MARIO ALEMAN:	Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much, Duane. We'll wait for a couple more minutes.
DUANE WESSELS:	Hey, Mario, why don't we get started with the roll call? I'm not sure who's on it or if we're still waiting for a new one or not.
MARIO ALEMAN:	Okay. Perfect. Thank you, Duane. Hello, everyone. This is Mario. I'm the administrator for the RZERC Teleconference call.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RZERC Teleconference call on the 19th of June, 2017 at 7:00 UTC.

On the list of participants, we have Duane Wessels, Jim Reid, Kaveh Ranjbar, Kim Davies, Peter Koch, Russ Mundy, and Trang Nguyen.

On staff, we have Kathy Schnitt, [inaudible], Steve Sheng, and myself, Mario Aleman, the administrator.

We have apologies from Carlos Martinez and we have no interpretation on this call.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for our recording. I appreciate, actually, at the end that you disconnect all remaining lines.

	With this, I'd like to turn it over to you, Duane. You can begin the call. Thank you.
DUANE WESSELS:	All right. Thanks, Mario. First on our agenda today is… Who just joined?
BRAD VERD:	This is Brad. Sorry I'm late.
DUANE WESSELS:	Hi, Brad. No problem. We're just going to start with the first item on the agenda, which is to review action items from the previous meetings, Mario.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[Great].
MARIO ALEMAN:	Thank you, Duane. On action items from the last call on the 22nd of May, 2017, we had staff to publish the minutes and transcript [analogy] recording from the 4th of April 2017 teleconference call. Staff to edit and add as well all the comments and suggestions from RZERC members to the operational procedures based on the feedback. [inaudible] a clean and redline versions of the operational procedures document with RZERC members. All of these action items have been resolved, and we also have shared a clean version and redline version of the operational procedures a few days ago.

EN

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask me. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you. The next is to review the minutes from the main meeting. Do you have those to put into the Adobe Connect to share with us?

MARIO ALEMAN: Sure. Would you like the minutes from the previous teleconference or the 4th of April or the 22nd of May?

DUANE WESSELS: I was talking about the 22nd of May's – the ones we need to approve. Maybe we don't need to put them in the room, but we do need to approve them.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay. Excellent.

DUANE WESSELS: Does anyone have any concerns about the May meeting minutes? If not, is someone willing to make a motion to approve?

BRAD VERD: I'll motion. It's Brad.

DUANE WESSELS: [Thank you,] Brad.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I second it. It's Kaveh.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Kaveh. Any objections to approving these minutes?

All right. So let's take them as approved, Mario, and have them published at your convenience, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much. [inaudible], Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Item #3C on the agenda was just the meeting minutes, correct? So now we're on to Item #4, which is really our only business for this meeting, which is to continue discussing the operational procedures document.

As Mario said, he shared a copy with you – a draft copy – that he and Steve and I worked on together and made a number of changes. We did get some feedback from a few of you on that copy. Some of that feedback we were able to incorporate easily. Other feedback I feel like we need to discuss on the call today.

Let's start with some feedback from Kim Davies. Kim, you made a suggestion about [inaudible] about the mailing list. The archive is open

to just changing the word "open" to "public." I think that's a reasonable change. So that has already been made, I believe, in our draft. Correct, Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes. That's correct, Duane. That's in our draft.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you. Kim's next suggestion was around the voting procedures – voting for the Chair, I believe. We had previously discussed changing this from 24 to 48, and the concern is, if even 48 hours is sufficient – Kim, I believe your suggestion was, say, for a week?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. That's right. The general gist of my comment was that, if we think 24 hours is too aggressive – I think it is – 48 hours probably has essentially similar problems. Given that the elections shouldn't ever need to be time-critical, I'm proposing a longer duration that, while it doesn't cater for every possible eventuality, should allow people to travel comfortably – take holidays comfortably – without needing to constantly check if something needs their attention.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Would anyone like to speak against saying a week for the voting instead of 48 hours?

All right. So that seems like a reasonable suggestion. Thank you, Kim. We'll take that.

