

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Welcome, everyone. This is the RZERC Charter Review Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 9<sup>th</sup> of August at 20:00 UTC. Attendance for this meeting will be taken through Zoom. Tim, over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, all. So, just picking up where we left off last week. We have Sections 2, 3, and 9 left of the document to review. And I guess we'll just jump straight into the discussion unless anyone wants to talk about anything from last week. Go to Section 2.

Duane sent regrets for today. He mentioned that he was going to go and put some comments into the document. And I had also said that I would read through the document as well and make any comments I was considering to start off the conversation. But where we left it last week was, we were discussing the cross-out on the second line of Section 2, talking about removing “the content of the [DNS] root zone.”

I’m trying to recall. So right before that ... I'll leave it up to others where we actually want to start it, but the two other comments that Duane had added ... So, the operational part. And then there was the significant part. There was a comment in the CWG proposal document where it outline that “significant” was not easy to define and may be more confusing than it needs to be.

So the position I ended up getting myself into when I was reading this earlier was potentially remove the word “significant” but leave “and

---

*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.*

---

operational” and then accept the rest of the changes that are in this section. But I wanted to propose that as a starting point for everyone.

Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, hi. Thanks, Tim. So I went back to my archives and the earlier versions of the Draft Charter when it was discussed by CWG and was put out for public comment. And I observed that there was the “operational” in the earlier draft, but it was then taken out. And I couldn't easily find what the reason for that discussion was, but it would confuse me a bit if we just put it in again without understanding what the discussion back then was because I don't feel that it is [dearly] missing here.

TIM APRIL:

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I find it hard to understand. I can place various interpretations on these. Replacing the current operator of letter C from the “Foo Corporation” to the “Bah Corporation,” neh. From our perspective, not an operational change to the nature of the root. It's really someone else to think about that kind of change. It is an operational change, but it's not that significant.

Adding another 600 service letters to the name servers of the root zone, that seems to be a significant operational change that we might want to

---

talk about as an operational change. And it's not that all operational changes should or shouldn't. And it's hard to actually make a strong and firm line as to what becomes an evolutionary change which is of relevance to the Charter of this committee and what is just business as normal.

Now, you can use the word “significant” and apply it to both architecture and operational as being a threshold going, you know, it's in the eye of the beholder. If whoever's contemplating this change thinks that it's significant and needs RZERC to look at it, send it over. If RZERC believes, “Nah,” fine. That's okay too. If RZERC agrees that it's significant and requires some further review and input from this group and its various stakeholders, again, all of the better.

So in taking the word “significant” to apply to both adjectives—architectural and operational—and understanding you're trying to get away from “add new labels, add new operators, remove an operator”—in other words, almost the process as the process currently runs—then I think the word “significant” covers that, and I think operational is actually relevant.

You could argue whether 500 new service letters is architectural or operational. But if you have them both, it's not an argument. It's clearly one or the other or both. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Geoff. And along that line, my reading of this when I was looking at it earlier was that the operational nature of it was in the generation of the root zone, not necessarily [the operator]. Like, if a

---

root letter were to change, who's operating it. It wouldn't necessarily impact that because I agree that [inaudible] moving to a different company doesn't warrant this organization talking about it.

But if we were going to add a giant number of new roots, or if Kim came to us and said they were switching from using some automated system to hand-managed text file for the root zone, that may be something we'd want to comment on.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Is this Charter for us or everyone else? Is it something that others need to hand matters over to this group if they fall within the purpose and the Charter of the group or is this to guide us going, "No, no. Yes, we claim that we should be looking at [Matter Y]"? Which seems a little bit weirder to me.

I thought it was kind of the former, that it's sort of the filter that goes to particularly Kim, but the root zone manager, the RZM, and whatever else comes out of the governance areas that kind of goes, "If you think it's big and warrants this group's eyes, then that's your call." And this group would also apply its threshold of what significant and might, with its interpretation of the Charter, take it up or say, "No, that's okay. It's not really a matter for us."

