DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, all. Welcome to the RZERC Charter Review Teleconference held on Tuesday the 6th of September, 2022 at 2100 UTC. Attendance for this call will be taken on Zoom. Tim, I'll turn it over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So mostly going to try and pick up where we were last week and see if we can expand a little bit more in the conversation we were having. Danielle and I were looking over this late last week and trying to divide it into a little bit more manageable or well-formed questions. So then I had proposed we approach it, how it slide out in the agenda where we talk about sections 2 and 3 without the clause of "within the root server system" to see if all of those edits were reasonable.

Because if I recall correctly, they're mostly just grammatical language preciseness questions. And then pick up the conversation where we left it two weeks ago with that clause "within the root server system. " And then address the other questions that are proposed in this section because those were from the process document. If we could switch to the charter.

GEOFF HUSTON: Could I be so bold as to ask someone to post that URL into the chat Thank you. Thank you.

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.

TIM APRIL:
Okay, so into try and recap what we were discussing the last meeting, the changes that are currently proposed, except for that one clause, the clause in both sections 2 and 3, was to add operational to the purpose section which mirrors what's in the scope of responsibility section. The term significant was added to the purpose, and then there's just annotations in the text of the 1, 2, and 3 to try and make it so it's easier to parse. I think that was all of the changes that were in that section. So any comments about those edits? Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:
It's Huston, look, I'm in favor of the edits as they're written here with the one exception of the phrase, "within the root server system. " I go back to almost the title of this committee, which is the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, not the Root Server System Evolutionary Committee. And I think it is appropriate and proper to consider the root zone without the qualification of "within the root server system" as being within the scope of this charter. So I would advocate removing that phrase in sections 2 and 3. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:
Peter.

PETER KOCH:
Yeah. This is Peter for the records. Hello, everyone. I'm just going to repeat what I've said before. I'm missing the analysis that would suggest these changes. I concur with what Geoff said about that particular one. I will point to the going back and forth about

operational in comparison to the earlier draft, and I don't think this is the right step at the moment.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter, this is Duane, can I seek to clarify, you think adding operational is not the right step at the moment? Is that what you said?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. That's the one point. In more general, I think we are filling with words. And it is still unclear to me what exact problem we are trying to solve, and we need to sell this to the broader community. I think last time we agreed that there would be an accompanying document or some rationale for these changes that's kind of desperately needed, I believe. And I haven't seen it yet.

And so I wonder why we are undoing a change that in this particular one, talking about the phrase operational, the word operational, we are undoing a change that was done in that earlier charter definition. I don't think it has stopped or overwhelmed the committee either way. I think the right step would be to document the findings and then from that conclude these changes. And I'm thinking, my impression is that we are trying to optimize or to polish some of the wording without being able to really explain what problem we are trying to solve. But again, I've said that before.

TIM APRIL: To respond to at least to one of the edits that's proposed here, the word operational here. The primary reasoning that I proposed it or

Duane did, that why I would support adding the operational or removing the operational from section 3 is to make the text not conflict with each other in both of these cases. Because the document says one thing in section 2 and then another thing in section 3, I think it should be consistent in both cases. Similarly, it's more of a confusability issue that I have with the numbering of 1, 2, and 3, and then I'm ambivalent on the addition of the word significant. And Geoff has his hand up.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geoff Huston. Look, Tim, you've actually, I suppose, said what I was about to say too. And the issue is the document was inconsistent before we started. These changes insofar as section 3 said architecture and operation, and the purpose document only had architectural and that needed some degree of resolution. The resolution to favor three over the single architectural term in section 2 strikes me as consistent with what I understand to be the goals of this committee. That it's the root zone, not just the architecture of its distribution.

And so I actually think Section 3 had it right. And the culled wording, removing that in section 2 was inconsistent with that. So that was why I'm in support of leaving the term operational there, arguing that it was already there in the first place just not consistently there. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. Yeah, this is Duane. So the reason that I would like to see significant and operational in the purpose section not only to make it match what's in the scope of responsibility section, but also to make it match from the back background documents we were given which was from the CWG-stewardship proposal that used operational. It used the word significant architectural and operational changes in more than one place. So it's not just making the charter consistent with itself, but it's making it consistent with the document that started RZERC to begin with.

