
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, everyone. Thanks for joining. This is the RZERC Charter Review Work Session held on Tuesday the 2nd of August 2022 at 20:00 UTC. Tim, over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So the first thing on the agenda is looking over the last meeting we had. That was really a month ago. So I think we had a few less people than we have now on that call. We started to go through the charter, discussing the charter, and ended up getting to the end of five sections. So then we had asked everyone to read the current charter, the CWG Stewardship Transition document. And if we get through everything that's on the current agenda, there was a discussion about reducing the amount of changes we put into the charter itself, but to have a standalone document where we basically articulate what scope we believe the RZERC to have.

Danielle and I started that mostly due to other complications and my vacation. And we didn't finish all of it, but there's a fairly substantial contribution to it so far. I don't know if anyone ... I think I saw that Peter had a chance to read some of it. We can discuss it at the end. [inaudible] on the agenda there.

So the proposal for today was to continue going through the charter itself. We have only a handful of sections left, but they're probably the most likely to have longer discussions. Once we get through that, we can talk about the paper and then the next steps that we can take from here.

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.

Any questions or discussions about the previous ... For anyone that has had the chance to review the transcript from the previous meetings, anything to bring up from that before we proceed? I don't see any.

Okay, we can jump into the draft document. The first section of our discussion was Section 5. I don't remember who proposed this, but there's one question. Do we want to consider possibly modifying the section here to include something about an attendance expectation? Or would that be something we'd want to include into the Operating Procedures or just not incorporate at all?

Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Thanks, Tim. Just because I don't know whether you had a chance to see that message that I submitted an hour ago or so where I tried to reconfirm the position of the ccNSO. And then I wanted to suggest, in response to your question of a second ago, that either here or in the Operating Procedures, maybe we could address this attendance issue by following the ccNSO suggestion and make decisions dependent on two readings. And again, I'm not sure that everybody had a chance to read that remark.

DUANE WESSELS:

Peter, can you say more about what that means and how it works?

PETER KOCH:

Okay. So in general, like everybody else, I went back to the ccNSO and we talked about—or the Council—and talked about preferences regarding consensus. And the suggestion the Council came up with was, “Stick with a term ‘consensus’ without explicitly distinguishing full and rough, but then maybe try to have two readings.”

And the two readings is something that the ccNSO uses in their PDPs. Which means that if there is more than a discussion, so if a particular section of a document or a particular item comes into the decision phase, then there will be one reading and the consensus will be gauged. And then there will always be another reading where people have the chance to join the consensus or raise objections or issues. And only if the two readings pass, it will be accepted.

My experience is that it will usually be accepted, but it gives people a chance to raise their voice if they want to. If they were unable to participate in one of two subsequent meetings, usually. It's a suggestion.

TIM APRIL:

Did you have a follow up question for that, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:

Well, yeah. That's not why I raised my hand, but I do have, I guess, a follow-up question for Peter. So that's an interesting idea. It's not clear to me if you're proposing that just for the purposes of the Charter Review or, more broadly, to the RZERC Charter—so to all decisions that might come after this point, I guess. Was it one or the other?

PETER KOCH: It was primarily targeted at the decisions of the Charter Review Team because that was the question posted to the ccNSO Council or posed to every one of us.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

PETER KOCH: I wouldn't be completely opposed for RZERC to do that, but I think we do have Operating Procedures already. But again, this was primarily targeted for the Review Team.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I think that's interesting. I didn't see your e-mail, so this is kind of the first time hearing of it. But, yeah, I'm not opposed at this point, I guess.

TIM APRIL: Just a clarifying question for that. By two readings, you mean to have a discussion on one regular call and then repeat that same discussion on another call that's scheduled later on and proceed from there?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim, for that question. Well, repeat the discussion ... That's usually not the case. What one would do is go through the items

one by one in one session. And then people can ... Members of the committee or of the policy development team or whatever can either accept or raise issues or make suggestions. And then go to the same items or another set of items because you progress through documents. That's how the PDPs is in the ccNSO work, at least.

