

## RZERC Charter Review Teleconference #03

Tuesday, 28 June 2022 | 20:00-21:00 UTC

### Attendance

Members: Tim April, Duane Wessels, Geoff Huston, Kim Davies,

Apologies: Daniel Migault, Howard Eland, Kaveh Ranjbar

Staff: Danielle Rutherford, Steve Sheng

### Agenda

1. Agenda Review
2. Discussion Items
  - a. Consensus Model
  - b. Charter: Section IV Composition
  - c. Charter: Section V: Meetings
  - d. Charter: Section VII: Records of Proceedings
  - e. Charter: Section VIII Conflicts of Interest
  - f. Charter: Section I: Background
  - g. Charter: Section VI: Decisions
  - h. Position Paper
3. Review notes and adjourn

### Action Items

- Everyone: Read the [current charter](#) and consider topics to discuss. Feel free to share with Tim before the next meeting
  - Remaining topics: II Purpose, III Scope of Responsibilities
- Everyone: Full RZERC to review text about the CWG-Stewardship Proposal intent for RZERC
  - See [Background Documents](#) for link to CWG-Stewardship Proposal and the relevant text excerpt
- Danielle and Tim: work on summary document of topic scoping exercise that would be first draft of the discussed position paper to share before the next meeting

### Decisions

- Consensus:
  - Committee will strive for full consensus. Every effort should be made by the Committee to reach full consensus. When such consensus is not possible, efforts should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any minority view recommendations that may have been made.
- Section 1 (Background) - remove from the charter.
- Section 4 (Composition) of the Charter - no changes recommended

- Section 6 (Decisions) - sentence added at the end of section 6 to clarify the notification and participation requirements for reaching a decision
- Section 7 (Records of Proceedings) - no changes recommended
- Section 8 (Conflicts of Interest) - no changes recommended

## Considerations

- Section 5 (Meetings) of the Charter - does RZERC want to include an attendance expectation in the Charter of Operational Procedures?
- Position paper - should RZERC have a position paper where it communicates to the public a more specific explanation of the RZERC's scope and purpose? This would be a living document.

## Resources

- Working document: [DRAFT Charter-v2](#)
- [RZERC Charter Review Wiki workspace](#)
- [Background Documents](#) for RZERC Charter review

## Records

- Zoom replay and auto transcript:  
[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/EtQ-1Dc7NA1aFcR5t8u9FiEVwnBC2HoJd4kuJ3qLaw9fK08y8vDdMT\\_wmlmxt9-UV2XP7cORz0RMRzO.oTxRr9FORTVHkShB](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/EtQ-1Dc7NA1aFcR5t8u9FiEVwnBC2HoJd4kuJ3qLaw9fK08y8vDdMT_wmlmxt9-UV2XP7cORz0RMRzO.oTxRr9FORTVHkShB)
- Auto recording only:  
[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/UXBzBijbf7EppJiGSzg7sS1p72kjaXOQO78onvwN-qf2vieMYz9cqhb87IzW4R\\_\\_fVk8FUVyJA7zI9mX.J8H2dQ1Vhy36i79w](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/UXBzBijbf7EppJiGSzg7sS1p72kjaXOQO78onvwN-qf2vieMYz9cqhb87IzW4R__fVk8FUVyJA7zI9mX.J8H2dQ1Vhy36i79w)

## Readout

### Consensus Model

Tim April reviewed the spreadsheet of feedback received from each of the appointing organizations on the level of consensus required for possible revisions to the RZERC Charter. Duane Wessels stated that Verisign's position was to require full consensus for charter revisions. Kim Davies stated as the rep from PTI he would abstain from providing input unless the RZERC could not reach an agreement otherwise.

Tim April proposed that the RZERC move forward with the charter review with the intention of requiring full consensus for possible charter revisions. If the committee becomes deadlocked trying to achieve full consensus then the policy may be revisited. Tim April proposed documenting the levels of consensus on different revisions recommendations similar to the ccNSO:

- **Full Consensus** – a position where no minority disagrees; identified by an absence of objection
- **Consensus** – a position where a small minority disagrees, but most agree

Duane Wessels and Geoff Huston agreed.