TIM APRIL:

I think that particular question is answered in the first paragraph of Scope, Subsection III, where it defines who can bring items to the RZERC, which is also up for potential change.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think with that double check, it makes sense holistically. Folk can raise matters. The committee has its own sift of what it thinks is a significant architectural operational change and, in essence, can then make recommendations to the Board as appropriate. So I'm, on the whole, happy with the inclusion of the words "significant" and "operational" in this.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. So I am not convinced that the purpose, as it stands in Section 2, needs a change. We haven't been overwhelmed by requests that would force us to be stricter in what we accept. We haven't seen things brought to our attention that we could not have adopted because we felt the Charter wouldn't allow this. And what remains is that probably, in the outside world, nobody knows what RZERC does.

First of all that would, if at all, be changed in the scope of responsibilities, maybe. But I don't see what problem we would solve by backing out changes that were made seven years ago once again, and what problem we solve by adding specific words. I would very much like to stick with the text as is because I don't think this is a significant improvement that we can base on prior experience of the committee.

---

TIM APRIL: Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I do have English questions, how to read that because ... Well, the first thing is “significant”—what significant means. But the other one is, how do we read that? Is it “architectural and operational” changes? Or is it an “or”? Meaning that if we have a topic to address, it can be said, “Oh, no. It's an architectural change but not an operational one.” So this is not RZERC or ... I mean aren't we ...

Well, the question, and I have no opinion on that, but I'm wondering if we're not adding unnecessary complexity. So I think I tend to agree with Peter.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Let me cloak this with something that I think is kind of real today. The extent to which hyperlocal or whole of zone root serving is informal, unstructured, haphazard, uncoordinated, I think a lot of us have a feeling it could be very valuable, but we're spending all of our effort on incremental queries into the root and the work on whole of root-styled root zone circulation is kind of sitting off to the side.

Is that matter an operational, or even an architectural matter, that is worthy of consideration by this group? Should we promote whole of zone by some form of zone transfer as being as important or should we

---

structure it with the same level of care as we've done with serving incremental queries? Now, it hasn't changed the root zone and you could argue, to some extent, that it hasn't changed the architecture of the root zone. But it has changed the operations an awful lot.

And if you think that kind of shift in the way the root zone is served operationally is important and is deserving of, I think, a more structured approach to make sure that there are folks who are going to serve it, it's on time, the whole of zone doesn't lag the true state of the zone by days, etc.—all of those operational things—then maybe “operational” has a place in this purpose that would not be there if you just said, “It's architecture.”

I guess it's a manufactured example, I admit, but it strikes me as one that would be a point where you'd actually introduce that topic into RZERC if there was operational where you might not do if it was not, if you're just constricting yourself to the architecture. Thanks.

I'm not convinced either, but that was why I was kind of in favor of having “operational” there for that kind of stuff, if that makes it clearer. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT:

So, the way we need to read that is “architectural or operational.”

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, sorry.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. That was in my head.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. So I would suggest “proposed” ... And the question is, who proposes to whom? Or is it something that just happens, like hyperlocal? “Proposed architectural change to ... the mechanisms used for distribution of the DNS root zone.” I think that hyperlocal would be covered by that. However, if we add “within the Root Server System” that would be interesting. Is hyperlocal still in the Root Server System? So that change would actually exclude something that we might want to have a look at.

Again, I don't think the purpose is what confuses us, but it's the proposal or the question of who should actually bring this to the attention. And we're all seeing hyperlocal, and every one of us could have just said to the committee, “We need to talk about this.” But apparently we haven't, had least not to the extent that it arrived on the agenda.



TIM APRIL:

I'm not seeing any other hands. When I joined RZERC—I don't even know how long ago that was—I very carefully read the Purpose Statement and excluded to myself hyperlocal as a topic that will be brought to RZERC because it had the content of the root zone rather than just everything related to the root zone. But I could go either way on if that were in scope or not. I don't know what we would say about it either way, but that was what I think about it.

