

---

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, this is Duane, anybody hear me?

STEVE SHENG: Hi Duane, this is Steve, I can hear you well.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh good, you can hear me. [AUDIO BREAK]

MARIO ALEMAN: Hi Duane, this is Mario, can you hear me okay? [AUDIO BREAK] Hello everyone, this is Mario, I'll be managing today's call. Can you hear me okay?

DUANE WESSELS: Hearing you, Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, great, thank you so much. I was actually trying to speak through the AC and I can hear actually some people join, as well. It is actually right now 17:00 UTC. Duane, would you like me to start the call? We have a few people who actually have joined and a few others who send their apologies.

DUANE WESSELS: Let's wait one more minute or two. I know Brad is trying to join, also.

---

*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.*

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Alright, thank you. [AUDIO BREAK] Hello, this is Mario, did somebody else join the line?

BRAD VERD:                        Yeah, this is Brad, sorry I was late.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Oh, hi Brad, welcome.

DUANE WESSELS:                   So at this point is it just Peter that's having trouble, I guess?

MARIO ALEMAN:                    I think so, let me send him actually the number where he can dial in.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Hello, this is Mario, is this Peter who just joined the line?

PETER KOCH:                        Yeah, hi, this is Peter.

---

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello Peter, finally we have you on board, so welcome.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, but this is cumbersome. I'm not having this trouble with Adobe Connect usually, so sorry for that, I have no idea what it is. How do I know?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, thank you for your feedback, we will raise actually a ticket to investigate a little bit more on any issues that's happening through the Adobe Connect. So sometimes it's better just to dial in and connecting for sure. So I think, actually, we were just waiting for Peter, and Duane, would you like us to start the roll call of the teleconference?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, please, go ahead.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, thank you. So, welcome everyone, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RZERC Teleconference Call on 22nd May, 2017 at 17:00 UTC. On the call we have as participants Duane Wessels, Jim Reid, Brad Verd, Kim Davies, Kaved Ranjbar, and Peter Koch. We have apologies from Russ Mundy and Carlos Martinez. On Staff side, we have Trang Nguyen, Steve Sheng, and Mario Aleman, myself, who is doing the call management today. I would just like to, please remember, all the participants to state your name before speaking, that will help us actually to get better

---

transcription services and speak loudly and clearly. With this, I would like to pass it over to you, Duane, to begin the call. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Alright, thank you, Mario. So, the agenda today is pretty short. The only thing really we need to do is review the state of the State of Procedures documents, and, well, I guess first we need to accept the minutes from the previous meeting and go over the action items. So, Mario, can you bring up the action items from our last call?

MARIO ALEMAN:

Sure, absolutely. Thank you. I will read the action items right now, and I would like to just share it on the screen, actually, so everyone will have it. On action items, from the previous conference call on 4th of April, 2017. We have the first one, Staff to edit and publish the minutes from the 28th of February, 2017 teleconference call. Mario to make mailing list archive public starting on 18th April 2017. Duane, Steve, and Mario to collect and discuss feedback to include in the Operational Procedures.

Mario to review the process for making changes in the charter, and consider creating working groups. Staff to work with the Chair on the Operational Procedures document. Staff to edit and prepare the minutes from 4th of April 2017 teleconference. These actually are all the action items we have from the previous call, and we have all gone through them so far. Over to you, Duane.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so these are all complete. Mario, do you have, should we add some time at the end of this agenda to talk about what you learned about making changes to the charter? Do you have something you would like to give to us on that?

MARIO ALEMAN: Sure, absolutely. So, we had a chat with Duane Wessels a few weeks ago, and discussed about investigating more about creating study and working groups. And so far we have decided that there is no need to revise and to create study and working groups so far. In the meantime, actually, we will basically be on alert and investigate it even more. But unless there is a need to create one working group, we can move forward with this.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thanks.

MARIO ALEMAN: You're welcome.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, next we should approve the minutes from our previous meeting. Has everyone had a chance to review those? Any motions to approve those minutes?

STEVE SHENG: Duane, this is Steve. I think Peter just raised his hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, I missed that. Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. It was mainly my fault, I didn't really fully understand the previous message about starting a working group. Could you elaborate one or two sentences on that?