Go through these items, in another, in a later meeting. So, give everybody at least a first, maybe a second chance to address the issue. And then the issue will be done after that.

So it's not like you have in some legal systems where you have the two readings in the same session or something to make it a more formality. But actually really to inject some time in between. And from memory, it is so that people ... Again, it would also address this participation issue. So if you miss one meeting where a decision is made. Because if you always have a second reading, you get a second chance or you get ... Yeah, you get a second chance. That's it.

It doesn't necessarily accelerate things. That is maybe a downside, but I'm not sure that will be an issue with our team.

TIM APRIL:

Kim.

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah, thank you. I think some additional context. By my recollection, the practice in the ccNSO of doing a second reading actually stems from a practice that they introduced about 12 years ago, I think, where working groups with attendees from all over the world, they staggered the time

slots they were being held at by eight hours so that each meeting was an at an eight-hour offset. Which meant that there was an assumption that everyone was missing every third meeting because it was in the middle of the night for them.

So it was sort of a practical outcome of that, knowing that not everyone is expected to attend every meeting. So business will be repeated twice throughout the course of the working group's work. I don't know if that's useful context, but my recollection is that practice is directly derived from the way the meetings were being scheduled at the time.

In terms of how we operate, I'm not against Peter's proposal. But it feels to me that that's getting into operational procedures as opposed to fundamental principles. And I would suggest the way that the committee wants to self-organize is probably something that should be decided by the members as they currently exist and may want to evolve sort of year on year as the composition changes, as time zone changes, in the like.

To me, I think the critical thing for the charter is just to preserve minimum expectations, whatever they might be. If there is a minimum expectation that there's a second reading, so be it. I think the text that we'd arrived at on the last call was more driven by just that presumption that there's a certain amount of notice. But it's debatable what that notice should be.

So anyway, I don't know if that's useful context, but that's my recollection of how that practice came to be. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Look, I have to agree with Kim to some extent that the details of decision-making processes are probably beyond the scope of the charter. And I can see in other committees I'm involved with at ICANN, notably SSAC, a second reading might will elicit some responses for folks who weren't paying attention the first time, which would actually have smoothed out some problems where assumptions of consensus were premature.

I find it hard to directly apply that to a group as small as this. And considering the size, I'm not convinced that that is necessary. But I think that the meta point is more the sieve of what goes into a charter versus what goes into Operating Procedures. And the charter, I think, has the issue that it's not a voting decision-making body. It's a consensus decision-making body. And beyond that, there's not an awful lot to say. The whole discussions we have been having about full and rough, it's hard to say what the sift is to get them into a charter.

Kim does bring up one thing, though, which is the notice of a decision. And conventionally, all members need, if you will, appreciable notice—because we are a representative group rather than a group of individuals—to have the opportunity to consult with our nominating constituency before being asked to reach an outcome. And while in some cases it may be a complete formality, in other cases it may well be substantive.

And the issue really comes the notice about decisions which is somewhere between Section 5 and Section 6, but it's not in either at this point. And I think it's reasonable in a charter that decisions shall be placed on an agenda prior to a meeting. And the whole issue of notice of that meeting, no less than 14 days' notice, also includes the issue of notice of decisions to allow such consultation as appropriate is, I think, more important to me than the nature of how this particular group itself comes to a decision. If that's any help. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Thanks, Tim. I wanted to thank Kim for that historical background with which I couldn't disagree. I'm just noting that this is also applied to committees that work on fixed a fixed schedule, maybe for tradition. But just because it works for the ccNSO doesn't mean it should implied on others. So I was just bringing this as one example and a suggestion that the ccNSO Council came up with.

