
DUANE WESSELS: Mario, please take it away.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Duane, this is Mario for the recording. Welcome to the RZERC Teleconference call on July the 26th of 2018. On the call we have today Duane Wessels, Kim Davies, Brad Verd, Russ Mundy and Peter Koch. We also have Jim, who is on the line, but I am not sure he was able to connect his audio; and from staff Steve Sheng and myself doing the call management. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. Thanks, Mario, hopefully Jim will get -- Is this Jim?

RUSS MUNDY: No, this is Russ, sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: It's Russ, okay. Yeah, so hopefully we'll get Jim by the time we get to the good part of the agenda. So just a quick agenda review today, really we have two sort of important things that we need to talk about. First is the RZERC's respond to the board regarding the KSK Rollover, and second is RZERC's response to OCTO on the proposed Root Zone Evolution Study. Anyone have a need to modify or amend the agenda at this point? Okay doesn't sound like it.

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.

Next let's move to review action items from our June meeting. Mario, I believe you sent those around to everyone, who's had a chance to look at them now, yeah?

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello everyone, this is Mario. Yes I was able to send out the minutes and the draft agenda on previous e-mail acts last week, and I'm going to go ahead and read the action items that we have from the last minutes. I'm sorry, Russ, do you have your, did you just raise your hand?

RUSS MUNDY: Didn't mean to I don't know how that happened.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, no problem. Thank you, Russ. So the first action item that we have in the previous meeting was staff that published the minutes, transcripts and audio recording from the 22nd of May, 2018 teleconference, and the second one staff to create a table that includes appointment terms and updates from RZERC members, and number three Steve to send out a letter to ICANN board about the KSK rollover resolution request and RZERC input, and number four Gene and Russ to start a Google doc as a response to the board on the KSK rollover resolution before the next teleconference call.

Number five, the RZERC Root Zone Management Evolution Study work party members to prepare a proposal as initial response to the OCTO and present in front of the next RZERC teleconference call in July 2018, and last but not least number six, Mario to send out a Doodle Poll for

the selection of the next RZERC teleconference call in July, which is happening right now.

So all of the aforementioned action items have been completed and we have [inaudible] progress the table from the appointment terms and updates from the RZERC members that we'll go and talk a little bit more during the Any Other Business. If you have any questions let me know, thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thank you, Mario. Does anyone have any comments or concerns about the June minutes? Okay. I think we'll take those as good and I'll ask Mario to get them posted to the website at his convenience.

JIM REID: Can everybody hear me now?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I was just going to ask if you're there, Jim. We see you on the Adobe Connect and I can hear you.

JIM REID: Great.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, we --

JIM REID: I had to switch computers. I had to switch computers and the Adobe Connect has for the last five minutes been re-installing, then re-installing it.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, we're glad you made it. We just finished item three on the agenda, and we're just about to get into the good stuff, so...

JIM REID: Okay great stuff, thanks Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah so next on the agenda is RZERC's response to the board on the KSK rollover. I sent out to everyone a link to the Google document, if anyone needs that link right now please let me know and we can put it into the chat. If you already have it I would encourage you to open up that document, and we'll go through it sort of paragraph by paragraph if that's alright.

RUSS MUNDY: I get mine --

DUANE WESSELS: Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, if you could put the link in, I've got so many things in my Google drive it's hard to even find one, so if you have the link handy, yeah please.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Steve just pasted it there.

RUSS MUNDY: Right.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. And so, as background, this document was written by a small group of us, Jim, Russ and myself with some help from Steve and Mario, and we have some things in the document which are sort of not controversial among the three of us, and some things which controversial even among the three of us, and so what I'd like to do today is go through this document and reach consensus with those others on the call regarding this content.

So I'll go through it sort of paragraph by paragraph, for anyone who doesn't have a computer in front of them by chance the opening paragraph says, "RZERC is pleased to respond to this request for a device". The second paragraph says, "Having discussed this topic in our recent meeting, RZERC feels that the tasks and issues surrounding the resumption KSK rollover are well in hand. ICANN has already received a significant amount of input including referencing a few particular things, such as SSAC, the design team reports, community presentations and

public comment period. We also reference upcoming advice from our second SSAC on the same question”.