DUANE WESSELS: So, I think on our previous call we talked about changing the charter, and I had brought up something which I was not 100% comfortable with at the time, revolving around the word "content" in the charter. And so that led to a discussion about things like does RZERC have permission to change its own charter, what's the procedure for doing that, do we need a public comment review period, and so on. And also on the call we talked through some of the changes and after that discussion, I felt that, you know, I sort of looked through my suggestion to make that change around the word "contents," for example. So at this time I'm not sure if there are other concrete proposals for changes that could be made to the charter at this time.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I remember the discussion we had in that report that I think Steve gave, there was mention of starting up a working group, and I'm not really sure I understand what that was. Like a working group for starting the charter and then you agreed that this is not necessary at the moment? Do I get that correctly?

---

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I think there was a proposal that if we were to change the charter, that we could do it in a working group.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, okay, that might -- so, the action says Mario to review process for making changes and then consider creating study working groups. That's what's on the screen right now, and Mario and you decided that this was not necessary at the moment. Do I get that correctly?

DUANE WESSELS: Mario and Steve and I had a call afterwards, and essentially, you know, I withdrew my suggestion to make a change around the word "contents," and I was not aware of any other proposed changes at this time.

PETER KOCH: Okay, fine. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, that takes us back to approving the minutes. Can I get a motion to approve?

BRAD VERD: I'll motion, it's Brad.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Anyone check it?

KIM DAVIES:                        Kim here, I will.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay, thank you very much. So, now to item 4, is our Operational Procedures document, which I believe you all have had a chance to see. Mario will probably put it up on the screen here. Steve and Mario did a bunch of work on this since our last meeting, and I also gave them some feedback very recently, which I believe they have mostly incorporated. So I have a few things highlighted that I would like to discuss with everyone. Do others have – I assume others must have specific things they would also like to discuss. Does anyone want to mention a specific section that they would like to talk about before we sort of dive into the document? Okay, I will, I guess, sort of go through it section by section, and if there's something that you feel we need to discuss, please speak up.

The introduction I think is pretty stable and this text is probably almost verbatim from the Charter. Anyone have questions about the introduction section? Okay.

Section 2 is again pretty straightforward, it talks about the membership. Section 2.2 it says "The committee members are appointed by the organizations they represent in accordance with their internal processes. When organizations appoint representatives to RZERC, they shall specify the terms of the appointments," and I suggested to add the

---

following sentence, which says, "which could be no term limit or automatically renewing." So I wonder if anyone has input on that particularly wording?

STEVE SHENG: Duane, Peter raised his hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, yes Peter.

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you. So, first, this is, if I understand correctly, more or less copied verbatim from the charter, isn't it?

DUANE WESSELS: A lot of is, yes.

PETER KOCH: Okay, so, I'm, so either we could just reference the charter here, or make it visible and obvious that this is the copy from the charter, and probably don't have to discuss these parts. But then I would not make any changes, especially in the change that you suggested, Duane, because the choice of limits is completely up to the appointing organizations, if I understand correctly, at least that should be the case, if I consider the discussion that led to be current version of the charter, and any changes, or maybe even clarifications, leads to an inconsistency

---

between what we have in the Operational Procedures and what is in the charter or the mission statement, and I'm not sure that helps.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. So, are there any objections to doing as Peter suggested, which basically, you know, copy the charter text and make it clear that it's included verbatim, or yeah, that's basically what you're suggesting, right, Peter? Or to just not include the text and reference it? So the charter doesn't say anything about term limits of appointees, agreed? Jim? Jim, we can't hear you if you're speaking. Brad, why don't you go while we're waiting for Jim.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, okay, this will be quick, I think. This is just the procedures document, correct? I mean, Peter, how would you recommend referencing the charter so that it's verbatim? In a footnote or something? I guess I'm curious, how formal do we have to get this, if this is just a procedures document?

PETER KOCH:

So, can you hear me?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yep.

---

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you. So, my point here is that probably we don't have to be overly formal, but we should also make clear that we do or don't change things that have been given upon us by the charter. So I'd rather have external references so that it is clear that the procedures document, this part of the procedures document is actually not the output of the committee, itself. It is there, it's the constitution, so to speak, or say charter, and then from thereon, the details, the minutiae are for us to decide, and we can go over these. But looking at this document, at the draft that we have, I think it's lots of copies from other places, especially the charter, and that may lead to confusion, at least I felt confused myself at one or two occasions.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. So, I'll ask again, the charter has nothing to say about term limits, and I'm not hearing any support for adding descriptions of term limits to the procedures document. Is that correct? Not even, I'm sorry, not even term limits, but, um, you know, nothing that would say how terms may be limited.