Kim, your next suggestion in Section 5.2: the wording was "perhaps at the next regular scheduled meeting." I had a call with Mario and Steve on Friday where – I guess it was just you and I, Mario – we discussed changing perhaps to the word "preferably." However, I notice that I think Jim has some feedback on this section also. Is that correct, Jim? You suggested deleting this all together?

JIM REID: Yes. I think that's a clearer solution, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I can go either way on this. Does anyone feel strongly about deleting this phrase versus keeping this phrase? The context for this, by the way, is in reviewing proposals that come before RZERC.

Okay. It sounds like there's not really a strong opinion for keeping it, so I suggest that we delete it. Or Jim suggests it.

Next we have some feedback from Peter. I think, Peter, a lot of these we need to talk through. Do you want to state your case? The first one was about transparency and putting the procedures document up for public comment.

Peter, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

MARIO ALEMAN:	Hello, Duane. This is Mario. I would like to suggest or just give a general recommendation that the better quality and communication with the bridge is basically by calling into the number that is provided by Verizon. So please make sure to dial in to enable your conversation in the AC room. Thank you.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. Well, I don't know –
PETER KOCH:	Can you hear me?
DUANE WESSELS:	Yeah, we can hear you. Go ahead, Peter.
PETER KOCH:	Okay. Sorry. I followed that advice and I'm double audio now. That might be a bit weird. Anyway – sorry. Okay.
DUANE WESSELS:	Peter, it sounds like you're maybe fiddling with your audio. We don't hear you at the moment.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Let me try this way.

DUANE WESSELS: We can hear you. Can you go ahead?

PETER KOCH: Okay. What were the actual questions then?

DUANE WESSELS: I'm asking you to state your case for why the Procedures document should go through the community review process.

PETER KOCH: Okay. The issues here is that I can hear you, Duane, very barely on the phone line but very well on the audio line in the Adobe room. So I was trying to combine those and that gives very odd results. Anyway, side remark.

First and foremost, the whole thing about this committee is doing transparency and being very open about what we do. We have seen that a couple of people have been asking already what RZERC would be doing. They seem to be curious as to what this committee is about. I think the openness would help against whatever reservations there might be. It's also just good practice within the ICANN committees, to my understanding, especially since the state of this committee is a bit odd compared to others. RZERC isn't really a Board committee as per the Bylaws. It exists in a weird state. The Board has approved the

charter, but nowhere does it say that the committee is in line with all the other ACs or SOs. So it stands a bit in contrast, for example, the CSC, which definitely is mentioned in the Bylaws. This already confuses people, and we should avoid more confusion by being as open as we can.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. Jim, I know you have some strong opinions on this also. Would you like to speak next on this?

JIM REID: Yes. Thanks, Duane. I think openness and transparency is all very well, but in this particular case, I think, Peter, there's [misguidance]. There are essentially two main concerns I have here. First of all, our charter, such as it is just now, clearly states that the only circumstance that we're actually empowered to run public consultations is when there are considered changes to the root system which may involve some kind of potential risk. If we try to step over that line, I think we could potentially get into all sorts of trouble by overstepping our authority. I don't think we should do that.

Secondly, I think this creates a very, very dangerous precedent because then we're discussing the internal workings of the committee and exposing them to public scrutiny and having public consultations on them. If we start doing that for a Procedures document, I think it's the start of a very, very slippery slope. We'll end up having to do public consultations on just about anything else we ever do, such as the appointment of a new Chairman or whenever we actually have some

deliberations on any particular issues to do with any potential changes to the root. I simply think we don't need to do that.

We've been appointed by various sectors of organizations or constituencies to think important thoughts about the root server system whenever people ask us to do that. I think we should be trusted to [inaudible] thought. We have that kind of community support and recognition already, and we should just [inaudible] to go on with it. I don't think in this case that it's necessary, and it's probably very undesirable to have some kind of community consultation phase. I think it's a very bad idea, and we should think very, very carefully before we start to do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Jim. Russ, you have your hand raised?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, I did, Duane. Thank you. I would say that, if we put our operating procedures out for public comment review as Peter has suggested, that would perhaps make RZERC even more unique than it already is because, to the best of my knowledge, the various ICANN activities do not ask for public consultation on their procedures.