I think I said, or I hope I said that this could be placed either into the charter or the Operating Procedures of the Review Team. So I would agree with Geoff that it's where I can understand Geoff's position that this might be too much of detail. The most important part, of course, is that this is not about voting. It's about striving towards consensus and then deal with "minorities" in an appropriate fashion.

And yes, notice or second readings might be considered operational.
Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Any other questions or comments on this? Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I see that Daniel has leapt in already and added a sentence in the draft. The 2 that I'm looking at in Section 6, "Noting decision shall be reached either through a notice meeting or a comprehensive poll of the membership online." And that's probably the level of detail that I would have thought is appropriate. That would certainly be good enough for me to note that. That you can't spring a decision on the body as part of the charter is probably adequate in the way that's worded. So thanks for that, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: You're welcome. I will just note that is an output of our call and discussion from the June 28th meeting. So that's not from today.

GEOFF HUSTON: Oh, so I'm repeating myself. I'm so sorry. Or maybe I wasn't on that meeting. I've forgotten. My apologies.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So from this conversation, I've picked up that there might be a few things we want to know for the operational procedure 0075tapdates.

But at this time, I haven't heard anything changing our work processes for the Charter Review or any charter revisions at this time. Is that correct?

TIM APRIL: That was my understanding. And then with the note that I ... My thought from what Peter was saying in the e-mail earlier and this conversation was that we should consider taking the second reading approach or some more rigorous discussion on the mailing list when we actually get to the point of making a decision about the updated charter.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Excellent.

TIM APRIL: I don't mean to be putting words in your mouth, Peter, but does that match?

PETER KOCH: Yes. It makes sense to me, Tim. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thank you. So jumping back to Section 5. I didn't mean to entirely constraint Section 5 to only about the attendance part of [it]. Is there any discussion about either attendance or any other parts of Section 5 that anyone wanted to bring up?

Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

I think your question that you posed was, do we need to make changes here and say something about expectations of attendance. I think in the charter, no. I think in the Operational Procedures, probably. But I think the reality is that, due to the way RZERC is structured with other organizations appointing persons, it's going to be hard to really require or enforce attendance.

So I think the best you can do is have maybe regular attendance reports or something back to the appointing guards. But that sounds a little, I don't know, a little administrative. So I don't know.

TIM APRIL:

I don't remember how this topic came up, but I was thinking about it between the last meeting and now, and my thought was to consider it for operational procedure update, not in the charter, and make it more of just an expectation of—defining the expectation—rather than anything prescriptive in that way. Which I think aligns with what you just said.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, it does. Yeah, I think the time where it gets really awkward is when there may be a meeting where a decision needs to be made and the attendance is very low. And then no action gets taken for reasons: you don't have quorum or just because you're not comfortable. So I guess that's just something that we would have to live with.

TIM APRIL: Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I was thinking a little bit the opposite of Duane. That since we're nominated by an organization, if a member is really not attending RZERC meetings, I suspect this organization is going to replace him. So this is why I did not really consider that quorum. We can expect to have a de facto quorum because the full organization is not willing to be misrepresented. I mean, what I'm wondering is, is the RZERC chair able to contact directly an organization if there is an attendance issue or something like that? And if so, is that something that has been considered, maybe the Operational Procedures?

I'm reading the chat, and Kim I think is pointing out that reporting back to the organization might be sufficient to have a significant attendance.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I don't recall anything in the current procedures that defines doing that, but that's certainly a thing [inaudible] considered. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I would urge us all to rethink this as a global body [inaudible]. In some ways, we are lucky there is no one from India or Central Asia here because then there would be no suitable time as a regularly-scheduled time to hold a meeting that isn't incredibly unfair to one person or another. And for that circumstance, it is quite understandable that

some folk might find it structurally extremely difficult to participate in all meetings.

The ccNSO response of rotating the meeting slot every week by eight hours ... I have been on committees that have done that, and that is equally horrible insofar as there's no fixed time for the meeting and everyone finds it difficult to schedule that into their calendars for that reason.

