EN

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello, and welcome to the RZERC Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 20th of October 2020 held at 19:00 UTC. Duane, would you like me to go through the roll call?
DUANE WESSELS:	Yes, please.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	From ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar?
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Yes. Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	From IANA, Kim Davies.
KIM DAVIES:	Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	SSAC, Geoff Huston.
GEOFF HUSTON:	Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RSSAC, Daniel Migault?

DUANE WESSELS: He may have forgotten that he muted himself.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll note for the record that Daniel Migault is active and present on this teleconference. ASO, Carlos Martinez.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Here again.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Tim April?

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Registry Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am.

EN

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ccNSO, Peter Koch?

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And Verisign as the Root Zone Maintainer, Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Duane is here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Duane, over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Welcome, everyone. And thanks for those of you who made the public meeting earlier today. that was sort of short and sweet which was good.

So, today, in addition to the regular stuff of the minutes, I thought we'd maybe spend not all of the meeting but most of the time we have today would be spent talking about the document on signing root zone name server data, and then maybe just a little bit of time talking about ZONEMD document.

And if anyone has anything else they would like to bring up, please speak up and let us know or type it in the chat. I'm expecting we'll have time for AOB items if we need to.

Okay. So, first up would be approving the minutes from our September meeting. Danielle has them up on the screen. They were distributed. Does anyone have comments, concerns about the minutes or reasons that they should not be approved and posted? Also, the link is in the chat if you'd look at it at this time.

All right. It sounds like we're good with the minutes, so let's mark this as approved and then they can be posted to the website.

All right. So, the document on signing [root zone and] name server data. This has been updated and sent out to the group about only 24 hours ago, so hopefully you had some time to look at it. There were a number of pending changes in comments which myself and Steve went through and cleaned up late last week, and at this point, there's not really a lot outstanding but I thought we would go through what's changed and what the outstanding issues are.

So, stop here. Stop at the preface for a second, Danielle. So, if you remember previously, there was a comment from Paul Hoffman. We had a paragraph here that Paul thought was not worthy of being in a preface so that has been moved down to like a background or introduction section, so we'll see that there. Just wanted to point out that that was moved.

And then we also decided to do the same thing for the other document which we can look at later. So those will be consistent. All right. So, scroll down a bit.

So, what is now section one introduction was really just that other paragraph from the preface, and what is now section number two, I

think it was previously called background or something like that and now it's called Discussion which I think is more appropriate. This text is mostly the same. There were again some editorial clean-ups and what not.

Down at the bottom of the screen here, you can see there is some new proposed text from Paul. Previously, Paul had a comment here at the end of this paragraph saying that he thought there needed to be more here to talk about ways that an attacker could modify responses and it wasn't exactly clear to me what Paul had meant. So I had a phone call with him and we got on the same page and then he offered to supply some different text. So that's what you're looking at here. He just did this I guess yesterday. This is really the first time I'm looking at it, so I don't have any strong opinions right now about it. On the surface, it looks okay. If anyone else has had time to look at it or has thoughts right now, I'll be happy to hear those. Otherwise, we can all take a little more time to give it some more thought if we need to.

I think the big difference here is that Paul thought it was important to have some mention of the fact that an attacker can modify responses for parts of things that … For unsigned data, basically. Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Duane. Just responding to your previous remark. I didn't want to interrupt your intervention. Could go ahead or could leave it.

I didn't have enough time to look into this, and especially the comments that were added yesterday in particular. I'm wondering whether we had

agreed, or at least outlined, a timeline for this. So we are still working on this. We are probably far from approving the document. Do I get that right?

Otherwise, my question would be has this been discussed anywhere outside RSSAC so far, to the best of our collective knowledge?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So, I think there, at this point, I would say there's not really any urgency about this document. We certainly don't need to approve it today or even maybe by the next meeting. I can have a conversation with probably Matt Larson about what sort of timing they have in mind for this.

You asked if it had been discussed outside of—I think you said RSSAC or RZERC; I'm not sure.