Now, maybe it sounds [inaudible] more than they do, but we do have the information that is visible since we decided to make our mailing list public. Because procedures are something that we as a committee can change at any point in time in any way that we see fit, I would be more inclined to proceed to complete them using our open mailing list so

people, if they are curious, can see what's going on, and then publicize through both our organizations that we go back to, as well as maybe an announcement on that daily ICANN news feed or something, that the procedures exist and that they are there.

If people want to provide inputs to us, they can do so, but it won't stop us from getting our initial procedures established and put out because, if they think we should have done public consultation, that can be one of the inputs they provide to us. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Russ. My personal opinion sort of matches Russ' and Jim's. I feel like the community has given us their input via the chartering process and should trust us to get the procedures right and speak up if we don't.

Peter, were any of us able to convince you to change your mind?

Peter, we can't hear you if you're speaking.

PETER KOCH: I'm sorry. Does it work now?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Sorry about this. This setup is a bit weird. Apologies again.

What I would have said was that it looks a bit odd to me that a committee that is specifically tasked to encourage public comments and input would feel this very public input at this very moment for the so-called operational procedures.

I disagree that these operational procedures are only for our inner workings. In part they are, but I think we've already identified issues that aren't completely internal. I refer to the conflict of interest topic. More importantly, there's the question on how input that is directed to RZERC would have to would have to be submitted and structured, which is also part of the Procedures document. So that argument doesn't really convince me.

Now, how big and how complicated we would do this is something to consider, as in draft something and tell the public that they have time until a certain point to voice their opinion and then continue from there. That is something I think we could live with, or I could live with, depending on how the details looked like. But saying that it's dangerous to receive public input to the procedures does not at all convince me.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know where "dangerous" comes from. Maybe that was Jim, and I'll let him speak to that. To me, our Procedures document is largely just based off the charter anyway. There's 40% new material, and 60% is from the charter. So I don't believe that we're afraid of public input here, but to me it's a matter of efficiency. We've already been meeting for three or four months, and we're not even to the point where we

have a Procedures document yet. I feel like this is going to slow us down.

Jim, did you want to say anything else, or should we move on? [inaudible].

JIM REID: Well, yes –

DUANE WESSELS: Well, Brad has a question next.

JIM REID: Thanks, Duane. I did not say that this was dangerous at all. I think it's unwise and unwelcome. I think it sets a very, very strange and unwelcome precedent if we were to go down that path. I have no problem whatsoever with us agreeing amongst ourselves with the Operational Procedures document is going to look like and then publishing it. Of course we can do that. But actually having a community consultation on the Procedures document steps us outside what we're supposed to do and also means that we've got the potential then that we have to do this any time this committee has any other work to do A suggestion Steve was commenting – the other committees don't do that, so why should we do it?

DUANE WESSELS:	Kaveh, I see your hand is up. I'm going to speak to the comments in the chat real quick. Brad asked if there are any other committees that put their procedures up for public comment. Steve is responding that, as far as he knows, there are none. Is that correct, Steve?
STEVE SHENG:	Yes, that's correct.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay.
STEVE SHENG:	Also, the CSC does not either.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. Kaveh, go ahead.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	I also don't think we need the proper public comments, but I have a more general question. Have we documented anywhere, if someone wants to reach this committee, how they can? Or is it open for someone from the public to reach out and ask a question? Because I understand Peter's concern that, in general, in order to support openness, we cannot just say we are transparent. We should also have at least some kind of input. If people find something in the procedures, they can let us know. We might completely ignore it, but I think we should have that input channel.

DUANE WESSELS: Kaveh, I don't think we do have anything like that at this point. In the procedures and the charter, all of the inputs into RZERC come from its committee members and liaisons.

Brad, you have your hand up.