And so while it is certainly incumbent upon all of us to find a meeting time that is mutually convenient, it's difficult to phrase expectations against folk when it is incredibly inconvenient—2:00 in the morning—for those individuals, for whatever reason. And so I would hesitate to start saying, “You must attend all meetings” when, for some, it might be an incredibly onerous imposition. And they might be happy with participating without necessarily dialing into these meetings live.

So I would urge us all to just remember we're certainly not in the same time zone all of the time. And that time zones are a very harsh taskmaster. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Kim.

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah. I think in addition to what Geoff said, just thinking about why we're here and the core purpose of this committee, which is to essentially review proposals and make sure that all of the different appointing organizations can add their perspective when it's warranted.

And I think in light of that being the principal reason why we're here, I mean, I don't say that regular attendance is a requirement so long as each representative [is across] the discussions and the issues that are being discussed reviews their proposals and has the opportunity to intervene when they have perspective to add or when they need to bring it back to their community.

So I think as long as around the meetings, we have the appropriate discipline of, again, providing notice, having a structured approach to our work so that all of the members are across the work, then they can be judicious in which meetings they attend and which they don't based on the agenda in advance and so forth.

I mean, I would definitely prefer full attendance for the meetings to be more effective, but for the reasons mentioned earlier, I don't think that's realistic. So I'm not sure that ... I was relaying some of the practices of other committees where they do share attendance records. And that was because those committees had a real concern that those that were completely disengaged from that committee's work, there was no way that their appointing organization was aware that ...

And one instance comes to mind. They never attended any of the meetings and there was no indication they were active at all. So I think—and I don't have the solution here—but something that just ensures that at a base level, each of the appointed representatives are tracking the issues appropriately I think is what we're trying to achieve here. Thanks.

TIM SMITH: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, thanks. So in my head, there are actually two points about attendance. One, I think we might be missing, either in the operations [inaudible] or here, the aspect of quorum for a meeting. I just realized that we don't talk about how many folks attending is enough to meet quora. It's not specified.

The other is, as we're speaking to what happens when members, for one reason or another, don't attend many meetings, the tricky part here is the first sentence in under Section 5 which is, "There's no guarantee that there'll be any more than one reading per calendar year." So to do something like ...

To say, as an example, if someone missed three meetings in a row, then maybe that's time to report back to the constituency group and say, "Hey, we're not getting attendance here." But it's tricky when you say, "Well, we might not have a meeting." So, I don't know. I think there's probably a ... That sounds very operational to me, regardless, but I think the quora thing is almost more important to me than the individual attendance of a specific representative. Over.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks. I think I might be duplicating [inaudible] that this attendance issue might be a moving target. We should, of course, agree what we want to achieve. You could argue that it is on the appointing organization to monitor the engagement or the presence of their appointees. But of course, if it comes to quorum or if it comes to concerns of representation, then the committee itself might want to reach out under extreme circumstances, so to speak, so that the further we discuss it, it is getting less clear to me what we want to achieve here.

However, with what Geoff said ... And these concerns or observations were, of course, very valid in terms either rotation or fixed slot with a significantly diverse-in-time-zones membership of the committee. That, again, might have an influence on what we did or what we do in Section 6, especially if we defer decisions or allow decisions made by a single meeting.

So taking that into account, we again need to think over what we want to achieve with that because, again, accepting that, yes, we are representing organizations, the voice of the organization—SO or AC—being part of a decision should also not be subject to some random or arbitrary pick of time zone where a representative cannot be expected to deliver that vote.

That might be an operational issue, but it is something that then should be addressed in the charter at a higher level, as in it needs to take into account diversity and time zones, and you name it. I'm pretty sure there's boilerplate text available to the extent that I couldn't reproduce better than it exists.