PETER KOCH: Well, the charter gives this, or delegates this to the appointing organization, and how could a procedures document that is guided or bounded by the charter, then impose, or specify, clarify, whatever word you pick, additional restrictions or constraints? That's the whole point here, I don't think we can, even with the best of intentions, we can't change the charter through the back door of the procedures document. The procedures can only be detailed to a level that the charter allows.

---

Everything else needs to be changed in the charter. And what you suggest, Duane, I can understand, that looks like clarification, but I think the message was clear when the charter was defined, that this should be up to the delegating or appointing organizations.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Alright, so we'll take an action to remove the sentences about terms, and make it clear that this is, you know, taken from the charter.

Section 2.2.1 describes how new RZERC members are brought into the committee and how outgoing members are essentially removed from the committee. I did not have any discussion points in this section. Does anyone else have something they'd like to discuss in 2.2.1 or 2.2.2? Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, sorry, it's me again. So this is new text, isn't it?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Because I didn't find that. And this is actually really going down to the details, so completely within the limits that I think we have here. I have a clarifying question for 2.2.1 that might be a typo, but might be intentional. "The Chair or an executive point of contact from the appointing organization will notify the RZERC, and then the RZERC Chair

---

will then notify the committee," where the committee has already been informed by the appointing organization, or the first sentence should read that the organization is talking to the Chair, rather than RZERC as a whole.

And it doesn't make much of a difference, except that the Chair is the point of contact that is identified from the outside, and the appointing organization might not have right access to the mailing list, so the point of contact should probably be identified in detail here. My second point here is that is a wording thing. The charter and everything talks about members of the committee and in 2.2.1 and 2, the draft talks about representatives, and if these are synonyms, then for clarity, I'd suggest to stick with one name, and not change this over the course of the document.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. I think we can easily fix both of those.

PETER KOCH: Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Jim? I see Jim is typing, but we still can't hear him, at least I can't hear him. Okay, thank you Jim. Alright, let's move on to Section 2.3, which is, this is text that we've already, that – words missing – and I do not have any comments or discussion points in this Section 2.3. Does anybody else? Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. Okay, so this time it worked in the Connect room. This is probably more or less a copy of what we already had agreed upon, correct?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: So, last time I think I made the suggestion on the list at one point in time. Due to our presence in different time zones, the 24 hours voting time, starting at some arbitrary point in time most likely working our Pacific time in the US, this might be a bit short. It worked this time, but could we extend that by another 24 hours, just in case?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so the proposal is for 48 hours? I'm fine with that.

PETER KOCH: Yep.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Okay, scroll down to Section 2.4, which it talks about support staff. And this is a very short paragraph, and here I have, I guess, the question for people, because this is one of the places in this document where when we talk about ICANN, we say "ICANN the organization," to

---

---

point out that it's different than ICANN the community. I find the wording a little bit cumbersome and I sort of suspect that other committees don't maybe do this. So I'm wondering what people think, and maybe if there's any input from the staff about how we refer to ICANN the organization, versus the community, or if we even need to make that distinction in the procedures document.

STEVE SHENG:

This is Steve. We could say ICANN Staff, but I think the difference between "organization," "community," and "the board," is something that we're trying very hard to delineate. So I guess I can take an action back to find some suitable wording that is less cumbersome, but essentially conveys the same meaning.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, so I know Steve in RSSAC we sort of have been a little bit more careful in our words when we talk about ICANN. Do you see that in, is this a trend in other committees, too? Or is it sort of unique to us at this point?

STEVE SHENG:

Well, I think it's unique to us at this point, because this is something, when RSSAC works on the Operational Procedures, this careful distinction hasn't really been pushed. Now, I think, you know, such distinction has been drawn, and we are at this point in time.

---

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Alright, thank you. I see Jim is making suggestions in the chat, so thank you, Jim, I think those are good suggestions and we'll make sure to capture those.

Okay, Section 3 is mostly all new. The charter does say a little bit about meetings, but it's really pretty terse. In Section 3, we are defining three types of meetings that RZERC could have; regular meeting, executive meetings, and public meetings. I do not have any discussion points for the regular meetings for Section 3.1.1, perhaps, does anyone else have anything to discuss in Section 3.1.1.? Okay, it doesn't seem like it.