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

If I looked at “The mechanisms used for distribution of the DNS root zone” and I'm ignoring, at this point, “within the Root Server System”—which I don't quite understand—if I just look at those “mechanisms used for the distribution of the DNS root zone,” it strikes me that that's far more operational than architectural. Now maybe it's the way I'm interpreting what is architectural and what is operational, but I think those mechanisms have a strong connotation of operations. How timely? How accurate? Is the root zone consistent across all of the possible sources?

All those things, to my mind, are operational questions about, are these mechanisms going to serve the community. And it's less of an architectural question. And I was, I suppose, erring in this Charter on the side of generality rather than saying, “Well, it's obviously architectural. Therefore, it's obviously not RZERC's business.” Because in some ways I think RZERC has a role from its constituency—you know, all of its

---

members—to be able to raise those matters with the peer members of this group.

So, as I said, I'm not sure about “within the Root Server System” as being valid here. But as this conversation moves on, I can't put all of the matters of what I think are important to the users of the root zone as being solely architectural. I think there is an aspect which is the way it works as an operational matter which is important. And I think it's a legitimate area for consideration and review by this committee as a consequence.

That's the best I can offer here, Peter. Look, I understand it's been in and out. Yeah. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: So maybe a better way to use data to make the decision for us is to go back to the list of potential items that Tim put together and say, “How many of these are operational?” And I think, not looking at it right now off the top of my head, but I think the answer is enough of them to include the word “operational” here. But I might need to review that to make sure I'm not speaking with a forked tongue. Over.

TIM APRIL: Trying to pull up the draft [inaudible] scope document right now and find what those were. So along that line, the topics that were ruled out

---

of scope by the survey we did were categorized into Standard Operational Activities of Changing TLD Operator Information, Revision of PTI Authentication Mechanisms with TLD Managers, Change of RSO (having to do with RSSAC002), Managing the Root Zone—are things that were in scope [inaudible] operational things.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Sorry to interrupt here. I do notice Topic #18, Changes to TTLs. I'd argue that's very operational.

TIM APRIL:

Yeah. So the category I had bucketed them all into, all of the in-scope operational things I had identified were untested, unexercised, or extraordinary operational activities—so KSK rollovers whether they're planned or unplanned, significantly expanding the root zone, the TTL item, changing of historically static RR type parameters. So, like, if the DNS signing mechanism were changed. So this definitely seems to be an operational component, but it's not the everyday, well-understood operational mechanisms.

I know Duane had other comments on this. We may have to wait for him to either send a note to the list or for the next call to go into more detail on that.

Are there any other comments or should we pin this one and have everyone think about it and come back to it at the next call? I'm not seeing any hands. Okay, so why don't we focus on the agenda for the

---

next call? We may end up needing to do the same thing with the next section.

So, the Scope of Responsibilities. And as I was reading over this earlier today, I noticed that there is one section ... So in the first paragraph of this, the Charter mentions “architecture and operation of the DNS root zone” which is part of why I was supportive of adding that phrase to Section 2. And then I had copied the “within the Root Server System” phrase from the previous section as well.

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, this actually drove straight at where I was going to comment about moving on from 2 to 3 because of this reference to the Root Server System. Daniel has pointed out, if you will, that this has a derivation in the RSSAC026 about, well, it's the set of servers that implement answering incremental queries. In other words, it's almost an architecture as much as a system. And that is subtly different to serving the root zone to folk who need it because it kind of ties in the current mechanism to the end point folk. Have access to a root.

And do we want to add that particular phrase to this? Or do we want to leave it to a reference to the root zone without a reference to the current way it is served which is, I think, carried as baggage when you reference the Root Server System? And it applies as much to Section 2 as the insertion of that phrase in that third paragraph of Section 3. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Geoff, for raising this. I would probably have the same opinion here, the same position as I had with Section 2. At this time and day, it's probably more constraining than we might want to envision when we ... Adding that phrase "within the Root Server System" would be more constraining than we might want to.