TIM APRIL: And one other thing I forgot to mention when I was talking a minute ago was the document that you mentioned, Peter, that explains the rationale for the proposed changes, that is, I believe, it's required by the process document that we present or gave to the board as part of this. And that was the intention or my understanding was that we would produce that document after we finalize what changes we intend to propose for the charter.

So as a result of these conversations, once we finally have agreed on charter, the differences would be copied into or we would have a diff document that we would basically annotate with the reasoning for these changes that would then come to this group to review that rationale before it's presented to the different constituencies and then the board after that. Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. This is Peter again for the record. Thanks Tim for that clarification. That's a doable approach. Make the changes first and then phrase or do the explanation of the rationale, fine with me. On the issue of consistency that was brought forward by Duane before, I agree that consistently of this catch phrase is useful. And the difficulty we are facing is that, obviously, viewing the CWG late phase, so to speak, when RZERC was introduced and when the charter was finalized, that slight inconsistency was introduced.

We should really go into a bit of detail there when we do the explanation of proposed changes, why we think that the last-minute change to the charter was maybe an oversight or whatever it was, why we want to undo this. In the end, I think whether or not it's operational, with these various points that are made, again, we haven't been constrained or overwhelmed with tasks. And, yeah, that's all I have to say, I guess. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I certainly agree with Peter that we have not been overwhelmed with tasks, which I think has been a good thing. But I do feel like the committee struggles with interpreting the purpose part of the charter. When we do the topic, the scoping exercises, I feel like we spend a lot of time referring back to this part of the charter and discussing about whether or not it helps us decide if something is in scope or not. And it just, I don't know, seems like we spend a lot of time and confusion

around this. And so, I guess, that's why I'm in favor of making clarifications here.

TIM APRIL: Any other comments about these proposed changes?

DUANE WESSELS: I guess, Tim, I'll I jump in again, if it's okay. I feel like, well, we're getting close, except for the within the roots of our system phrase, I feel like we're not quite there yet. I don't know how we're going to come to consensus on this. And it's a little bit hard when we don't have the full committee participating in these. Yeah, I'll end it there. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: That brings up a good point. Danielle and I were going back and forth over email about earlier. The last call that we had was Howard's last call was an RZERC member. And then it also appears that Kaveh is going to be rotating off with the board meeting to appoint another person to our RZERC in the next, I don't remember exactly how long, I think it'll be after the next ICANN meeting. So we're not going to be able to fully finalize these changes and everything before both of those parties are read.

We have appointed people from both of those organizations again. My hope was to try and come up with the proposed changes to this document, create the rationale documentation that we've been talking about, and have that ready for the new people who are appointed to come in, review it, have a chance to ask any questions or propose

potential changes, and then begin the process of trying to socialize this with the appointing organization. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: If I understand the marker on this document correctly, the addition of the phrase "within the root server system" has been an addition to the previous document.   And I find myself trying to struggle with the rationale for adding it in the first place.   If the aim of this review exercise is to discuss proposed changes, then I'm actually at a loss to understand why this particular proposal is still sitting in the document. In so far as if the aim is here is to get consensus on proposed changes, I'm certainly not in a consensus position personally to agree that that particular edition makes sense and context for this draft charter.

And so I think even now I would like to understand the rationale for its addition and why this is worth continuing to consider almost irrespective of the rotation of the various members. So I suppose I'm arguing, changes need to be if you will place across a slightly more strict acceptance criteria than what was there already. And I have yet to hear that for that particular phrase. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: The way I was intending to try and drive the conversation was to address the changes, absent that phrase first.   Get to some of the agreement there and then hopefully restart the conversation about that particular phrase being added or not into the document after. We can switch to that conversation now. That's easier. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: This is Geoff. Where did this addition that phrase come from? I'm at a loss at this point. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: I'm trying to recall the context and search my notes for it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: There's a comment from Tim April on August 2nd from the section that says, should we specifically note that this distribution is "to the root server operators" rather than just the distribution of the root zone itself. And then Duane added the comment, I can support that. Maybe "distribution of the DNS for exam within the group server system. " And then Duane proposed that test in the Google Doc.

TIM APRIL: I think that was the result of a conversation we were having on a call that was on the 2nd, I believe. Because I don't remember exactly why I typed that phrase in.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Give me just a moment. I'm going to pull up the notes from that call. I'm sure that we get the chat for people to review.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. So in this particular case, I could understand that this actually addresses a point that was subject to our scope discussion, which basically is what is called hyperlocal or whatever you call it one of these similar initiatives and different names.