Let's scroll down to 3.1.2, which is the description of executive meetings, something that we have talked about on these calls a few times, and the idea here is that RZERC can have executive meetings to discuss extraordinary circumstances that may require some level of confidentiality. These meetings may not be minuted, minutes may not be published. Current in this draft, it says, "Transcripts might not be published for executive meetings at the Chair's discretion," and I'd like to get people's input on that wording. Peter, you have your hand up, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, so first I support the distinction between the two and the third one which we will come to in a few minutes. There's another section in the document that already covers publication of meeting recordings and transcripts and so on, and so forth. So we should be careful not to duplicate these, redundancy might introduce confusion, again. But more to the point here, I think every party participating in the meeting

---

should know up front whether the minutes and transcripts will be made public. That's the whole point of executive meetings to start with, but also, having simply on the Chair's discretion, and while I trust you, Duane, we never what would happen, but that should be agreed upon by the committee and at the start of the meeting, I guess.

DUANE WESSELS: So, would you prefer some statement that says, you know, the committee would reach consensus prior to the start of the meeting regarding publication of transcripts and minutes?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, that would address my point.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And there is some other, in this first paragraph, there are some repetitive phrases which I think we can easily clean up in an editing session. Any other, oh, Kim, go ahead, sorry, I didn't see you hand up there.

KIM DAVIES: I guess my concern with this section is that it doesn't really have any details, things like notice that needs to be given for a meeting, what the quorum is for a meeting, and so forth, whereas the regular meeting section just above it, goes into some detail about advance notice to be given. I think potential concern there is an executive meeting could be

---

called at very short notice with very few people attending, to make decisions on behalf of the committee.

So I'm wondering, does that need to be expanded upon a little bit? Or constrain executive meetings to very specific purposes. I mentioned the confidentiality aspect, but all other aspects of the meeting is considered to meet the same rules as a regular meeting. But that's kind of my area of concern.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I think that's a good point. Would you be comfortable with, you know, the same level of advance notice, or do you think it should be, perhaps higher for executive meetings?

KIM DAVIES:

I'm fine with the same level. I'm just, in the back of my mind, trying to think, would there every be a circumstance where the executive meeting would be required, because there's something that is very urgent, would that be the basis upon which, I mean, could the RZERC ever be called upon to act urgently on a particular matter, I guess is the question at the back of my mind.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I can see that too. But, to me, in the above section where we talk about 14 days, in ICANN land, that's pretty short notice, I think.

---

KIM DAVIES: Sure. Yeah, so absent any further ideas, I mean, just maintaining the same notice period, the same requirements, consensus as other kinds of meetings, I think.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Alright, let's go down to the next section which is 3.1.3., public meetings. And this talks about having public meetings likely to take place at the ICANN community meetings and reasons for doing so. This section is again not as specific as the regular meetings where we talked about advance notice, and what not. So I'm guessing we could similarly put some text in here that says, you know, the timelines for holding a public meeting, and so on. Any other input on Section 3.1.3.? Okay. In Section 3.2, this section is specific to the minutes and the recording of the transcripts, and here again we have the language that says the RZERC Chair has discretion, which we will change to consensus based decision on publishing minutes. Okay.

Section 3.2.1. is about meeting minutes, and I think this is relatively straightforward. We talked about this in a previous call. We have a section on minutes, on recordings, and on transcripts. Does anybody have something they'd like to talk about in any of those sections, 3.2.2., 3.2.2., or 3.2.3.? Okay, it doesn't look like it.

Section 4 is decision making and consensus. This is relatively short, an earlier draft that we were looking at was much more complicated here, so I like this a lot better. I like that we talk about two types of consensus, full consensus and rough consensus. This seems good to

---

me. Does anyone have input on the consensus part of this document?  
Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks. So, I wonder where the precedent of this is? The only one I remember is probably a bad precedent, that was the GAC that I think during the previous, the latest ICANN meeting, tried to gather around their consensus principle by defining three stages, I understand we have two on the table here, three stages of consensus that ended up with one more or less being a majority. Given that we were, that this decision had been taken out of our hands by the chartering process, I am not completely confident that we can do this in the procedures document and "clarify" and thereby maybe escape the boundaries of the charter here. I think that needs a bit of clarification.

DUANE WESSELS:

Well, the charter is very terse on consensus, right?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, which means that what did people have in mind when they wrote "consensus?" How far could we actually try to get there, as I said, people have tried before to come up with something that smells like a majority decision, and still call it "consensus," which in my reading, or which would be, I should speak in subjunctive here, definitely be not what the intention of the founding parents of the committee was.