BRAD VERD: You beat me to it. I was going to say that we represent all the different parts of the community, and we should bringing any concerns that are raised by our constituency back here. That's how I believe the inputs come in.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Good. Then if we somehow document it – "If there's any comments or concerns, please contact your liaison or contact your constituency" – then that's good. I don't think we need to go for the public comment for –

BRAD VERD: That's in the charter. That's not part of any operational procedure for others to – that's in the charter, right? That's implied in the charter.

JIM REID: We could put something on the web page that just says, "Here's an e-mail address to contact us if you can't make co-representations to your community representative."

BRAD VERD: Is that our only concern here? How to get inputs into us? And we need to document it somewhere? And if we do that, then this discussion about public comment goes away? Or is there something else?

Peter, if you're talking, we can't hear you.

DUANE WESSELS: Go ahead, Russ. You have your hand up. Peter, we want to hear from you if you got your audio working.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. I wanted to say that I just did a quick search on a common search engine. ICANN, RZERC, and our page showed up right up front. I clicked on it, and it seems like, if we want to take explicit action to let people know that we're working on our procedural document, we could put an entry on the page there because there's also the entry that points right to the mailing list.

I guess I'm more much in line with what Brad was just describing than what I think I heard Peter say earlier, where a big part of our job is to collect public input. I don't think so. I think our job is to know as much as can know about the root zone system, interact with the organizations we're representing, and get input from them. If we hear other input, that's fine, but I don't think our charter includes seeking broad public input. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter, any chance you're able to speak? I'll give you the last word if you want. Otherwise, we should move on.

PETER KOCH: Can you hear me now?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

PETER KOCH: Great. It seems I'm in the rough. I cannot verify all the ideas about what the other committees do. I still think this is a bit special, given the lack of embedding into the Bylaws, which makes it a bit more susceptible to confusion on the outside. But I'm not going to ride a dead horse here.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I think we should try to follow up on this issue in e-mails and make sure that everyone is in agreement and on the same page with this. In the interest of time, we should move on.

Peter, there was another thing in your feedback that I wanted to ask you about. You wrote that, on decision making, you believe that the two-stage model has its merits. I was wondering what you meant by "two-stage model." I thought that maybe it refers to how, in our procedures, it says that, when we receive a proposal, we have community input at two stages. Is that what you're referring to?

EN

PETER KOCH: Am I audible?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Okay. What I was referring to is this distinction between full consensus and consensus; that is, the decision making by the committee, not so much the input and how the interaction with the outside world works. I was especially referring to the decision-making of the committee with an effect on the outside, so to speak.

The charter leaves open what definition of consensus is going to be applied. After some back and forth and some research and discussion, I came to the conclusion that the suggestion, at least I found it in the latest draft, does have merit.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So it sounds like you're comfortable with what the latest draft says there and not really suggesting any changes around the decision-making section. Is that correct?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Somebody else made a suggestion that I was going to maybe not counter but weigh in against.

DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. All right. Lastly, your last comment, Peter, I want to also ask you about. It says, "[inaudible] of the decisions aren't made during meetings, I wonder if the formal actions on the agenda [inaudible]." There was another comment about this; that maybe the Procedures document is being a little too specific about our agendas and what needs to go on the agenda. Is that your input here?
PETER KOCH:	Yeah. You might read it like that. It's part of this, but it also has another aspect. The guiding principle is that the committee shall decide based on consensus of all the members of the committee, which to me makes sense because we are appointed by different organizations and we are a rather small committee. So every community or constituency represented should have a voice and should have enough time and consideration to give input.
	Now the formal action, maybe that's a term of ours that I didn't recognize. I understand that we are not going to have the minutes' approvals or other clerical decisions subject to long consensus procedures. Maybe that was meant. But for the work that we actually are designed or tasked to do in the future, I'd rather stick with the consensus principle as specified in the draft Procedures document, and what I saw was kind of a mismatch between consensus decisions by all members of the committee versus formal actions during meetings. I'm not sure how that is resolved or what the intent was – what formal actions were envisioned to be.

DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. Thank you.
	So next I think we need to talk about what the Procedures document says about Statements of Interest or conflicts of interest. Had a lot of input both from Peter and Jim on this. I would like to invite somebody else to provide some text around this. The wording that is currently here –
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[Inaudible] please stay on the line.
DUANE WESSELS:	I don't know what that was. Sounds like it's over.
	So there was a lot of input on the text around Statements of Interest and conflicts of interest. I would like to invite Peter and Jim to provide some [inaudible] text maybe join in the editing of the document with us to get this resolved. What's here right now, I think, if I remember correctly a lot of this was the output of Steve and myself taking a first draft at this and – yeah.
	Jim, are you able to speak to some of your comments about this section?
JIM REID:	Certainly, yes. As far as the issue of conflicts of interest, if my understanding is correct ICANN already has documents which other committee members, Board members, already have to comply with.

[Resources keys], these are also used for things like consultants doing RFP proposals. So if ICANN's already got a document which covers the conflict of interest issues, we should just incorporate that by reference and we should expect the members of the committee to make those appropriate declarations that are required in these other circumstances. So I think we can keep this fairly simple [inaudible] and we just do what the rest of ICANN does for these particular issues and we're done. We don't need to over think it.

DUANE WESSELS: Jim, I think that one of the reasons that things are the way they are now is because a lot of the other committees, they use the Statement of Interest framework and RZERC is a little bit different because all of us are appointed by other organizations, other committees whereas for some of the committees that already use the SOI framework, that's kind of your application to participate in a committee whereas here your participation is appointment. But we still recognize the need to disclose conflicts of interest, so that's why the language is like that.

I don't know how common it is for other committees to use the conflict of interest language. Do you happen to know, Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Sorry, Duane. What was the question?

DUANE WESSELS: The question is to what extent do other ICANN committees, I guess in their procedures, to what extent do they refer to Statements of Interest

versus conflict of interest? I remember we sort of struggled with this when we were editing the document a month ago.

STEVE SHENG: Right. I think the most I know in the GNSO context these are referred to Statements of Interest, meaning that in the case of a conflict, it doesn't prohibit the person to participate in the deliberation but you just have to make your interest known ahead of time. I think that's both to ensure transparency, on the other hand to ensure there's sufficient expertise in the deliberation. That's the model where most ICANN committees adopt similar to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee also use a similar Statement of Interest.

We're using conflict of interest because that's specified in the charter, so in some sense that was the reason why we used the term conflict of interest. Let's see, the exact charter language says – let me see – "Committee members must provide Statement of Interest that identify potential conflict of interest in their committee service." That's Section 8 of the charter.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So I think, Jim, kind of picking your input here – in the Procedures document Section 6.2 is really pretty terse but we have this sort of long Appendix A and you were suggesting to include something by reference. Were you referring to Appendix A there that you think should not be included in the Procedures?

JIM REID: I don't think we need that as an Appendix. I think we could condense that to one paragraph that references some other ICANN document or [form] which covers that. What I had in mind when I was looking at this particular issue is I had just filled in a contractors' conflict of interest annual disclosure statement because I serve on the [inaudible] panel. So what I can do is I can circulate that document and I think if we consider that's appropriate and necessary that –

STEVE SHENG: If I may come in?

JIM REID: Yeah. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: I think where you're going is exactly what we're trying to accomplish with Appendix because there's no standard Statement of Interest form for ICANN per se. Each of the Supporting Organizations have their own or Advisory Committees, but they follow very similar format. So we just took those and kind of make it RZERC. The questions asked is exactly the same but there's no one generic Statement of Interest we can refer to in the ICANN context unless we want to refer to GNSO Statement of Interests. But then we're not GNSO either, so I'm not sure it's appropriate for us just to – [for ask] the RZERC members to fill out a GNSO Statement of Interest. But we try to get the idea from those and just put that in Appendix A.