If I may, then I have another remark. The highlighted final sentence, I think, is something that we need to or should pay a bit more attention to. So obviously the parents, if I may say so, of this Charter had some vision that the CSC and the RZERC would work closely together. And while we do have a liaison from CSC, I don't remember that we had any issues that came out of CSC that would have informed our work. And so I have no conclusion to draw from that, but it's something that we might want to dive into a bit more.

So what was that vision? And why might the committee not have experienced that vision to come tangible in a way? I'm not suggesting doing anything with that sentence at the moment, just taking it as a hint to observe and research a bit more. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Yeah, [I had] certain questions with reading that line earlier, especially because it seems to be redundant with the first paragraph of the section as well. Any other comments or proposed changes to the section?

---

---

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

That leading sentence of the third paragraph, “For architectural changes that impose a risk to the security, stability, or resiliency of the content of the root zone ...” Isn't it a service, not a content? I kind of don't understand what that means.

You know, I actually thought the root zone was a service to the rest of the DNS and everyone else. And it's not that the content matters so much as the service—the attributes and answering queries, etc. I don't quite understand why the word “content” is there. So maybe others have views as to whether that's the right way of phrasing it, “content of the DNS root zone,” or if there are alternate ways of phrasing it that make more sense. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Kim.

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah. I think this is probably just a hand-fisted attempt at trying to draw a distinction from what's in the purview of the root server operators and RSSAC. I don't interpret it any more than that, but I agree it could be constituted in a better way.

---

TIM APRIL: Do you have any suggestion of better wording for that phrase? I don't know what intent is, but [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: I could offer one but, you know, I'm always wary of drafting on the fly. But, "For architectural changes that impose potential risk to the security, stability, or resiliency of the DNS root zone" and to simply remove "content of the" and just simply talk about the DNS root zone in those attributes. That might be a better way of just simply doing this. So, to strike out the three words "content of the." But like I said, I'm always hesitant about editing on the fly. I'm never sure.

TIM APRIL: [All right]. Is that a new hand, Geoff, or an old?

GEOFF HUSTON: No, it's old. I threw it away.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. So it occurs to me that this phrase is used in multiple instances, and especially in the previous paragraph as well where the Charter also talks about the content of the DNS root zone. So we're probably having that very same discussion. And it is used as a standing term talking about the security resilience—sorry—at least talking about

---

the content of the root zone, “the systems including both hardware ...”  
If we change it in one place, then we might have to change it in another place. And then, again, maybe we should get a better understanding of why it was phrased in that way.

And I understand the ... I hope I understand. I believe I understand what Geoff was going to say here. We should also take into account the previous explanation that talking about content, rather the operations or rather the service, that might have been an attempt to separate the domains of duty, so to speak. That needs a bit more research in the genesis of the original text.

My plea is for consistency in wording here between the paragraphs. And I think that phrase occurs at some other place in the document as well. Actually, it doesn't. It's only in 2 and 3.

TIM APRIL:

Yeah. It's just those two locations. We've crossed one but not the other so far. Or it is crossed out in one but not the other so far. Was that me that crossed it out or was it Duane that crossed it out in the first one? Duane. I guess this may also be another conversation that we'd want Duane for [inaudible].

Danielle, do we know if we have any of the information from the discussion about the creation of the Charter from the first time of why it was phrased in any of these particular ways?



---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I don't know if we have access to the records creating the Charter. I think we have minutes going back to the beginning of the RZERC, when that was formed. But that's definitely something I can look into this week.

Steve, you were around ICANN at least then. Do you know about anything related to the original language of the Charter?