Next paragraph says that, “RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by SSAC, RZERC, Root Zone Management Partners, and ICANN’s office of the CTO. At this time RZERC does not have significant additional advice to add to what these activities have already provided. Additionally, RZERC is not aware of any reasons for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the KSK rollover”. So that’s sort of the end of the non-controversial text among the office of this document, does anyone who wasn’t a part of the work party have any questions or concerns about those opening paragraphs?

MARIO ALEMAN: Duane, we’re still not in the yellow area, are we?

JIM REID: Just [inaudible], Peter.

DUANE WESSELS: We’re not in the yellow area. Yeah we’re not in the yellow area yet. Okay, so let us proceed to the danger zone, the yellow area. So the first references highlighted here says that, “In the RZERC’s opinion routine rolling of the key setting key for the root zone would not be considered an architectural change to the content of the DNS root zone. The changes to key algorithms would be”. So there’s some disagreement about whether or not we should have this paragraph in the document.

I'll let some of the others speak if they would like to state their position on this.

JIM REID: Well I was just --

RUSS MUNDY: Do you want to go first, Jim, or should I?

JIM REID: Okay, it was my text so I suppose I should go first Russ, then you can rip it to shreds in a minute. I actually thought this has been put -- I think this would important text to add over -- I don't have any strong feelings about it, and that's [inaudible] text turns it to key algorithms lends would be an architectural change.

So in my view, is ruling the key sounding key should be treated the same way as updating an existing delegation, and therefore that should be part of essential routine root server operations, and if it's part of root server operations it should be something for RZERC to bother itself with. That's my basic position on this. But it [inaudible] in all honesty, I think the best thing to do here is just delete all the yellow text, and I mean all of it, not just that paragraph.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so I've noted a proposal from Jim to delete all the controversial text. Cutting this call short I suppose, but let's have a little bit of a

discussion anyway. I know Peter's got his hand raised, but Jim I think -- I'm sorry Russ I think you were also ready to say something about this?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, I guess I'd like to just speak more less what I wrote up as the strong objection to this. This particular three lines, first is that Arthur Charter says risks to the architecture and operation of the DNS root zone, and I think especially for the very first time that the KSK is rolled. There is certainly some risk about things in the root zone, and therefore I don't think it really fits our charter and charter requirements for the group to say that this rollover of the KSK is just a routine operational thing, and we don't really want to see it.

The other reason is since in fact we're as a group, and I think in the ICANN sort of ecosystem of things it's not clear exactly what RZERC should and shouldn't be doing, but it seems that we're way too early in sort of the existence of this body to sort of say, "This is an automatic pass for RZERC, don't tell us about it in the future". So those are really my two pieces of why I think that it would be not appropriate for RZERC to have this particular third rep in. So I'll stop there, let others chime in with what they might want to say.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thanks Russ. Peter, is your hand still up? Did you --

PETER KOCCH:

Okay, yes it is. Do you want me to go?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, please.

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you. So when I read this I was wondering why a statement to that far extent would actually be called for. So first I think that the -- if we were at the point where a regular key rollover for the root KSK had been discussed and agreed upon, the subsequent rollovers would probably be operational, and under that circumstance I would agree with what is written here. However, regular KSK rollovers have not really been discussed very far I think, we still might want to have experience with the 5011 rollover and I think that is something that needs a bit more attention.

Maybe it was a good idea at its time, but some of the operational environments have been -- has changed and to the extent I would be very hesitant to actually give whoever is asking for this carte blanche for going ahead. Again, if it is decided at some point in time to regularly roll, that would be operational, but I don't think we are there yet. Also the question of decision making in this whole process still has some interesting questions that might need a bit of understanding or investigation, especially the threshold issues and then how do we deal with threshold that we don't understand, or that give unexpected results and so on and so forth.

I understand that many of the details have been resolved by clever research and the brains and knowledge of so many people, but I'd be hesitant to say, "Well don't bother us with this anymore, we're out". So

I would appreciate at least to delete this first paragraph and let's see when we can do the others to deal with the rest of the yellow text.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. Jim?

JIM REID: I think Kim had his hand up first.

KIM DAVIES: So I think my opinion is very similar. I don't think this is sort of the correct definition of what would be spoken out of scope, which is kind of implicitly what that paragraph seems to do that. I think if we did want to include language I would focus on something along the lines of, such a rollover would be considered routine if the rollover is performed with previously exercised and proven parameters.