JIM REID:	Okay, Steve. In actual fact the contractors' conflict of interest disclosure is completely inappropriate anyway. It's all about business relationship with ICANN staff and ICANN Board members. That's certainly not what we're about here. My apologies for that.
DUANE WESSELS:	Russ, go ahead. I know you've been waiting a while.
RUSS MUNDY:	Sure. Thanks, Duane.
	I think Jim may have just acknowledged or recognized that the internal conflict of interest statement that Board members or staff members use really is quite different than the Advisory Committee members. And I think that the approach that is used by the various Advisory Committees is the right approach for here for our committee and I think I did have just one minor nit that I just noticed as Steve is talking about Statement of Interest. Appendix A is member disclosure interest and whatever we decide the right words are to use we need to be consistent with that. Thanks.
DUANE WESSELS:	Yeah, I think part of the problem there, Russ, is that the charter says Statement of Interest and we don't want to go back and change the charter.

RUSS MUNDY: And it uses both Disclosure and Statement, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you.

                              Jim, I'd like to invite you to work with us in the coming days and weeks
                              between the meetings to massage this text, if that's okay. [Inaudible] e-
                              mail and maybe [inaudible].

JIM REID: Okay then.

DUANE WESSELS: [inaudible] editing session.

                              Jim, another thing I want is to address in your feedback was it gets back
                              to the Consensus section and you have some comments about RFC 7282
                              which is about IETF Consensus, correct? I took a look at that RFC and my
                              feeling was that it was sort of inapplicable because it talks about very
                              IETF-ish things, I thought – "humming" and that sort of thing – and in
                              my opinion it didn't really fit too well in the Procedures documents but
                              I'm willing to be convinced otherwise.

JIM REID: I suspect we probably need some kind of definition of "consensus," and
                              RFC 7282 is a reasonable approximation to that or a suitable document
                              for it. If there's something better, then fine. I don't have any religious
                              fervor for 7282 and I quite agree with you, Duane. There's a lot of stuff

in that that's completely irrelevant to what we're going to do in RZERC. But in the absence of anything better that seemed a reasonable starting point to use for a definition of "consensus." Although, on the other hand I could happily just say we work by consensus, full stop, and not need to expand to that any further. That doesn't need to be by full consensus or we have rough consensus. We just have consensus and if there are dissenting voices whenever we publish a finding or a result, I'm sure you in your infinite wisdom, Duane, would make sure that those dissenting opinions were fairly represented in the output from the committee.

I don't have any strong feelings about this but I think it would be helpful to have some kind of definition of "consensus," but I don't think we should spend too much time worrying about it. If we don't feel we need something we could just leave it at that. But I [think we have to be] very careful that we don't go into an elaborate description about the different kinds of consensus and what sort of consensus flavors we might use inside RZERC. I think that's a wrong step to take.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you.

                        Peter, go ahead. I see your hand up.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you. Am I now audible?

EN

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Great. I think that the IETF model in explicitly this or some predecessor RFCs are sometimes used as a role model but are not necessarily always applicable to decision-making in organizations that don't really follow the IETF model or that don't follow an engineering task in which you can do compromises, which is actually what their whole consensus process is about. And I've seen other groups within ICANN coming up with different definitions of this consensus and I sometimes try to be very explicit going through two, three, four, or five, stages, which might be overdoing it. I would just say that just referring to the IETF definition of "consensus" won't necessarily help. And again, I'd like to express my support for the text that is currently in the document.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. Thank you, Peter.

I think we've sort of discussed at least all of the feedback that we've gotten on the Procedures document. We have about 10 minutes left. Does anyone feel like I've overlooked something, some particular feedback, or something that they'd like to bring up?

Jim, go ahead.

JIM REID: Yeah. Thanks, Duane.

There was this issue about how we call meetings established in my e-mail that I sent the other day.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, yes. Thank you. That's right.

JIM REID: I think we should streamline that, and I think we should have a very simple paragraph that says, "Meetings will be called with a minimum of some number of days' notice," which we can decide at some point and then have enough flexibility to say that, "Provided there's consensus" – sorry to use the "c" word again here – "we can change that in extenuating circumstances if there's consensus to shorten that notice period."