So first of all, depending on how you read the root server system, if you read it as the classical, like the letter labeled the root servers, then anything that would go beyond those distribution, this particular and, yeah, classical or other would say legacy route service system would be out of scope. So we couldn't really advise on why hyperlocal, you name it. If root server system is whatever is considered contemporary, we maybe haven't added a clarification because if you read it that way, then hyperlocal and friends would be in scope. So whatever we try to achieve here, I think that this phrase may not be concrete or precise enough to do what we want to do. But thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. I guess I was just going to reiterate why I suggested or why I like this phrase which is because I think it helps sort of narrow the purpose to things that are within ICANN's remit. We spent a lot of time last meeting talking about this particular phrase and hyperlocal roots. And to me there are a lot of ways to distribute the root zone hyperlocal

or otherwise that are entirely outside of the root server system and entirely outside of ICANN's scope of influence.

So if there's a way, well, I guess, first of all, we have to agree as a committee that this part needs to change. And if we do, and if there's a way to phrase this, such a way that it refers to things that ICANN has influence over, then we should do that. As Peter said right now, it's maybe a little unclear. It's maybe a little bit open to interpretation. But again, my concern is that I don't want that RZERC Charter to sort of claim responsibility for things that are well outside the bounds of ICANN.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: That's a good point, Duane, but if we look at ZONEMD, it's there with a direct impact on hyperlocal and alternative distribution mechanisms so that a client can assure itself that the zone copy it has just obtained is genuine.   And I can certainly envisage recommendations around signaling such that hyperlocal clients can receive a signal rather than constantly poll when a new copy should be received. And I think that kind of work is entirely consistent with the work on ZONEMD, which in turn, I think, is entirely consistent with the RZERC charter as it's stored then and as we're looking at here.

I take, I suppose, what I would describe as a conventional interpretation of the root server system. And in other context of ICANN, it's the 13

letters, the 12 server operators, etc. , whereas I would have thought omitting that allows more directly such mechanisms that impact upon the root server system in terms of what signaling could be provided, what other forms of credentials could be provided that would facilitate the timely, accurate, and useful distribution outside of the direct query response system that we use with the root server operators as they stand. And if the purpose of all of this is evolutionary, rather than just looking at today, then I would argue such a broader view is proper, and appropriate, and responsible as distinct from saying, nah, none of our business.

So I would argue we have already been doing this and I would argue it is appropriate and proper that we continue to do this broader view to actually facilitate such alternate mechanisms other than direct query response. And again, I suppose to close, I would argue, "within the root server system" in the ICANN context, says something to me, which is quite specific, and it's certainly narrower than If you just don't miss it and talk about the distribution of the root zone, you are taking a much more general stance. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: This is Peter again. Thanks, Tim. So from a very practical or pragmatic point of view, Duane, I think I have a certain sympathy for your approach to say we should be able, the committee should be able to work where there is influence. But maybe already today, some people

would claim that ICANN, and that is pending what whatever the RSS GWG comes up with, that ICANN does not have control over the root server system.

And even if it had, if things change in a way and I'm picking on or pointing towards the evolutionary aspect here. If things just happen, and should be observed and a reaction would be due whether or not that is by ICANN, or whether or not ICANN is able to enforce anything there, I do think that this committee is probably the last line of, well, there's no defense, but at least the one line of being able to notice and maybe raise a warning flag.

So I don't think that constraining this to the litter-based root service system is the right way to go. We do see other mechanisms. We also do see that big resolvers that don't need any distributed route get a certain influence and that might be another aspect to look into even if we are pretty sure that ICANN will never have any control over those some big resolver systems. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So I think I am not really much in favor of not really dank down to purpose of the root zone distribution system as we know it now. And the reason for that is that whatever mechanisms are being used, if something really bad happens and results in a lot of people not being

able to have access to the root zone, I think it's going to be hard for ICANN to say they're using another mechanism than ours.

I mean, I have the impression that it will be hard for them to argue that they didn't have to send any warning before because it's not their own distribution mechanisms. So I for that reason, I am more inclined to say that we should have a borough scope than the one of the root systems as we know it now. Because in some ways, I don't know if I'm clear or not, but in some way, I think ICANN has another side responsibility to have that root zone being distributed. But this is just my personal opinion.