You know it's not routine and until it's been proven to be accomplished with that same environment. So I'm perfectly fine with that paragraph being deleted, but I think if we did include it we should focus on that the second step under which the rollovers been done has been otherwise proven in the past.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Okay, Jim, do you have something else to say about this paragraph again?

JIM REID: Two things; first of all, I would not consider the initial key [inaudible] [inaudible] to be a routine operation, and I think that already builds on the comments of both Kim, Russ and Peter already said. But I think the sensible thing to do here is just delete the text. I think the shorter and crisper we make this document the better. I think get it to two or three paragraphs, I think we'll be doing very well. So let's just delete it and be done with it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Unless anyone wants to argue for it, we will plan on deleting it.

JIM REID: Thanks, Duane. I think I was the only one arguing for it, so let's just get rid of it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Okay, so the next paragraph is a reference to SSAC063, which is, I think it's from 2013 if I remember correctly, it's sort of an older document discussing the rollover. I believe this was -- This is something we talked about in our end person meeting in Panama, was maybe including a reference to this. So that's what this is. I think Russ you support this, I think Jim, you don't support this, if I remember correctly.

JIM REID: I don't think it adds any adds [inaudible]. I think the document is improved by the [inaudible].

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, and this is, sorry since you asked Duane, I'm really on the fence, or am sort of leaning towards removing this section, because we did already reference SSAC063 and too pert refs. So it's already included as recognizing that it's important things, and I was a little puzzled by why it was identifying just a single recommendation, there were five recommendations in there.

So I'm very much in agreement with the idea that shorter is better, and unless we have a strong reason for picking out a particular recommendation from SSAC063, I think this portion of text should probably just be dropped. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Happy to do that, unless anyone would like to make a case that it should remain. Okay. So moving on, the next paragraph was written by me which references something that Matt Larson said during his presentation -- his recent presentation at ICANN meeting. It shows that they were going to investigate and document how popular validators react when root zone trust anchors change. So I just -- First I quote from his presentation and said that RZERC felt it was important work. Again, I think it sounds like based on the comments in the document Jim and Russ would both advocate for removing it at this time?

JIM REID: Yeah, well I would for sure. And remember that what we're doing here is giving advice to the board, and I think this is not strictly speaking

advice to the board that's within our limit. Sure what Mark's doing and what OCTO's doing is very important, and we'll be glad to see the results of that when it's ready, but I don't think it's germane to our advice to the board on KSK rollover.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, this is Russ. I had a similar view, but also from kind of the scope of our perspective here. From the overall root zone perspective and how kind of in total the root zone would operationally function, yes I think this paragraph does address an important issue and what Matt talked about is a very important thing, but I would see this more if it's going to be spoken about and one of the responses is, it would be more fitting for RZERC because the provisioning part of the root zone was architecturally and operationally I'm not sure would be that heavily impacted by what the resolvers do and what the studies yield. So that was kind of my thoughts for deleting it. Again, it doesn't exactly -- doesn't seem to fit the charter of RZERC or scope of the question that we were asked.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks Russ. Peter, I'll note that you want to go, let me just respond to one thing that Russ said though. Yeah basically Russ you're saying that this doesn't impact the provisioning of where sort of RZERC's role is. Right, but really very few things in the rollover do I would say.

RUSS MUNDY: I very much agree with you, Duane, but the -- although the most important part of the rollover actually is the rollover mechanisms itself takes place within the RZERC scope of interest, but what the resolvers do once that different zone gets published, I don't -- that's what I don't see as being within the RZERC role itself, even though the role itself I believe follows smack dab in the center of the provisioning part.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So I guess what I hear you saying is that from RZERC's point of view all that matters is that the zone gets correctly published, and sort of what happens after that is someone else's problem.

RUSS MUNDY: I guess I would say that there is some I'll say secondary impacts that could happen if there were some kind of big problem with resolvers out there, where the rollback plan had to be put into effect. Because clearly the RZERC function and all we would be involved in that, but I think that would be something that would come from the -- what's being seen and observed in the RSF itself rather than in the RZERC, and if the determination was made rollback had to happen, obviously those functions would occur in the RZERC scope, but it's like a secondary effect rather than a direct effect if that makes sense.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thank you. So I would join the people who suggest to remove this, and I give my reasoning with this slightly overlapping with what I heard, but slightly different maybe. One is practically speaking, we're asking back a question or we are saying, "Yes we would like to see the results of this work".