At the moment we've got three separate notice periods where if it's a private meeting or a public meeting or if it's just a regular meeting of the committee. I think we should use the same procedure for all of these things and have enough flexibility in that to vary the notice period if and when the need arises. I think we could considerably simplify the language and streamline things.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. We'll take a look at that and see if we can do as you suggest.

Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:	Sorry, I'm muted.
	In looking at this again today and hearing our discussion, I realized that there might be something that would be appropriate to – a sentence or so – to add to the introduction, and that is that this being a group that is constituted from other groups there is nothing that's [in] since this group produces recommendations there's nothing binding on the groups where the members of this group came from. This is something that SSAC is extremely sensitive about and has been from day one about what the RZERC is. So it might be appropriate to try to put another sentence in there. I'd love to hear comments or thoughts from other members of the committee about that.
DUANE WESSELS:	I think that's a reasonable thing to consider, Russ. Can you maybe send some specific wording –
RUSS MUNDY:	Yeah. I'll try to write something up this afternoon or tomorrow morning and get it sent off.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. That would be good.
RUSS MUNDY:	And hopefully that would also help alleviate some of the community confusion that people were saying, "Well, then if RZERC says something

then this group can't say something that conflicts and that one can't." I think it might help the broader clarification aspects, too.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks.

Alright. I'm going to suggest that we close out this agenda item of discussing the Procedures document and move to Any Other Business. One important item under Any Other Business is the date of the next teleconference.

Currently, I believe it is scheduled for July. If we kept with our current schedule, it would be July 17th which is the first day of IETF.

JIM REID: That's probably a bad idea unless we're all going to be there.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. I will be there. Who else will be there?

JIM REID: I will.

BRAD VERD: I will.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I will.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I won't.

DUANE WESSELS: Anyone from staff will be there?

MARIO ALEMAN: Hi, Duane. From my end, I have no plans to attend [IGF].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Me neither.

DUANE WESSELS: I'm not sure if I heard – Kaveh, did you speak up and say whether or not you were [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will be there, yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

[STEVE SHENG]:   If there [is] interest and need, we can submit requests for rooms and arrange for teleconference and then it's just that there wouldn't be any of us staff in the room for that. But we can set up a bridge and one of you can dial out and it would be just like a regular meeting.

JIM REID: I think the problem, though, Mario, is a question of timing on Monday. If I remember correctly the IETF meeting doesn't finish that day until about 7:00 in the evening local time. So we may have scheduling conflicts because we'll be involved in working groups at the time when we normally hold an RZERC conference call. So maybe we have to push it back a couple of hours which might be no big deal if the other people are based in North America. But maybe a call that's going to be at 17:00 UTC on Monday might be a problem for those who are actually physically attending the IETF meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: So I'll suggest that we do a Doodle poll for times around the IETF [inaudible] schedule and see if there's a time slot when most of us will be free. If not, then I'll suggest that we postpone – we either move the meeting a week ahead or a week later in the month.

One last item on meeting schedules, I'd suggested to Mario that he should send out a meeting invite with a recurring meeting for the third Monday of every month just so that we can all reserve it on our calendars, and then he would continue to send out reminders with the agenda for individual meetings for each meeting. Does that sound reasonable to everyone?

Alright. With that, unless there's anything we need to discuss at the last minute I will suggest that we adjourn the meeting today.

MARIO ALEMAN:	Thank you, Duane. I just have one more question. Is there any other alternative on dates besides Monday – could be Tuesday or Wednesday – for the next [RZERC] meeting so I can consider that –

DUANE WESSELS:	You mean July only?

MARIO ALEMAN:	Yeah, in July only so I can consider for the Doodle poll.

DUANE WESSELS:	I don't know. Let's do this, Mario – let's do a poll for Monday first and if that doesn't work out then let's consider another day just to keep it sort of similar.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay. Thank you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, everyone. Thank you very much. I'll call the meeting adjourned and see a number of you in July in [Prague].

BRAD VERD: Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye.

MARIO ALEMAN: This meeting has been adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]