TIM APRIL: And I have found myself now looking at the questions that we're in the agenda for later on of, does having this phrase in there, does it appreciably change, allowing the opportunity to do the work that proposed or that we envision our responsibilities are.

And then also the sorts of questions that Peter is asking of, if we add that phrase or not have that phrase in there, will it dramatically change the amount of work that we would come to the committee or prevent us from commenting on things that we might need to comment on in the future. And as I've been thinking about that, I'm starting to lean away from including or being in favor of that text. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I can certainly envisage if hyperlocal gathers some momentum, that the current on-demand, unsynchronized polling system for hyperlocal

clients cannot and will not scale. It's just a mess. And every other time in computing and networking terms we've come across this unscalable distribution property. We move from unsynchronized, uncoordinated pull to structured push where changes are rolled and notification sent and then clients know when they should pull rather than just simply pull on the off-chance.

Now, I suspect, but can't tell that this is going to come up again and again. And there will be some pressure to try and coordinate a sane signaling system to allow this mechanism of having a local root zone to scale up to the, well, hundreds of thousands of recursive resolvers out there.

And I would be saddened if the comments was, well, that's not in the root server system, therefore, it's not our problem. Is a position taken either by the root server operators, which I doubt they would or by ICANN itself. I think that would be the wrong response to that quite legitimate way of scaling the DNS further than where we are today. So that's the scenario that's in my head as to why this makes some sense even in the ICANN context, that considering that issue about scaling the root zone and its uses is, to my mind, well within this evolutionary charter that this group is meant to be focused on. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: So I'm just I'm trying to judge the opinion of the room. It seems like most are-- So our work party charter defines that we're operating under full consensus. I don't think we've reached that decision yet. I'm trying to figure out a path forward from there. Are there – putting a pin in

that one, are there other comments in these two sections that we need to address ICANN? I'm trying to pull it up right up. I don't have it up on my screen right now. Do we need the phrase?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry, Tim. The only comment left in the document is one from you that says, is the statement needed?   Referencing the sentence, "The committee will coordinate with the CSC as needed at the end of section 3." I don't think we've discussed this one yet.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I mostly just put that in there and it seemed weird and out of place to have specifically call out one, call it the CSC as some of the coordinators needed with when we can coordinate with whatever committee we want.   But I'm fine leaving it or just deleting that comment. It does matter to me. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So I'm just wondering, so we have been discussing the purpose section and it's unclear to me if we have any sort of full consensus for any of the proposed changes. My question would be, what are the alternatives? Chances we don't agree, do we go back to the initial text in the charter or do we add a section where we said we had that discussion or we think we should discuss that more, that we have a chance to reach a full consensus, and that we may decide to continue discussing the things. It's a question. I'm wondering, what is the path we can foresee?

TIM APRIL: My understanding of the procedure that we've outlined is that we did full consensus on the final document so that we would be resolving all of the comments one way or another with full consensus from the committee. So it may require for the discussions either on list or on a call later on. And I guess we could do this as [00:36:59 –inaudible] or something like that in the chat. My intro read is there would be little opposition to adding at least the room maneuvers in section 2. I think the words significant and operational may potentially have more opposition and require further discussion.

And then there's the switch from and, I'm trying to find, and or in the first paragraphs of purpose and scope of responsibility that I think it's just a readability and which I believe would be on controversial. But beyond that, we need to come to an agreement between the rest of the committee, or go back to the start of this process and have a longer discussion about consensus. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. So it seems pretty clear to me that adding the phrase "within the roots of our system" is probably the most controversial thing we are faced with here in our last couple of meetings. And as Geoff noted, there is certainly at this point, very little support for adding it, right? That's if you look at the balance of what people are feeling at this point, I would say most people are against it. So I would suggest as a way forward to take that off the table for now and perhaps see if you can reach some kind of consensus on the other changes that have been proposed.

And then we can revisit this perhaps afterwards if people would like to. I mean, I feel like we could continue to have a discussion about the hyperlocal root and what's in scope and what's not in scope. We could continue to propose various hypothetical changes or proposals that might come our way and talk those through. But as a way forward, we should probably take it off the table for now.