---

DUANE WESSELS: So, Peter, would your proposal be to simply, you know, either copy the charter wording verbatim, or just reference it here, and not say anything more about it?

PETER KOCH: Currently we haven't – let me ask a question, I'm just not sure where to go here. So I wanted to bring this up. My point is that we haven't referenced, or the draft procedures document hasn't made use of this distinction up until this point. So I see that in the next section, but why, what was the reasoning behind this? Of course, consensus should not enable a single individual to veto decisions, I guess that's the basic thing, but what was the motivation for this attempted definition?

DUANE WESSELS: I'm not sure. Steve, do you know?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: At one point we copied this from RSSAC procedures document, I think. Is that sort of where it originated, Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Right. Peter, I think Trang, who was involved in the chartering of the RSSAC said the CWG, when they were defining that, they did not want to go into detail on defining the consensus, and rather left that to this

---

committee to determine. But when we look at, you know, when we start drafting this section, we look at what are the consensus models that various parts of the ICANN community are using. So essentially there is "unanimous," which in this case is the "full consensus," there is "consensus," which in this case is the "rough consensus," and then there is "divergence," or "no consensus."

So, those are the three levels, and there are different shades of those levels. And you know, in discussion, also looking at the other procedures, and we thought this two level probably best captures what the RZERC deliberation results could be, so that's why it's put here. So, that's the context.

PETER KOCH:

Okay, I'll take it from here. I think there are differences between, for example, RSSAC with a wide variety of members and a large number, and RZERC, that works with the system of representation or representatives from different communities. So the rough model probably has more rough edges than it would have in a committee of 25 or 30 people. But since I understand we don't have to nail this down today, we can leave it like that.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. And we have a suggestion in the chat from Jim. So, thank you Jim, we'll capture that, too. Let's move on to Section 5 which is long. It talks about how RZERC could receive proposals and consider them, and so on. I think this is pretty good. I think overall the text is kind of maybe, could use just kind of a copy editing pass, but I think the sense

---

of it is very good. One thing that stood out to me, and I asked this to Steve and Mario when we were working on it recently, was, throughout this whole process, we potentially end up with two periods of community feedback, community input. One during the proposal phase, so the community may advise RZERC on whether or not this is something that RZERC should do, should take on, and then again, on the output, the recommendations.

Does anyone want to raise a particular point in Section 5 at this point? So, my sort of impression of this is that you know, a lot of this stuff takes a lot of time, and so as I sort of imagine us going through this, I see these as sort of very long processes, you know, of interacting with all the stakeholders and the communities and gathering input, perhaps from experts. And I wonder if other people have the same impression. It's probably perfectly fine, we need to be deliberate and careful in considering architectural changes to the Root Zone, but as written here, RZERC does not sound like a committee that can act quickly. Okay, it looks like no one put on this section.

Down to the last miscellaneous items. There is a paragraph that talks about proprietary information and potential need to engage in nondisclosure agreements. I don't have particularly strong opinions about that, I think it's fine.

There's a paragraph about conflict of interest and it says, "Committee members must provide statements of interests," and my question I guess for everyone and maybe for staff, is since the members are appointed by external bodies, do we all need to then submit statements of interest specific to RZERC? What happens if someone is appointed,

---

but they don't submit a statement of interest? Is that going to be a precondition for their acceptance into the committee?

STEVE SHENG: Um, this is – yeah, go ahead Brad.

BRAD VERD: This just seems like something that's not appropriate here, that's just my opinion. Because they're appointed by the outside community groups, so there's no statement of interest. If the groups want to do a statement of interest to find out who they want to appoint, that's up to them, but there shouldn't be one from RZERC, that doesn't make sense to me.

PETER KOCH: So, Brad, sorry, so you were saying committee members should not provide statements of interest? But the RZERC itself may provide one?

BRAD VERD: No, no, no, as I read this, and correct me if I'm reading this wrong, we're saying that since I am now a member of RZERC, I need to provide a statement of interest, correct?

PETER KOCH: Yes.

---

BRAD VERD: Okay, so, I am appointed by the group I'm representing, in this case it's RSSAC, right? So if RSSAC wants to have some procedure to come up with how they appoint somebody to RZERC, and that includes a statement of interest, that's fine, but that's up to RSSAC, or the ccNSO, or whoever else. But for RZERC to ask for a statement of interest from somebody who is being appointed doesn't make sense to me.