PETER KOCH: I meant to say RSSAC. It's my understanding is that that group, or the caucus, did the work on the document. The underlying [inaudible] recommendation.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't think this has gotten any attention really within RSSAC recently, so we can bring that up there. Danielle can do that as our liaison, I suppose. I think RSSAC would welcome this as a follow-on to the work that it did and to give a nudge to the future studies that we hope will be done. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. So, the underlying RSSAC document is really [inaudible] to several different things at the same time, including figuring out the right place for some of [inaudible]. So, I think it grazes the issue without necessarily hitting it home. That's why I like our paragraph about priming queries and I see that is a way to further spawn the discussion, again specifically as it relates to the implications of the signed priming queries.

I think we've got good text in there to indicate that some more research needs to be done in that area.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks. I agree with you that one of the things I struggled with a little bit with the RSSAC document was the approach that it took from the start and the total of the document was … To me, it kind of assumed that you would rename the servers to accomplish this goal here. So I'm glad that we're … I feel like we're putting the emphasis in the right places for this work. So, yeah. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm just wondering if the request from Peter was to have the RSO reviewing or the RSSAC caucus reviewing the document.

PETER KOCH: If I may jump in. My interest was whether this had popped up in any of the operational fora where I hadn't seen it, but maybe someone else had. I believe that the root server operators themselves are informed.

My concern—it's probably a small concern but still something to keep in mind is understanding that we are only suggesting or recommending more research. That's set aside. But moving into the direction of signing the name server names is a deviation from the DNSSEC trust model. That's one thing.

And then, while there's always the discussion that the root is special and therefore it might be more useful in the case of the root and we are discussing this or the document, the RSSAC document is probably discussing that, it might be taken as a precedent for other operators, be that TLD or lower down in the tree and that could have a trickling effect that may confuse people.

Again, we are only getting to recommending research but this perception issue is something that I would like to see dealt with one way or another.

Of course, everything can be misunderstood and will be, but maybe the impact that people take the root as example and model their operation after that without going into the same depth that we and RSSAC do is something to take into consideration. And I'd just like to have a place to feel that, to raise that—sorry.

Previously, the document wasn't [baked] enough, in my opinion, to reach out to all the ccTLD operators encouraging them to look at it and to understand whether they had concerns in either the direction I had just paraphrased or whether they would have any [inaudible]. I think it's important that other authoritative operators get involved early, say. Thank you.

EN

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, I understand it's fine … Is it fine I'm sending the link of the Google Doc to the RSSAC caucus for feedback or--?

PETER KOCH: No, no, no, no. Let's not do that yet. I think, before we get to that point, as a community we should agree that the document is a) in a state that we want it seen more widely and b) that we want that feedback. This is kind of new territory for us, so let's figure that out. We can talk more about that. I want to get to Howard's hand if he wants to chime in on this also. Harold?

HAROLD ELAND: Yeah. To Peter's point—I figured you'd want to circle back to me—this is exactly almost a corollary to the consternation I had raised that ultimately brought about recommendation 3, which I have since recommended we scratch out and I'll explain my change of heart here.

So, I originally had raised the point of saying, hey, the new TLD—a PDT test were actually changed mid-flight to change the, sign the [inaudible] glue for the TLD name servers from a should to a must. And that happened mid-flight.

My reasoning behind this, trying to get to recommendation 3 here, was should ICANN be really taking that position of a must when the overwhelming, or at least the current or previous thinking of it was, well, but not for the root.

EN

So, it seemed to be a bit of a [inaudible] between what was good there and what wasn't.

So, what I did was is I took this question to my constituency, which is why you saw a bit of a delay here for me and I put it out to a poll, specifically in that case. I didn't send the whole document. I just sent the framing. After waiting for responses and asking for responses, I literally got one response and it was from Joe Abley and you can imagine which way that went. It was full-on priming query, let's talk about priming queries which I understand and I thought was otherwise well-represented in this document.

So, based on that—again, I'm representing my constituency, so it to me seemed like I was the only one that had this issue, so I didn't feel … Since nobody else seemed to have that issue, I felt that as the elected representative, it was my duty to follow the course of the constituency and say, okay, we are saying we officially no longer have this view.