Now I'm not sure what message that sends to the board, does that mean that we would like to see the results of the work and then make a decision, and ask the board to postpone any rollover? I don't think that's what we want to say. I have no issues with us adding some diplomatic language, appreciating the work of say OCTO or whoever was involved, but this is kind of the again, diplomatic sugar that fits into this.

So from that perspective, I don't think this paragraph is actually giving advice to the board that the board is looking into, and this probably also holds for the next paragraph, if I may jump ahead. We are much into technical detail there and I'm not really sure that is the abstraction level that RZERC is expected to deal with or live on. So to that extent again, the next paragraph asks a question and in the sequence of events, I'm not sure how the board would or should interpret being asked a question again once they get our submission by the deadline. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thank you, Peter. Russ, go ahead, your hand is up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, thank you. Peter brings up what I think is a very interesting point that I personally had given a lot of consideration of and that is, it might be appropriate for RZERC to add some of the diplomatic sugar, as I think Peter was suggesting, that included recognition of the extensive work that's been done by ICANN and particularly the OCTO, and that we understand there will be information collected during the rollover and we would be very interested in seeing the results of that. Or some words to that effect. Is that the sort of thing you had in mind Peter?

PETER KOCH: Sorry, it was hard to unmute. Yeah, kind of. I'm not sure that is asked for in such a communication and it would probably -- The extent of this - - how do you say that? Appreciation of third party efforts would have to be in line with the rest of our text I think. So if we have a very short and crisp answer then we might even not want to add this, but if we think it's important than we can do it. I do have some suggestion for added text though, but I'll postpone that until we get to the point.

BRAD VERD: Hey Duane, can I say something please.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh yeah, please.

BRAD VERD:

Sorry, I'm not in Adobe so I can't put my hand up, so I've got to interrupt. Apologies. I'm not -- how do I say this? I feel like I'm not sure this document is the place to stink other parties, however, speaking to this text alone I think -- Well I think everybody agrees that the resolvers are not in the scope of RZERC. Certainly you can qualify it by saying, "We know this isn't in scope of RZERC, however, we hope the board is taking into consideration the results of the data, or whatever the findings are that are coming from this data, as we believe it's important to the overall health of the root server system".

Right, I mean I think it's dangerous for us, and I say us as a whole, meaning Russ you're in a unique position of spanning all three groups between SSAC, RSSAC an RZERC. If we only comment on our own little world and without kind of hoping -- and hope that the other guys are covering the bases, than we should make sure the other guys are covering the bases. If we're not checking to make sure the other guys are covering the bases and we're just going to say this is not in our scope, I think that maybe isn't the best approach.

DUANE WESSELS:

Are we good with that?

BRAD VERD:

I guess what I'm saying is I don't think we can over communicate that's all, even if it's not in our scope. We can say it's not in our scope, and we say we believe it's important, and I think that's perfectly fine to do. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks Brad. Jim, you have a response?

JIM REID: Well Brad, we already have that text in the previous paragraph, the one that remains. That first sentence is, "The RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by SSAC, RSAC, the root zone management partners, and OCTO". That pretty much covers off everything.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, and I might disagree. I'm just saying that if we believe -- That this statement's here because somebody thought it was important. If we believe it's important even though it's not part of our scope, I think it's okay to say it just by saying, "We know this is out of our scope, but we believe or we think that the work that OCTO is doing is important, and we hope the board takes it into consideration" or something like that. I don't know, I didn't write the language. To me it's not the end of the world if it stays in is what I'm saying. That's all I'm trying to get across. If we qualify it.

JIM REID: I just thing that overall we're making [inaudible] part, sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Russ, why don't you go ahead, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thanks Duane. Yeah I am fine with the approach you're suggesting Brad in terms of -- with the -- for those things that we as RZERC see as important overall to the operation of the root zone, or the functioning of the root zone in particular, I think it's perfectly fine to point out things that folks need to pay attention to. Especially in the going forward perspective where this is something in this particular paragraph that Mat had talked about at the last ICANN meeting, but the work itself is something that is ongoing future type of thing.