PETER KOCH: Okay.

BRAD VERD: So I think this should be removed.

PETER KOCH: I'm sorry, which should be removed?

DUANE WESSELS: 6.2.

PETER KOCH: Well, 6.2 is in the charter itself. "Committee members must provide statements of interest that identify potential conflicts of in their committee service."

BRAD VERD: That's in the charter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, it's in the charter, and that's why it's kind of – when we draft this, we have to look through the charter on this.

BRAD VERD: I think maybe, I mean, if it's in the charter, it's got to be there, but I think maybe, maybe the better way of saying that, you know, now that, how do I say it, the rubber is hitting the road, I don't believe that you should have a statement of interest, but declaring any conflicts of interest would certainly make sense. But if I'm appointed, having a statement of interest, I mean, that doesn't make sense to me. But if it's in, you know, if it's in the charter, if that's something maybe we should look at changing, we can do that, or not. Does anybody else see that?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, it stood out to me, which is why I brought it up. It's a little strange.

PETER KOCH: Duane, Jim raised his hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh yeah, go ahead Jim. I think Jim is typing. Yeah, in the chat he says that he's basically agreeing with Brad, if I understand, oh, so what Jim is saying with respect to conflict of interest, we would trust the RZERC members to recuse themselves. Kim, go ahead please.

---

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks. I always just looked at the statement of interest as just a way of predisclosing areas where you might need to recuse yourself. I don't think it's part of evaluating whether you become a member of RZERC or not, because as discussed, that's an appointment made outside the scope of RZERC. Everyone at a minimum review on a regular basis the potential conflicts they have and disclosing them, you know, just adds transparency and eliminates potential sources of tension when an area of comes up.

I personally don't see a problem with it, it's just another way of doing disclosure, whether we do it ad hoc on the fly, or whether we use this as a mechanism to do it in advance. But it sounds like the decision has already been made for us, that declaring them in a statement in advance is part of the charter.

DUANE WESSELS:

I'm guessing that every one of us already has statements of interest from other committees, right? So it's probably just a matter of copying and pasting over from wherever to ours.

PETER KOCH:

I don't think you make this SOI to the committee, it's recorded in a central place somewhere on the ICANN website, and it applies to the person and not to role, if I understand correctly. But I'm happy to be corrected by any of the staff members, being more familiar with this.

---

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, the statement of interest is really to identify the person, not the organization. So for example, like in the GNSO, they appoint someone to the council, and then a matter is brought up, a proposal being brought up by a particular registry or registrar, where this person, you know, maybe hired or consulted on that, so from that person's perspective, they need to disclose that in the interest of transparency during the deliberation.

And this goes to another thing. The RZERC members, they're appointed by the organizations. But do they represent the organizations when making decisions? Is there a requirement that they have to go back and check with the organizations, or they can just, as committee members make decisions as RZERC for the community?

DUANE WESSELS: A pretty big question. I don't think we have to address that. Brad, you have your hand up?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I do. I mean, I hate to say it, but I think we're spending a lot of time on what is a terminology discussion and you know, everybody said it here, I think Peter, you said, I know Steve, you just said it, which is, we are using the term from the charter, I get it, we're using the term "statement of interest," or "disclosure," and it's a terminology issue, right? There is a statement of interest, which is your interest in joining this committee, or why I think I'm qualified, and then there is disclosure of conflicts of interest. But if we want to use an SOI here for disclosure,

---

that's fine, but let's just agree with that and then move on. This is a terminology issue.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. So, we'll take another pass this section in an editing session. But we should wrap this one up, I think. We pretty much made it to the end of the document. The last section says, review of the charter, the procedures document, I think it's pretty straightforward. So we should wrap up this discussion of the charter and we have a number of things to work on.

The last item on the agenda is the date of the next RZERC meeting. I believe that previously we had agreed to monthly meetings on Mondays, like the third Monday of the month, which would put us on June 19th. Does that match everyone's expectation?

BRAD VERD:

Say that again?

DUANE WESSELS:

June 19th is the next meeting, right?

BRAD VERD:

I have no challenge there.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay, so we will send an invite for the next meeting a month from now, June 19th, and go from there. And with that, I think that we can be adjourned. Alright, thanks everyone.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Thank you for joining this call. Please remember to disconnect all the remaining lines. Bye bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**