And I think part of the reason I'm okay with that is because if we say, if the recommendation is that ICANN needs to think about their position, I think that is beyond the scope of the RZERC committee. We shouldn't necessarily tell ICANN how they ought to position things one way or the other. It's not a direct implication of a root zone change. It's an indirect implication.

So, from that perspective, I still have a little tick in my craw here about this, but that's why I went with let's take the recommendation out completely because that really is just a corollary. If ICANN Org does the

recommendations, their opinion on how they [need to do this] will naturally follow through.

Sorry, it's a long-winded response to tag on to Peter's question. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks, Howard. Peter, go ahead again.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. And thanks, Howard, for elaborating that whole issue. It goes in the very same direction. [Handing] over root zone might be taken as an example. As you said, it can trickle inside the ICANN organization and end up in, say, the PDTs or somewhere else and I would not want to have a practice escape into the overall DNS land where it says, well, first of all, you must have [inaudible] name servers and they ought to be signed. Well, the letter would follow from the zone must be signed.

But we do have a number of registrars or name server operators that operate hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of zones. And if they were all switched to [inaudible] name servers, that would have interesting consequences when it comes to maintaining [inaudible] records, consistencies, the overall system and that it's just … I'm [exaggerating] here of course but keeping an eye on, especially large-scale changes. That is something that shouldn't happen lightly.

I still understand we don't recommend this at the moment. It's just one of these unintended side effects that I would be very, very careful about. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, both of you. I think these are very interesting points. I guess the question I have is whether or not this is something RZERC needs to take a position on or if we want whoever is doing this study to come up with that position. So, if you have thoughts one way or the other, let me know. Geoff, your hand is up, I see.

GEOFF HUSTON: Sorry. Yes, it is. I'm reading the 2017 RSSAC 28 document, [inaudible] 2017, which recommends further studies da-da-da, feasibility and impact of the vulnerabilities, study of the priming response size.

And I kind of wonder what the purpose of the RZERC document is in relation to RSSAC. If nothing has happened for three years in RSSAC, why does RZERC think it can prompt action when RSSAC can't or won't?

This kind of strikes me as odd that when something comes to some kind of [inaudible] and just fails to proceed in RSSAC, why does anyone think that RZERC would give it more impetus when it's the same pool of people in the end?

So, I'm very confused at this point what the relationship is between RSSAC 28 and this document and what the expected outcome is inside both of these sort of areas, because I just don't understand at this point where this document is going and why as a result of that. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I'm not sure that any of us can really answer that question, but I can say that when I spoke about this to Matt Larson of ICANN OCTO, he thought this was a good thing to have and that it would sort of reinforce or maybe lend some urgency to the RSSAC study which I think is already on their to-do list. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. So, my understanding is that it [really] affects the root zone and it's more in the scope of RZERC to provide advice regarding to that than RSSAC. So, I think that's why RZERC might be the right place for such recommendations.

DUANE WESSELS: Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: Daniel, my point is RSSAC went and made these recommendations. It wasn't debating whether it should. It was a definitive statement in 2017 going, "This should happen." Right? And whether it was the right thing or not for RSSAC to say it, the fact is they said it. They recommended it. And at this point, I'm just in this state of confusion as to why more voices clamoring for the work from the same community, just with a different committee hat on, makes any difference.

I'd like to think that RSSAC saying it back in 2017 was a placeholder to understand this more. I don't understand the value RZERC would be

adding in adding its hammer to hammer the stake in a little harder. That's all. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. So, a couple of points. One is I think we have closer to more like a toothpick than a hammer. But I do think that it's not a bad idea to get different perspectives on a single topic. And one of the things that I'll note is remember that RZERC comment—and this comes back to Peter's point—that the RSSAC document explores several different things including what zone is the right home for these name servers and if the ultimate answer is not necessarily [inaudible], then that shapes the conversation a little bit differently.