So I would have no problem of having some words that addressed in that manner for the overall good, or the overall proper functioning and operation. Even if it's not directly in our charter it would be encouraged work and we would appreciate getting a chance to see results, or something like that.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. So while listening to this, and thanks Brad in particular for bringing this up; I wonder whether we might want to point out that we are kind of late in the game for a reason here. My impression from the previous discussion was that we were not so much inclined to give the board a clear marching order saying, "Everything is fine, just go ahead, don't worry".

The way that I see and / or hear these encouragements worded might be read in that particular way. So just as a counterweight maybe we

want to point out that, while under normal circumstances not being in a position, RZERC might have, not intervened, but taken responsibility for this from early on.

The particular circumstances of this rollover and it's overlap, or interaction with the IANA transition brings us in a -- I can say but we won't write unfortunate position to just enter this game, and to this a bit late without wanting to sound like complaining or something like that. Just to make sure that there's a reason that we've remained silent so far, and from the start this had not been put in our hands, because we didn't exist when this all started.

DUANE WESSELS:

Peter, you're talking about something sort of for this response in general, not necessarily in this particular paragraph that we're talking about, is that right?

PETER KOCH:

Yes and no. So indeed it would be a more general remark, but it was triggered by me reading this, or hearing this kind of encouragement of the work of the other entities. If we do that we might want to still cover our necks a bit by saying, "Yeah but don't take this an unconditional endorsement of what was going on".

Bluntly speaking -- Well still we are recorded, but then again, bluntly speaking I want RZERC to be the one and only entity that said, "Yes go ahead, no problem". But there are some uncertainties and some risks to take and I'm not sure that we should take them instead of the board.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Peter ,what did you say? You said you want RZERC to be the only one to say, "Go ahead", or you don't want? I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you when you said that.

PETER KOCH: Sorry about that. The negative. So I do not want RZERC to be the one and only entity that says, "Just go ahead".

BRAD VERD" Got it, thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright so this, does anybody have their hands up. I feel like this discussion is sort of expanding and broadening in scope where really what we need to be doing is tightening up this document, and really we

need to reach consensus on it so we can turn in our homework. So Jim what's your feedback at this point?

JIM REID:

Two points I need to make here. First of all and you already said Pete, is we seem to be drifting off a little bit. Please bear in mind and I think to everybody is that we've been asked by the board for our opinion on the KSK rollover plan. I think we should contain ourselves to that specific topic and my personal view on that particular topic is, we should not express an opinion way or the other.

I think we can just say as the people that have done the analysis, naming the people already mentioned earlier, that'll draft a response, SSAC, RSAC and so on, are the only ones that have done the analysis and let them be the ones to give advice to the ICANN board on whether this is a go ahead or not. We've got nothing to add to that. That's what we're really saying and I think we should just leave it at that.

DUANE WESSELS:

And that matches what we sort of talked about in Panama, was that RZERC -- that this response was going to be very neutral, I thought. I guess along those lines I have a question for the group about paragraph -- it's not in yellow, but it's the one right before the yellow starts which contains a double negative, which says, "RZERC is not aware of any reasons for not resuming the plan". Is that the same as saying RZERC says go ahead?

JIM REID: No, it's not, it just says we don't know of any reason to stop it. It doesn't mean to say there aren't any reasons, there may well be reasons, but we don't know what they are.

DUANE WESSELS: Russ go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. I agree with a Jim's response to your last question that it's not the same thing as saying, "Just go ahead and do it". There are various ways that you can sort of nuance what set of words you put out there, and I think what this particular sentence says is that from what RZERC is aware of, or knows at this particular time, there is no reason to not resume the plan and continue on time. And so it's not saying, "Do it".

Now one of the things we do not say in here is whether -- that it's still a board responsibility. I think with the way the question was asked from the board and the fact that it came as a board resolution, I do not think that it's necessary for us to say that. Some people think it is appropriate to include words like that in the response, I don't. But I don't know if folks have a view on that with respect to what RZERC says in reply.

