, yeah. I would think so. You may want to, you know, not just cut-and-paste- [OVERLAP] No, well, I think - go to our procedures, and make sure that what you write matches what you're expected to submit for RZERC, because I think we omitted something about one standard item that was in some of the other statements of interest [UNKNOWN].

RUSS MUNDY: Ah. Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Because we're all appointed by other organisations- [INTERUPTED]

RUSS MUNDY: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: - there was, yeah, so. Just give it a double check.

RUSS MUNDY: So, maybe, Steve, Mario could point us to the proper paragraph that we need to read, to make sure that-

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING AGREEMENT]

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, that takes us to the end, and - is anyone here not planning to come to the public meeting on Wednesday? The open meeting?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What time is it?

MULTIPLE VOICES: [OVERLAPPING SPEECH]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's 2pm. Wednesday.

RUSS MUNDY: It conflicts with the end of the DNS support workshop, which I'm- [INTERUPTED]

DUANE WESSELS: You're closing?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, I'm closing, so, I probably won't make it.

BRAD VERD: It conflicts with the RSSAC open meeting, also.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [UNKNOWN]

BRAD VERD: [LAUGHTER]

DUANE WESSELS: We'll see who gets more attendees.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Poor planning.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [UNKNOWN], really poor planning.

BRAD VERD: We could combine them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, yeah.

KAVED RANJBAR: Because we don't need, like- [INTERUPTED]

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING SPEECH AND LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [UNKNOWN]

BRAD VERD: Just see if you get the same audience.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING SPEECH]

PETER KOCH: All apologies, we should have flagged this earlier. There's so much overlap now, RSSAC, and SSAC - from a planning perspective, we need to make sure that the public meetings- [INTERUPTED]

BRAD VERD: Yeah, we've got to overhaul all those meetings.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, next time you can have a joint meeting, I think that's a really good idea. I mean, I don't think we need the whole, neither group needs the whole- [INTERUPTED]

BRAD VERD: Neither group needs the whole-

DUANE WESSELS: - the whole time, so.

BRAD VERD: [UNKNOWN]

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so let's wrap up, let's adjourn this meeting, and then we can…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [OVERLAPPING THANKS AND GOODBYES]

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]