STEVE SHENG: I can do some do some research. This is part of the CWG. Right? And then there's some public comment proceedings, and then there's the drafting of the Charter. So we can take that back and do some research.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Steve and I will take that as an action item to get something to the RZERC, hopefully in the next week so that you have that at least a week before the next Charter Review meeting.

TIM APRIL: All right. Thank you very much. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. I cannot find a button to raise my hand. I do have a question. I'd like to understand how the group feels where the boundary is between RZERC and RSSAC because when we have the ... Regarding the content of the zone, it is clearly outside of RSSAC. Now, when we're talking

---

about architecture operations, it's clearly out of RSSAC. But architecture, I'm not so sure.

So I would be interested in if anyone has a clear idea on where is the boundary between RSSAC and RZERC.

TIM APRIL:

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm not going to walk into that one so easily. My comment was more mechanical, and it's simply noticing that we talk about architecture and operations in the first sentence of Section 2 and in the first second of Section 3. Oddly enough, when previous versions struck out "operations" in 2, it left in "architecture and operation" in 3. And my only plea was consistency, please.

Daniel's question is a lot harder. And there is, I think, a difficult situation about the root servers and their responsibilities, if we put it like that, to the Internet itself of making the DNS work for all of the tools that everyone else uses that refers to it. And they're not used via ICANN. And there's no, if you will, formal agreement between ICANN and the root service as to what the roots do. It's the root servers at large making a unilateral declaration of what they're doing, Daniel. And that unilateral declaration is not managed by ICANN, so it's a question of some relevance.

But I also think that RZERC has a say about it as well. Not an overriding say, not a directive say. But certainly an ability to comment. If, in a very

---

hypothetical world, the root servers collectively said, “We’re not going to do AXFR whole zone transfer service from this date on,” I think there is a role for RZERC to comment on that going, “Are you sure?” And then, “Let’s talk about this.” Because I think that becomes beyond what we thought was the root servers fulfilling their obligation to the community at large.

But beyond a few simple examples, I don’t think I can answer more generically what your question is posed. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

I had the same question that you had, Daniel, as well when I was reviewing the Charter right before we began this whole process. And before joining RZERC, I was trying to find where the demarcation between RZERC and the RSSAC was. [inaudible] it started to feel like this might end up being a third rails sort of situation where we might want to comment on things that the RSSAC is doing—or the RSSAC or the RSOs are doing.

But it seemed like once the zone file had been generated and provided through whatever mechanism ICANN uses to distribute the zone file to the RSOs, it didn’t seem like we would have much influence over the process following that. I think I was one of the few out-of-scope votes for things like the MTU and PSS values for the RSOs to use for serving the root zone because I felt like that was an operational issue that would be up to the RSSAC or the RSOs to define on their own. But it seemed there was other stuff that was more in scope than [inaudible].

Peter was next.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Tim. And thanks, Daniel, for asking that question. I think that zooming out of editing the text or trying to fix some issues and find solutions, going to ask these questions as in what is the relation of the various players.

I mentioned CSC before because it's mentioned in the Charter. And then we also note that we have two advisory committees represented on RZERC that have their own mandate which allows them to advise the Board any time. And then the other Charter gives those two advisory committees another way to advise the Board through RZERC. And that is true for both RSSAC and SSAC. And I think, at least in the beginning, we had similar discussions about demarcation lines or boundaries. I'm sorry, you said boundaries.

But maybe it's not about boundaries. It's about overlap, and the question is why is an overlap a problem? Or in what different roles would, say, one of the advisory committees talk to the Board directly or in the RZERC collective or in the RZERC group?