TIM APRIL: The general idea of what I'm getting from this is that we shouldn't be putting ... It seems like everyone basically agrees that we shouldn't be putting the attendance requirement into the charter and consider it for Operational Procedures. But we should think if we want to include, you said, Section 6, Peter? So the decision section. Is that what you're hinting at?

PETER KOCH: Yes.

TIM APRIL: To take into account that it should be allowing of decisions to be made over not requiring a meeting or consensus to be judged without the requirements of a meeting. I'm trying to look at activity how to address that, but maybe we'd be [inaudible] on that and come back to it—

PETER KOCH: Yeah, if we—

TIM APRIL: —if anyone has proposed text.

PETER KOCH: Sorry, Tim.

TIM APRIL: Go ahead.

PETER KOCH: If we stick to this high-level issue, then it needs to take into account a geographically or time zone wise dispersed membership. And that would probably be translated into details in the Operating Procedures. But again, I'm pretty sure that text to that in that spirit exists elsewhere that we should be able to copy.

TIM APRIL: Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. There are so many considerations and I have the impression we are such a small group that it's probably the responsibility of the chair to make sure that this has enough feedback to take a decision or, I mean, to see if there is a problem or something like that. So this is why I don't think we should add too many rules and things like that in the charter as well as operational processes probably. I mean, this is just a thought.

TIM APRIL: Would there be anyone who opposes just taking a note on this and taking this up as part of an Operational Procedure Review? Because my reading of the decision section is that if the Operational Procedures were to allow or to take that into account, it would control for that. Do we believe that it needs to be in the charter itself or could the Operational Procedures deal with that on its own?

Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I vote for procedures, not the charter.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm not so sure. And it actually affects whom these nominating bodies would select. If it's necessary to make sure that the person they nominate is able to attend meetings with everyone else at the same time zone, it tends to produce a constituency that is clustered geographically and actually works against folk from areas which are not well represented. And India is a very good example of a time zone that's just not shared with anyone else and difficult to accommodate.

If it's left to Operational Procedures, there's very little guidance. If the charter says, "There is no voting. There is no compulsory attendance. The decision shall be made across time and shall be reached through comprehensive polls," that is a clear stricture on the Operating Procedures not to introduce procedures that effectively—and without any intent—but effectively disenfranchised, in some way, some people.

I like the idea of, in the charter, saying that it's either through a meeting or through comprehensive polls of the membership online. I think that's a reasonable thing to state in the charter. To actually say, "You don't need to be at every meeting physically. You're still participating." And I

think that's a good signal to send within the charter, rather than leaving it vague and ill-defined and up to the Operating Procedures.

So I would tend to try and say in the charter that we're not going to insist that everyone is synced in time at the same point to make a decision, however that can be phrased. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: I just noticed that Howard put a comment into the document. I'm trying to read it quickly.

Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, and apologies in advance. I might be more confused than at the beginning. So on the topic of not being biased by whatever reason towards or against particular time zones or a compilation of the group that favors or discourages certain time zones, why would that already be addressed by still leaving "a notice meeting" in there? I think there's a ... I sense a contradiction there, but I'm open to be convinced that it isn't.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I have to agree. As I look through this again and again, it's kind of, what is the best way to accommodate decision-making frameworks where

you would like the ability, as far as possible, to discuss a decision and arrive at consensus as a conversation. And that's a good thing.

But that necessarily implies, to some extent, being able to meet contemporaneously. And for these kinds of global groups, that's not necessarily achievable all of the time. And you need to accommodate the folks who it's simply not possible to get to the same time zone. So, yes, Peter. I, too, am confused about how best to do this.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Realistically, I think decisions should be discussed at notice meetings, but consensus should include a comprehensive online poll of the membership. And what you're effectively saying there is that decision should involve the opportunity to discuss—in other words, decision shall be discussed through notice meetings—and consensus is necessarily the result of a comprehensive poll of the membership online to give folk who weren't at the meeting the opportunity to be part of forming that consensus, which I think is entirely appropriate in a charter. That's the best I can offer here.