So you said neutral? Yes neutral from the sense of not making the board's decision for them, but it's not just plain vanilla neutral because there's no reason to not do it. So in my mind that infers, "Go forward and do it". We don't say it that way, but that's what the inference is.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright thanks Russ. It sounds like you were saying there are people who feel that it should be clearly stated that that's the board's decision. That's probably something that's happening in SSAC because I haven't heard anyone say that who's in RZERC.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes it is.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Alright, well --

RUSS MUNDY: And that activity in the SSAC realm comes from the concern of some of the people in SSAC leadership roles, that the board was trying to shuffle off responsibility for making that decision themselves to the SSAC. You know, "You guys are the security experts, you guys should tell us". And I think that's why that feeling is so present in the SSAC.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Well so I think we need to sort of come to closure here on this and there was a proposal from Jim to delete all the yellow paragraphs, and the discussion, I didn't hear a lot of support for any of these. So in the interest of getting this document out. What do people think about that? Just clearing these out and being done with it. Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Well that was actually going to be myself --

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, yeah.

RUSS MUNDY: Just not include the yellow paragraphs like Jim suggested before. Make it tight and then I think we have a document we can agree to. Although earlier I think Peter said he might have some additional text that he wanted to it.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, yeah. I just remembered. Peter you have any reference to introducing some new text?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. So what I think might be mentioned, and again, that was more or less to counterweight -- to put counterweight to all the enthusiasm that I am exaggerating, but I sensed the encouragement and so on and so forth. One thing that might be mentioned is that the efforts of outreach and getting operator feedback and feedback from the affected parties did not result in an overwhelming number of responses.

This is just an observation and not trying to put blame on anybody, especially not the involved parties on the side of ICANN or the committees, but that is obviously something that in the long term should be thought about. And since this question of, "Have all parties been involved in the discussion" is in our charter, I would assume that

this is appropriate for RZERC to mention, even if we don't have an immediate solution to that.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, so you're suggesting to make the observation that there was not a lot of input from certain parties, certain groups. But again, to me that seems a little bit outside of the goal of providing advice to the specific question from the board, which was the reason given for removing some of these other programs, yes? Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks. This area of outreach and engagement of communities and so forth, has been discussed extensively and in fact to somewhat lesser extent in the RZERC -- RSAC carcass, but RSAC has talked about it a lot, has had a lot of interactions with various ICANN staff about it. And I think the limited input or outreach that you may be thinking about Peter, and responses are comments that have come in to the formal plan and comments on the KSK roll mailed out list.

There is a very, very large body of outreach activity that has gone on. Beyond, that there's a whole plan on it and a lot of things that actually have been done. So I think if RZERC wants to say something in terms of, "Gee it wasn't as good as it could be", we need to I think research well where that statement would be coming from. Did you have other examples in mind besides the KSK rollover list and the comments on the plan itself Peter?

PETER KOCH: I'll respond straightly if I may Jim?

JIM REID: Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH: So I explicitly did not mean to criticize or blame ICANN staff, and I also did not mean to say that there wasn't enough discussion and consideration given to outreach. The observation that the comments received -- The formal comments received if I remember correctly, most of them were submitted by people I do know personally, which is probably not a good sign, because that also holds for the rest of the committee.

So without going into any reasoning or root cause analysis or whatever for this, what we could say is that there were attempts to, maybe numerous or various, wide attempts to get that feedback, but for some reason again, to put it into colloquialisms people were interested that didn't raise concerns.

DUANE WESSELS: I'm going to jump in here in the interest of time. I think Peter since we don't have actual text at this point that we can chew on, I think it's probably a little bit late to add this to the document and we need to get it out the door, and I want to get through the rest of the agenda in the next six minutes, which is probably unrealistic. Is that okay with you Jim, or did you have something really important to say?

JIM REID: No, carry on, Duane, I'm just about to say to Peter is I think Peter is trying to prove a double negative here, and I think it's better if we don't mention the comments that Peter made. Yes for Peter's sake it's valid, but I don't think it's appropriate to bring to the document at this time given the deadline that we've got to actually get this document across to the ICANN board.