TIM APRIL: Okay, so I see, plus one from Geoff on that. Okay, so if we take that half, if we do a vote with Emoji or something like that of barring that phrase from both sections, are there any objections or other discussion about the other proposed edits in these two sections. And excluding my last comment about is this statement needed. I think Geoff says he's in favor of all comments or edits that remain.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I am as well. This is Duane. I'm in favor of the proposed changes that we see for the purpose section in the one or two minor changes to the scope of responsibilities section.

TIM APRIL: Peter or Daniel, noting that we will have Daniel and I can work on writing up the justification of all of these that the committee will review before we proceed to the next phase.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So the question is whether we -- I suppose Daniel is me. So the question to me was whether I object or not to the change that are in purple.

TIM APRIL: Purple one and there's one in red. Yeah, so you would basically ticking the check box on all of the remaining edits in sections 2 and 3.

DANIEL MIGAULT: To me, that's fine.

TIM APRIL: I understand your statement there, Peter. Yeah, we'll have to work on the rationale and that may take some back and forth with the committee as we develop that. But, hopefully, Daniel, I can work on that between now and the next meeting, which I think is going to be in at least a month. Okay.

                        And then so the other questions are, do the Purpose and Scope of Responsibilities sections enable the RZERC to fulfill its role and responsibilities as envisioned? And then question two, does anyone not say yes to the first one. And does anyone say yes to the second? Are there any aspects of the Purpose and Scope of Responsibilities sections that are ambiguous that require amendment? Go, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I feel like at this point, no. I mean, we've talked through some other changes and sort of where we've ended up, I think, is maybe kind of as good as we're going to get for now. So at this time, I would answer no to your question.

TIM APRIL: And, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm not sure the way you phrased it with a yes or no.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I was questioning myself about that too.

GEOFF HUSTON: But are you saying, does this document look ready to you at this point, noting that there are a few more steps along the path. And my answer is, I think it looks like Duane said about as good as we're going to get through this drafting process. So I'm in favor of moving forward with it as it stands. Yes. If that's what you're asking.

TIM APRIL: That is in fact what I'm asking. My brain is not fully working. And I'm just checking the next thing on the agenda. So I think that leaves us at the only other piece is oh, I think we addressed the next two questions as well on that. So I think it leads us to the review section at the very end of the document. Do we have any comments or proposed edits on

the section or [00:45:32 -inaudible] and make that there's in five years' problem. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: There are two things which are curious in this and maybe it's just me. The passive sense of if determined necessary kind of begs the question, by who? And it just seems like such a dangling hook that doesn't have a home. I'm like, what you're trying to say is, well, after five years, you got to do a review and that doesn't preclude doing a review more often, but who initiates a more often review is actually a pertinent question. And secondly, all reviews of the charter shall be subject to the ICANN public comment processes subject to or in accordance with. And I think what you meant was in accordance with. Subject to is a weird verb.

I think what you're trying to say is the reviews shall go through ICANN public comment and comments shall be addressed yadi yadi yada yada, which is actually in accordance stands rather than subject to. But maybe I'm just nitpicking on grammar at that point. But the first one, perhaps, a little bit more substantive, is it seems odd to have a passive sentence of if determined necessary without at least some clue as to whether it's an RZERC decision or somebody else's decision that would figure out a more frequent review at any point. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH:	This is Peter again. So I'm not going to respond directly to Geoff's question or remark, but there's one issue that is probably kind of related. RZERC is a bit different than the other committees because it's not in the bylaws, right?
	So linked to the question who can initiate a review or who is then able to accept that is the question who owns the committee and who is going to approve the charter. And is it useful to keep it that way or should RZERC become a bylaws committee. I'm not saying that we need to provide the solution to that, but maybe we could post these questions as a finding or as an observation in the review. This is not related to section 9 in particular. It's more a general thing.
TIM APRIL:	Trying to think of it. so that just to rephrase it to make sure I'm capturing it properly from my notes of best of it, should RZERC become a bylaws committee through whatever process that might actually entail and so and that's probably a resolution of the board as a method to try and provide either more accountability or better oversight control sparked off of this review part.
PETER KOCH:	So yeah maybe phrase that a bit more neutral, and maybe I did bad in my first attempt. I didn't mean to suggest that it become a bylaws committee, but I do think we observed a couple of times that RZERC was not on the radar, unlike other committees that are mentioned in the bylaws and or have a longer presence or a higher profile or you name it.