However, the portion about priming queries is true regardless of where that fits. So, that's why I think it's important for us to call it out. And I'll also note that there really hasn't been a home necessarily that really drives the point of priming queries are [inaudible] out there and we don't have a good handle on exactly how they operate completely and everything and someone needs to go this work. So this kind of narrows that focus, I think, from the RSSAC document. So that's why I think it's … I won't say it's important for us to do but I think it adds a helping hand and a level of [inaudible] to that portion of the RSSAC document. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:	All right. Thanks, everyone. I think, if nothing else, we can probably agree to take Howard's suggestion to strike out recommendation 3 at this point. Is anyone opposed to that? Speak up if you are. Otherwise, I think that we should do that.
	And then that sort of leaves the new text from Paul above, which again, I think that looks pretty good. So we'll probably accept that. And then I would ask people to read through this again and we'll come back to it at our next meeting and decide, I guess, if it's ready for more input, if we want to take it to our constituencies and share a version of them, get their input or if we'd rather not do that. I'm really open to either way, but we do need to agree that that's what we want to do.
	So, if there's no further discussion on this, then let's go to the other one quickly.
	So, two things to update on this. One is that … At our last meeting, we had sort of come to agreement that this was done. We had eliminated all the outstanding questions and comments, and rather than go for approval right then or shortly after, we had agreed to wait two months and see what the status was within the IETF.
	So, I can tell you that, since that time, there has been sort of a flurry of activity that I have been involved in with the [IASG] review of the document. There's been a few new revisions posted. I believe all the outstanding questions from the [IASG] have been addressed. I do not believe that it's going to in any way become an RFC in the next month. I think that's still a few months away, given what I've heard from other people who have recently gone through this. It's still probably going to

take four months maybe to work its way through the rest of the process.

so, I don't expect it to have an RFC status [inaudible] here. I just want to let people know about that update. I'm not even going to necessarily suggest that we call for a vote right away. But let's come back to it next meeting and see what we think. If we want to push for a vote, then we can. Otherwise, keep it on the burner here.

then the other thing is that, as you saw on the mailing list, probably Daniel Migault had some feedback on the document that he provided. He wasn't with us for a lot of the development of this document so he gave it a good read through and added some comments or made some comments.

Daniel and I had a call so I could better understand what he was after there and we made a few edits. But this one, I don't think this is one of them. I don't know who made this anonymous comment is. Is this Peter or is this somebody else?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, [inaudible]. That's me. The only person on the planet that doesn't' have a Google account.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, that makes it easy to identify you, then, I guess. You're always anonymous. Did you want to speak about this quickly today or not?

EN

PETER KOCH: I sent the same comments to the list I think 20 minutes or so before the meeting started. I'm happy to talk about this but I think the comments by Daniel were broader or more in depth, so I'm happy to wait of that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Well, thanks. Let's finish with Daniel's stuff. So, scroll down a little bit [inaudible]. in this paragraph, based on the conversation that I had with Daniel, he made some points about how this is a little bit confusing as written. Essentially, just rearranged some of these sentences here and eliminated some of the clauses, like we should say however DNSSEC [inaudible] a little bit different. So that was from that conversation.

And then in the next paragraph, we added the phrase recursive resolver to clarify that we're not talking about queries sent, for example, from stub resolvers to recursives, because obviously those can't go to designated root server addresses. So, clarification there.

I thought there was one more change that we made, Daniel. I'm not seeing it right now. I don't know if it's lower or not. Daniel, do you remember any other things that we discussed or that you'd like to call the committee's attention to?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No. I think we discussed whether we had to remove or not one paragraph.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, that's right.

DANIEL MIGAULT: The other thing was that we had also some time we were using capital letters and we were mostly wondering whether it was inconsistencies or if it was okay or—

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. You had some questions about what I would consider style or editorial questions which—

DANIEL MIGAULT: Mostly.

DUANE WESSELS: In my opinion, it's fine as it is. The style is okay. I don't know if Steve or Danielle plan on having a professional copy edit done on this. I know they did it for some groups. But if they do, that would be welcome for sure. I wouldn't mind that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I will let Steve do that but I don't think I will. I will look at it.