And I repeat what I said earlier in the previous paragraph and Peter's sentence, he's paragraph, "The RZERC is confident the assessments made by all the people who've done the assessments work already". So if that's not been comprehensive enough, than we should withdraw that paragraph as well and I don't think we should do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thanks. So let's if it's okay with everyone, I'll move on to the next topic on the agenda. We're probably going to go over time a little bit if we can. So there was a small work party that met to formulate a response to the OCTO on the root zone evolution works. OCTO is stated in that call and essentially what we came up with was to come up with a response to OCTO, and invite them to our next meeting in August to address our response, and basically have a higher bandwidth communication with them. So that party was Russ, and Howard, and who else? Peter?

PETER KOCH: Me, Peter, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So has any progress been made on our written response, you know our draft response to them, do either of you know?

RUSS MUNDY: I don't know that there has been any progress to get text down on the response.

DUANE WESSELS: Do you think that --

RUSS MUNDY: Howard had the beginning text. Well if we can finish our response to the board question, then this becomes -- can become our next and highest priority item. So maybe it can get more attention. It's in my view --You know Howard gave us a bunch of templates to begin with, and we're having that discussion, there's this -- I think it's reasonable to, especially if we set ourselves a goal of having the invitation to the response, and the invitation out about two weeks prior to when our August meeting would be. I see Peter's hand is up. Yeah so I don't know what is, but go ahead yeah?

PETER KOCH: Sorry Russ, I didn't mean to interrupt, I just wanted to add, so just please finish your contribution.

RUSS MUNDY: Go ahead.

PETER MUNDY: Okay, fine. I'm not sure how far the other members of the committee have been following this, but and I didn't hear you saying that Russ or Duane. There were concerns about the translation of the initial set-up of this study, or the definition of the study of the transition documents into the proposal for the study itself in terms of the description of the scope, and then some wording that looked or sounded like a pre-emption of the results in terms of what might or might not be a valid result, or a valid recommendation as output of the study, in terms of no big changes and costs needs to be considered and so on and so forth. But since, and I hope I reflect this correctly.

Since we've believed that these were more or less translation issues, or wording issues, the idea was borne to invite the OCTO team or the people actually working on this to the RZERC meeting, to resolve these interpretation or wording issues and maybe get to the gist of it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So I think tentatively let's plan on inviting the OCTO folks to the August meeting, unless something changes. I suppose we can always postpone that if we need to, but let's plan on that if that's okay with the two of you.

RUSS MUNDY: Fine with me.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

JIM REID: I mean it's fine with me, but I wonder if we really need to be pushing this so quickly. I would imagine that OCTO is going to be so busy with the KSK rollover that they're not going to want to spend any time on anything else that can be pushed back until after that's out of the way. Why the haste?

DUANE WESSELS: Well Jim, to be honest, I've received two or three e-mails from Ed Lewis asking me about this. What is RZERC thinking? It says if you just tell me the questions I can answer them right away, so his eager to get this going I guess, so that's partly where this is coming from.

JIM REID: Okay. Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, moving on to any other business. I have a topic on here which is re-appointment of RZERC members. Myself and the staff have drafted a letter, which is going to sent out to all of the appointing organizations shortly. I actually have nine or so draft e-mail windows open and shortly after this call is over I will hit send.

Those letter basically ask for clarification from each appointing organization regarding the terms, the term limits, the start dates for each appointment, and we have a spreadsheet set up to track all those values. In the case of IETF I know Jim that you were recently appointed and we have that letter already from Ted so we don't really need one from him, but we're expecting from all of the other appointing organizations.

Lastly let's talk about RZERC's next meeting. Our default date would put us on October 20th, which is a Monday, and I'm planning on being on vacation that day, so it's not a good day for me. That doesn't mean you couldn't have a meeting without me, but it might be a good idea to seek an alternative date anyway. As a starting point how does the week prior look for people in general, the week of the 13th through the 17th? It will be okay to have a doodle poll for some day in that week?

PETER KOCH: Works for me.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. So I'll ask Mario to set up a poll for a meeting that week, and see where we end up. It sort of shortens the time I guess for the meeting with OCTO regarding the root zone evolution study. If we can't do it the week of the 13th through the 17th, then we'll probably have to push it back to the last week in August which that would be fine too.

PETER KOCH: I need to drop off if we're finished anyway I hope.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, let's wrap it up, we're a little bit over time. Thanks everyone. I'll call the meeting adjourned and we'll see you in the next call.

JIM REID: Cheers guys. Bye-bye.

DUANE WESSELS: Bye.

RUSS MUNDY: Bye.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]