I couldn't say that that was detrimental to the committee's work, but lack of visibility sometimes leads to lack of, say, lack of work so to speak. If nobody knows it exists, then people are less likely to approach RZERC with an issue. And, again, that might be a feature as well. So just noting the observation, it's bylaws committee. The question is more then who owns it and what is that specific nature did it benefit the work or is how does the community think about this today? Does that change of spin make sense?

TIM APRIL: I think so. I'll have to think about it and possibly come back to the recording to try and synthesize it. But it seems like a potential and thing to include in the rationale behind the final report that comes out of this process that goes with the board or goes to the board in the public comment, I think. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think Peter's comment is spot on in terms of a review of charter. Because one is, what's in the charter, but secondly, this contextual thing about what is this body and what is its place in the ecosystem. Now, one approach to that is to actually propose an answer and see if it flies. The danger is, of course, that other folk who may have an interest in a slightly different view of its role in charter have sort of presented with almost a fated compliant have a much harder task of trying to say something else.

An alternative way is to flag in the review process of this charter that this is still an outstanding issue and that the current instantiation of this

committee at this point simply wants to flag that as an issue, and would like to solicit inputs from both the community and the ICANN board as to how that might be addressed in a subsequent review.

So in other words, shunted into the -- well, it hasn't really stopped the functioning so far, but it may have implications in the future. We should not ignore this issue and put it in that phrasing to save us trying to invent a much bigger wheel right now as to the context reporting and so on of the committee as it stands here and now. So flag it, but not necessarily solve it this time would be my suggestion. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Okay. And while we were discussing that I was looking at the section 9 again, and I was wondering about add the phrase to try and address Geoff's original comment, if determined necessary by the RZERC or the ICANN board, to try and make it so that it's like, right now, I guess you could read this as anyone could request that the RZERC review their charter and cause a whole bunch of work for us. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: So I think that's better. Yeah. I don't think it goes all the way of addressing some of the concerns that Peter and Geoff raised, but I do think it's better to have at least something there.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. That wasn't to try and remove the proposal that they we're getting at, but get part of the way there and let the next charter review handle the rest of it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can't raise my hand, but can I suggest something here? So I think having some sort of proposed text is good here because in the initial draft report, we can include rationale about a conversation about where does this committee belong in the community? There's a discussion about bylaws, and then during a public comment and during the feedback session, which is with each of the appointing words that choose to accept that invitation, we can call this out specifically to get more input from different people in the community. So we might not have an answer now. We can solicit input, and then based on that input, continue the conversation after we've developed an initial report.

TIM APRIL: Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I mean, what Daniel said sounds good to me. I was also going to suggest on Geoff's original comment. He noted that subject to here was a little bit strange. I forget what you suggested instead, Geoff, but I think we should put your suggestion there instead.

GEOFF HUSTON: I suggested in accordance with.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, right. Thanks, there.

TIM APRIL: I assume that would be in accordance with the.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.   Oh, it's either ICANN's public comment processes as Daniel has. Oh, it's one or the other. It's either the apostrophe s or the, I think, but I'm Australian, grammar is optional.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Is there a preference?

GEOFF HUSTON: Not from me.

DUANE WESSELS: Nope, not from me.

TIM APRIL: Okay, does any other comments about section 9, we accept those changes, and I believe that would be it. At least the first, at the initial testing with the charter. I'm not seeing anything. Geoff says, "Plus one to accepting the proposed changes. " Okay, and I think we're at the top of the hour. I think, Danielle, please correct me on this if I'm wrong. I think next one, next to these meetings is about a month away in October. Oh, yeah. There it is. I finally finish the past three, the position paper I think we've been talking about, we'll probably pick that

up after we return in October, but that will probably be in the normal meetings. And then the two of us will try and come up with the output document, and try and get that ready, hopefully, for when we get back in October. Any other comments? If not, thank you very much, everyone, and talk to you in a month. Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. Just raising the flags, so to speak. This might have been my final and last RZERC of meeting for having to rotate out. I don't think that the ccNSO has started a replacement process yet, but if the next meeting is in October only, then changes might have occurred by then. Just to let you know.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thank you very much, peter for all of your help during this process. Any other comments? All right. Thank you all, and talk to you in month. Thank you for your service in RZERC, Peter. Talk to you all later.

PETER KOCH: All right.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]