DUANE WESSELS: No, no. They have other staff I think to do that. But the other comments, which I didn't make any changes for, was about the opening paragraph of the discussion. Daniel, your opinion is that this paragraph doesn't really add anything. It doesn't need to be there. We heard that

also from someone. I forget who but somebody else I think made a similar point in the previous meeting. So, I think the way we left it was the original paragraph was not as good as this one, and Geoff supplied this text, but if people want to have a discussion again and suggest to delete this paragraph, we can certainly do that. In my opinion, it's fine but I'm open to other's thoughts there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to say I don't have any strong opinion, so I will not fight for [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks. I'm just pointing to my second comment in the document. Given that this is advice or a recommendation going to the Board, the whole document is quite technical and assumes certain familiarity with the underlying RFC [to be] and maybe the target audience is not only the Board but other ACs or SOs, and to that extent, we might even go even beyond that paragraph. So I definitely think that the paragraph should stick, but my second comment is that actually the suggestion to elaborate even a bit further what it is and especially what it not is, i.e. who is affected by this change, who is going to use it, and why do we recommend this, the document there.

I understand that we tried to keep the document crisp and short, but I'm not sure. Maybe Kaveh can enlighten me here how deep the Board

would want to dive into things or how other constituencies might look at this if we just exchange references into a currently at least bit obscure by nature Internet draft of the IETF.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, I really have no idea at this point. I think this is something that we can discuss at BTC and I can get back to you, but the process I think is in general unprecedented. So I can't think of any similar thing or process, so yeah, I don't have anything else at the moment, but I will think about it and get back to you in the next meeting if that's okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Kaveh. So, Peter, I wanted to clarify because I think you were talking about a comment that you left at the bottom of this document, right? Is that where you think that this should go, these two clarifications?

PETER KOCH: Well, I put the comment at the bottom because I had no other area to put it and there was no option to put the comment unrelated to any particular point in the text. I could have done it at the headline.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: I was actually going to say, Peter, that I actually think this is adequate and sufficient. The Board has its own resources it can call on to further analyze the implications of material coming to the Board and Kaveh mentioned in passing the Board Technical Committee, for example. There is also OCTO. There are a whole bunch of sources of expertise and knowledge together with a public process that circulates and socializes these sort of grounding documents to allow stakeholders and other parties to put their own hand up.

I don't think it is necessarily appropriate or even wise for RZERC to pre-judge what other parties might think and canvass the wider implications. I actually think, as I said, the Board has procedures and resources to allow it to do its own due diligence here and doesn't need us to try and send our own necessarily bias to some extent broader view of this. I think we should allow the Board to do that. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: If I may. Thank you for that. Now it's more clear for me. Yes, in that sense, definitely BTC will try to understand, and if there are questions, we might come back to answer but also, as mentioned, Board has access to OCTO, to RSSAC, and other advisory bodies, even external. So, if needed, we will do that. So, if that's the question, then I don't think we need to add more. Having this level of technicality is good enough.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks. So, I'm not sure I understood Geoff's remark correctly. I didn't mean to second guess anybody's opinions or even pre-judge. My observation was that in comparison to many of the SSAC and also more recently the RSSAC documents, which I think are a bit more elaborate and look at, at least in addition to the primary audience, the Board—a bit of a less technical audience—to a bit more just explain what this whole thing is about and why it is on our table and we say it's on our table because somebody brought it forward and so on and so forth. Formally, this is all correct.

I was going to suggest that we might help people better comprehend what we are trying to say and more clearly identify who might be an effective party if it is decided to do this at the root level and that is exactly what I read as a recommendation in there. I am not going to die in a ditch over this, of course.

DUANE WESSELS: Are you willing to draft some text, at least as a starting point or …?

PETER KOCH: Yes, I am.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Well, I can work with you on that and we can find a way to make something fit and put it before the committee and see what people say.

Okay. Anything else about this document? Geoff?

EN

GEOFF HUSTON: One, two, three, four. The fourth paragraph in section two. Your assertion that none of the delegation name server records, nor their corresponding addresses are signed is actually talking about the in bailiwick out of bailiwick issue and you're actually talking about the root zone, not a general comment about DNSSEC because those names, if they're defined within a DNSSEC signed zone, those records are signed but they're signed elsewhere.