Let's not forget that one of the founding legends is that RZERC was built to replace the NTIA in that little niche that was left after NTIA was replaced by the Stewardship system and especially gave up the approval of root zone changes, and so on and so forth. So maybe it's a feature that there's overlap. But I think we would do well if we zoomed out a bit and documented these questions so maybe we can go back to the community and present this as findings rather than preempt their

---

responses and input and change the text already. The text of the chapter, I mean. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

That's an interesting assumption. In some ways it's the IETF that tells the root service operators the nitty gritty of what to do—insofar as there have been various RFCs in the past and may well in the future—on what the DNS should look like and how it should operate and standard form. And in some ways, it's not a negotiation unless the root server operators sit in the IETF and gently bias the process their way. But that's the writing instruction. There are a set of standards on how to do it.

RZERC makes recommendations to the Board, not to the root service operators. But the root service operators don't have, if you will, a detailed mandate or contract from the Board. It's all done via RSSAC. And so I'm not sure, actually, if RZERC said, "Well, TTL should be three"—pick a number—what would happen thereafter because I'm not even sure there's an instrument that would let TTLs be set to three via a resolution of the Board unless there was goodwill on all sides that this was sensible and we all agreed anyway.

So I think in bringing this up, there is a conscious understanding that RZERC makes recommendations [in] consideration to the Board about changes which are under the purview of the Board. And some of these things which appear to be highly operational are actually, I guess, more

---

under the purview of standards and IETF best practice documents than a resolution of the Board.

But that doesn't mean it's not good sense. If these are good-sense engineering measures, then they shouldn't be talked about and we should be doing it. We shouldn't be blindly adhering to procedure if it gives us bad service outcomes. I think we'd all agree about that. But how best to do that is, I think, the problem here.

So as far as I can see, the stricture on RZERC is formally that it goes to the Board, and some things the Board has limited or no purview over, per se. And I suppose RZERC needs to understand that. If that helps. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Any other comments on that one? I can't really form a thought about that right now, so I'll think about it. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I would make one more comment about the work in progress over the Root Server System Governance Working Group, which is a work in progress. And whatever we see of the landscape today is going to be subject to change as a result of that group when it eventually does whatever it needs to do.

I think it is an interesting point to bring up that if we're having some issues in understanding that delineation, then certainly the folk who are represented at the GWG—and that includes myself from SSAC and the IAB, variously, and folk from RSSAC—should perhaps raise that in the

---

GWG as one of those things about, "You might want to think about this because it's unclear the relationship between the work of the GWG and the work of this group."

As it progresses on, it might be helped by some further clarity in this space. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

I'd consider the ongoing work in the GWG as part of this. And the way I had [inaudible] in my head was who knows when the GWG will produce something that we can review, and to not block this work on that and potentially, if needed, revise the Charter later on. Because I think there's the provision in our Charter that would allow us to reopen proposed changes if we need to do afterwards as it's written now, but who knows if we'll amend it later.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I agree completely. I wouldn't wait for the GWG. But when it does finally do something, we should consider it. But I think I was going one step further. If this is something that we might like to see thought about in the GWG, it wouldn't hurt to convey that message if that's what we think. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Great. So we have about 10 minutes left. Are there any other comments on Section 3? Or my other proposal was that Daniel and I had started the position paper document about what the outcome of the scoping survey ended up being. There's more text. The text from Sections 1

---

through 3 is more stable than 4 and beyond. But that covers all of the subjects that were rated as in scope.

I wanted to propose that everyone read through or skim through the first three sections and use that to help consider the discussion and take into consideration the discussions we've had on Sections 2 and 3 today, and see if that ... It made me wonder whether we're going to end up doing a full rewrite of the Section 2 or 3 as a result of that or if we stick closer to what was already published in the Charter and rely on the scoping document to proceed from that.

Is everyone on board with that approach and we discussed it at the next meeting in two weeks?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I think I'm on Board. This is theoretically a Charter Review Work Session. Is this scoping going to be in that stream of Charter Review, or is this the formal meeting of RZERC? I'm not sure that it matters, but I thought I'd just raised the question.

TIM APRIL:

There is an RZERC meeting on the schedule for next week.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Ah, so that's what you're referring to.