PETER KOCH:

And that makes sense to me. Thanks, Geoff.

TIM APRIL:

Does that alternate text help with what you just proposed, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I believe it does, yes.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So we would scratch the green text here added in June in support of the new text that Tim added today?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, given that either I'm colorblind or green and red are different between you and me, I'd also change ... Not the "option" to have a notice meeting, but with the default assumption. In other words, it's not, "We might have a discussion before the poll." It would be, "In the normal course of events, we would have a discussion before the poll." So, change "option" to "default assumption" or even "default action."

Right. And I see the alternate idea—Anonymous Penguin, whoever that is—that sometimes things have a certain timeliness that we can't do that. And that would normally be the reason why you wouldn't. Urgency is an issue. So the alternate phrasing of that is also consistent with what I was saying, yeah. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: So does that [inaudible]. Yeah, I wanted to do. So removing ... I tried to strike it out and replace it with the other text. How does that look to everyone else? Thumbs up from Geoff and Howard.

Any other discussion for Section 6? Did we actually finish Section 5? I don't think we did. Any discussion for Section 5 and 6? Not seeing anything, okay. [inaudible] 15 minutes, so we can potentially get

through ... We can start the discussion on Section 2, which is the next one up for discussion.

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: So if the chair says this is a meeting, that's not a meeting if only the chair is there. And either the procedure should define a quorum ... Which is fine. What constitutes a meeting is not in this charter, and that's almost a procedural omission that needs addressing.

TIM APRIL: So it's [inaudible] 5.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. It's either a majority of members or whatever. I believe it needs some degree of statement about what is a meeting and what is, "Well, no one attended it, therefore ..." because that's no longer a meeting, I would have thought. That would be my assumption, so ... Yeah, thanks.

TIM APRIL: I was just typing something [inaudible] I don't know if "simple majority or something else would be better. Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: I believe we went over that just a few minutes ago when Danielle said she was going to actually put the quorum requirements into the

Operational Procedures. I'm [inaudible] as to which way it goes for charter or operations?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, the reasons I talked about the decision process, Howard, I would be, I suppose, happier to see some mention of a quorum in the charter to provide signaling to the nominating bodies about what's being required here, such that if a person is nominated by an appointing body and they say, "Well, it's great, but I'm not going to attend any meetings," the charter is going to say, "Well, maybe that's a problem and we all need to think about this." If it's in the Operating Procedures, that's not so explicit.

I realize there's a delicate balance to be walked through in all of this as to what's operational and what's charter because the other problem is that you can get these skeletal meetings which the procedures of the day might well admit, but come close to contrary to most folks expectations.

So I, too, am confused about what you put in procedures and what you put in the charter here. It just seemed to me that some note in the charter might be appropriate, but others might have better ideas. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Yep. I completely agree. How about this? How about we do both? And that being, "A meeting will require a quorum as defined in the Operational Procedures." And then in the Operational Procedures, we define the quorum. That way, it's not set in stone for us. And should we later on decide we want to change the definition of quorum, we can do so without having to affect the charter. Over.

TIM APRIL: That's exactly what I was about to propose by alternate text. Does that work for others? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, that works for me. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Anything else on 5 and 6? And the next section was Section 2, the purpose. So I see some comments from ... Both Duane and I put some comments in there. I don't know if you want to speak to the proposed changes you have been the first sentence, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. So the first change is really just borrowing the phrasing from the CWG proposal just to make them the same, I think. Well, and then the second one is to remove the word "content" or "content of the DNS root zone" because that's something that I've long struggled with in trying to apply this charter to the work of RZERC, I think. I don't know

where the word “content” originally came from, but I think it's probably misused here and is too limiting, maybe.