And to make this sentence a little bit more comfortable for me, you might point out either that you're referring to the root zone in particular or you're referring to parent zones where the delegation name server records exist in other zones. In other words, in a different bailiwick.

Now, frankly, I think it's clearer and easier to simply say in the root zone for DNSSEC none of the delegation name servers are signed. You're saying something about the root zone. You're not actually saying something about DNSSEC in general. And if you really want to go down and start scratching at that saw, you might point out that it's not part of DNSSEC validation to go and validate those names of the name servers, but at this point, you're down the rabbit hole and digging like crazy. But I think the qualification of the root zone from that statement would sit a little better. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that's a reasonable change. I guess maybe the complication here is where it says delegation name server records, which to me

means [inaudible] NS records but I can see how that would be missed or it's a subtle distinction. Happy to add root zone in there.

Anything else?

PETER KOCH: Duane, apologies.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah?

PETER KOCH: Since I already talked about the second comment, my first comment that I submitted was just a wording issue and hopefully a no-brainer. When we talk about data protection, I don't think [inaudible]. I suggested to replace that by [inaudible] integrity or data integrity protection, just to not trigger the wrong people.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

PETER KOCH: I guess integrity is really what we're talking about here.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I went through a lot of this with my ISG review comments and almost everywhere that … So, in the draft, almost anywhere that it talks

about integrity, it also talks about authenticity. But for purposes of this document, I think data integrity protections is sufficient.

PETER KOCH: Either is fine with me. Just that data protection is probably the wrong thing.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And I think you also are suggesting that it should be singular rather than plural, right? Did I read that …

PETER KOCH: Maybe the point was that data protection, as in GDPR, are different or you could have argued that these are different things, but no, I don't mind. We leave that to the copy editor or to any other native speaker, if they can agree.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Peter. All right. Anything else to discuss about this document? All right. Good. Let's go back to our agenda then. I think that's it unless anyone has AOB or if we should talk about the next date of the next meeting. I'm not finding it on my calendar.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I haven't sent the calendar invites for this because I just wanted to confirm that we will not change the ETC timing of this with US Daylight

Savings which is coming up next week, but the next one would be November 17th.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. That's the week of IETF. So, does anyone … The schedule has only just recently come out as a draft schedule but does anyone know that they would have trouble meeting November 17th at the usual time? Well, I guess we have to decide about UTC first, right?

GEOFF HUSTON: Duane, I understood that the IETF is going to run it on Bangkok time.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

GEOFF HUSTON: Which means if you stick to around this time, in Bangkok it's still 2:00 AM, 3:00 AM, something like that. So, you really are not headbutting against the core of the [inaudible]. That might still be a problem for some people but I don't think it's going to be a clash with the Bangkok time to IETF.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I guess the question is are people going to try to shift their schedules to Bangkok time that week? I'm probably not going to. It's too much.

GEOFF HUSTON: The IETF, by the way, runs from 5:00 UTC to 11:00 UTC.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Danielle's other question was about do we want to keep the meeting anchored to the UTC time zone or do we want to adjust for Daylight Savings?

                                For me, this is the middle of the day. It doesn't matter a lot. Geoff, does it matter for you?

GEOFF HUSTON: It's currently a 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM because I've already switched to Daylight Savings. Look, if we both do this, we have this weird system where the meeting changes across a two-hour window which is bizarre. I'm actually more in favor of keeping it at UTC but that's a personal preference. I think it's up to everyone else. I have no problem with any of those three start times that occur through the year. So I'm perfectly comfortable. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Anybody else have difficulties or preferences around this? If not, I think I'm fine with keeping it UTC in the interest of simplicity, if nothing else.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, great. I'll send out placeholders, keeping it at 19:00 UTC moving forward.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, great. All right. I think we're done for today, then, unless there's anything else. Going once, going twice. All right. Thank you, everybody, for your time. Talk to you later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]