---

TIM APRIL: It's the standard monthly one, but I believe ... Danielle can correct me on this, but she had mentioned that ... I don't think we have any other topics for that meeting, so we were going to cancel that one and have the scheduled meeting two weeks from now rather than next week.

GEOFF HUSTON: Right. Personally that's great because I'm on leave next week. But, yeah, whatever.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I was just typing in the chat. That's correct, Tim. And I think the idea is to discuss this scope paper in the Charter Review Work Sessions.

Peter, in your comment in the chat, are you saying you think the scope doc belongs and the RZERC monthly sessions or also in the Charter Review Sessions?

PETER KOCH: Well, since we are all the same people, it probably doesn't matter in practical terms. For transparency and our recordings, I'm not so sure. It would be an RZERC document, not an RZERC Review Team document. But I wouldn't object to dealing with it in either one. Just we keep note of that.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay.

---

TIM APRIL: Seeing no other hands about that, let's proceed that way. We can discuss this in two weeks. And hopefully, Danielle and Steve can find any of the historic information about the scope [of the] the Charter discussion from back when it was created and hopefully inform the discussion in two weeks.

So beyond Sections 2 and 3 of the Charter Review, we just have Section 9 which is the actual provision for the review to happen. And again, once that's done I think we've reached the end of the Charter Review process other than creating the report and all of the public comment pieces. Everyone would like to review Section 9 and see if there are other changes there.

Danielle, did you say you had other potential texts for that from other work? [inaudible].

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I've been keeping track of a list of items that people have said does not belong in the Charter Review and instead belongs in the Operational Procedures. I think my plan was to conclude that RZERC Charter Review wait until a new Charter is approved and then proceed with an Operational Procedures update based on the new Charter.

TIM APRIL: I meant for Section 9, the review.

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Oh, no, we don't have any proposed changes to Section 9. Sorry about that.

TIM APRIL: Oh, okay. All right. I guess everyone can review those documents in Sections 2 and 3. And we'll talk in two weeks.

Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: If you'll scroll on down to Section 9 just because you refreshed my memory there, Danielle. Should we reference the Operational Procedures document? In other words, "The Charter of the Committee shall be reviewed at least every 5 years ..." Or maybe somewhere in there just reference using those Operational Procedures as guidelines or something? Over.

TIM APRIL: [inaudible].

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Tim, if you were talking, I personally couldn't hear you just now but I saw your mic moving.

TIM APRIL: I was just meaning to ask if that was directed to Danielle or me or to the rest of the committee.

HOWARD ELAND: I guess it's to everyone.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm wondering what further guidance the Operational Procedures would bind a future incarnation of RZERC to. As it currently stands, RZERC has almost an open latitude as to how to review that Charter the next time it decides to do so, or within five years, you know. And there's the public comment process is the only binding thing. Is more guidance going to be helpful or is less guidance, oddly enough, going to be helpful to allow this future RZERC the greatest degree of ability to figure out how it wants to do that/what it wants to conclude? What kind of further guidance were you thinking of in the Operating Procedures?

HOWARD ELAND: So I wasn't necessarily thinking of anything above and beyond what we've already talked about, but we've made several references to it now in this review process. So I thought it would be worthwhile for those folks who won't have the luxury of remembering five years back, that they can at least not had to reinvent all of the wheels and have at least a ground point to start from. That was my thinking. Over.

TIM APRIL: Well, looking at them I'd say you could put a comment in the doc, Howard—or I can do it in a couple of minutes—to discuss that further when we come to that section. [inaudible].

HOWARD ELAND: If doing so would force another meeting that we're not going to have, I'm not that married to it.

TIM APRIL: At this point, I don't think it would add another meeting, but I'll take a note of it. And if it comes up, if we have time to talk about it, we can.

HOWARD ELAND: I'll place a comment in there.

TIM APRIL: All right, that's fine. Any other comments or questions before we adjourn? All right. Thank you very much, everyone. I'll talk to you in two weeks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**