TIM APRIL: Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Just on that last point, I think the intent of the word “content” was to distinguish it from the publication mechanisms where the root server operators play a role. I agree it probably could be worded better, but that was the intent. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. So I like the idea of removing the word “content” there just because my head immediately goes to zone data. So, I like that.

I do have a little bit of a question about the first part of the sentence, which is “were expected to review proposed significant changes.” I don't know how we know they're significant if we don't review them. So without trying to navel gaze on the word “significant,” I think maybe we have to just refine that just a hair [inaudible].

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. I can't speak with authority, but my understanding of the appearance of the "content" here is that it, of course, did not mean the individual delegations—because them to be liberated was part of the intended transition—but technical content in terms of adding record types, adding IPv6 records, adding DNSSEC, and things like that.

And the distinction would be justified by an architectural appearing in front of that. And I am not completely sure I like removing the content of the ... I think it should be preserved in a way that captures the mission as described previously. Like, new record types or ZONEMD or stuff like that should still be in scope.

TIM APRIL: I'm going to lower my hand. Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Coming back to Howard's comment about "significant," I think my perspective is that we make minor architectural and operational changes pretty regularly and we don't concern RZERC with them. And I suspect RZERC has no interest micromanaging every little change and tweak that's made throughout the normal course of business. Between our team and Verisign's team, there are constant updates and adjustments and so forth.

So what we're really trying to do is capture in a sentence, which is very difficult, that these have to be significant, that their material to a point

where there's significant potential adverse outcomes or things that warrant wider review, I think ...

Hopefully, I speak for everyone that everyone wants these big changes to get adequate review, so we're all comfortable with them and there are no surprises. And that's absolutely everyone's intention here, but capturing where you draw the line in a pithy way is pretty difficult. And I think that challenge when the first version of this charter was created was what ended up with those case studies, those litmus tests, that big spreadsheet of different potential scenarios. And we all put in our perspective on what we thought may or may not make the cut.

I mean, it's really hard to draw a box around this, and I'm not sure we're going to accomplish it here again today. But that's kind of the elusive goal. Where do we draw a box around what stuff is below the threshold that RZERC shouldn't need to care about it, and what stuff really needs to get on RZERC's agenda? Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

One of the things, as I was writing the draft position paper document, was trying to phrase some of that. And one of the ways I had it in a draft I had on my computer was, "The structure and makeup of the DNS root zone, but not the response data ..." because I was trying to figure out how ... I didn't like the word "content" either and couldn't quite figure out how to describe it without being much more verbose to say that the RR types that are allowed, but "we don't care about the RR data" is the best way I could describe it to myself. I don't much of a better way to phrase that.

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I think it's hard to review Section 2 Purpose in isolation from Section 3. And some of the discussion I'm hearing is actually Section 3, The Scope of Responsibilities. I actually think the purpose, removing content—including significant and operational—certainly summarizes the purpose if you take that word as synonymous with “intent.” This is why it exists.

Section 3 says, “This is the instantiation, the scope of how we conceive of that intention.” I would say that, to complement each other ... And it's going to get confusing if we refine purpose to have a whole bunch of scoping qualifications when, in theory, they're meant to be in the following section.

So I don't think we need to overthink Section 2 because Section 3 is there, is what I was trying to get at. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

I'm noticing I have three minutes left. Any other discussion on that? My proposal was going to be that I'll take that as an action item to think about the text in 2 and 3 a little bit more on how we might propose changes in the document itself before the next call and pick up from there on the agenda. That's Section 2, Section 3. And then the review criteria is what we have left [in charter review].

Can you remind me when the next meeting is, Danielle? Is that next week because we're delayed?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. The next scheduled meeting is a week from today, August 9th. And that's because this is an off week. Since IETF was last week, we postponed last week's meeting to today.

TIM APRIL: All right. So if everyone can review 2 and 3 before next week and we can pick up where we are now. Other than that, any other discussion before we adjourn? Not seeing anything [inaudible].

Thank you, everyone. Talk to you in a week.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]