#### **Charter Review, Section 4: Composition**

Tim April initiated the discussions on the charter review with Section 4: Composition. Tim April proposed to leave Section 4 as is and not make any changes to the composition of the RZERC. Duane Wessels, Geoff Huston, and Kim Davies agreed.

#### **Charter Review, Section 5: Meetings**

Tim April proposed to leave Section 5 as is and not make any changes to the Meetings section of the charter. Duane Wessels agreed. Kim Davies asked if there should be any attendance expectations for RZERC members in the charter. Tim April noted that RZERC members are accountable to their appointing organizations and not to the RZERC. Tim April stated the RZERC could continue this topic at a future meeting.

#### **Charter Review, Section 7: Records of Proceedings**

Tim April proposed to leave Section 7 as is and not make any changes to the Records of Proceedings section of the charter. Duane Wessels agreed and noted that there may be changes to make to the timing of the records. Tim April agreed and noted the expectations for the timing of records (such as the meeting minutes) is in the RZERC the Operational Procedures and that RZERC could modify the Operational Procedures after the Charter Review.

#### **Charter Review, Section 8: Conflicts of Interest**

Tim April proposed to leave Section 8 as is and not make any changes to the Conflicts of Interest section of the charter. Duane Wessels agreed.

#### **Charter Review, Section 1: Background**

Geoff Huston stated he is not sure why the historical background of the RZERC was necessary for the charter as it was no longer a relevant part of the charter. Geoff Huston proposed removing Section 1: Background from the charter. Kim Davies supported Geoff Huston's proposal and added that PTI has been phasing out references to the transition as well. Tim April agreed.

#### **Charter Review, Section 6: Decisions**

Tim April proposed adding more text to the Decisions section of the charter to reflect the conversation and at the beginning of this meeting that in general the RZERC will strive for full consensus in its work. Duane Wessels stated the operational procedures go into more detail regarding consensus and isn't sure if the charter requires revision. Geoff Huston stated the balance between the text in the charter and the operating procedures is sufficient for RZERC's needs and proposed no changes to the charter at this time. Tim April and Kim Davies agreed.

Geoff Huston asked for clarification on the intent of the second sentence of the Decisions section related to the “Internet-based discussions” text. Kim Davies stated his interpretation is that this text allows the RZERC the possibility to come to a decision on the mailing list without the need to call a regularly scheduled meeting. Tim April proposed adding “, while being documented in an open and transparent way” to the end of the second sentence. Geoff Huston stated that there should be additional text that requires participation by all members, even if it’s an abstention. Kim Davies suggested an additional sentence for the charter that articulates the principle, “Decisions shall be reached either through a noticed meeting or a comprehensive poll of the membership online.” Duane Wessels mentioned an example of a past RZERC document on the KSK rollover that had a strict deadline and he was not sure how this proposed requirement would have impacted the RZERC’s ability to deliver a response to the ICANN Board. Geoff Huston stated his interpretation is that RZERC decisions could either happen at a regular meeting or through Internet-based discussions. Kim Davies added that with proper notice every RZERC member has a chance to attend the meeting and contribute to consensus, and therefore 100% participation is not required as the opportunity was provided equally to each member. In the case of an urgent operational need, RZERC members should make every effort to coalesce in order to respond to the ICANN Board. Kim Davies also noted that a comprehensive online poll would require a 100% response rate with the option for abstentions. Duane Wessels and Geoff Huston agreed.

### **RZERC Position Paper**

Tim April proposed as a follow-up to the topic scoping exercise writing a living position paper that documents how the RZERC interprets its scope and the boundaries of its remit. This paper would enable the RZERC to revise its interpretation of its scope without having to conduct a full charter review. Geoff Huston supported this proposal and added that it would be useful for others, specifically in the RSS GWG, to understand the RZERC’s role. Duane Wessels stated he saw the value of the topic scoping exercise was to get RZERC members to consider how they would respond to potential proposals that came before the committee. Duane Wessels added that he saw value in having a document that illuminates the RZERC’s purpose to other groups. Tim April stated he and Danielle Rutherford would get started on a draft for the committee to review.