

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining us. This is the RZERC charter review work session held on Tuesday, October 18th, 2022 at 20:00 UTC. Tim, I'll turn it over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So the main thing we wanted to try and go over this week is the proposed, the initial report that has been prepared. Danielle had gone through and put in bullet points about a lot of our discussions that we had had over the review calls. And then I went through and tried to summarize the bullet points and present it in a way of, I'm trying to remember exactly the format I used, but it was basically the proposed change and justification for each of the major revisions that we've had in the document so far.

For trying to make that conversation easier to follow-up for all of us, everything that's in the italics in the document right now is intended to be deleted before publication, leaving just the proposed change in the justification. I don't know how many people had the chance to review or we could go section by section and have a discussion if that looks okay. I'm open to proposals of how people would like to proceed there. I saw some comments come in from, I think, Duane in the document.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Maybe just one or two from me. Did you want me to dive right into this one?

---

*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: Sure. I'm okay. We can jump around the document. Being the one that wrote it, I'm happy to take the questions either way or if you want to go section by section here. Do you want to start with yours?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I'm happy to jump in with this one. So thank you for this report. I shared it with my supervisors, my root zone maintainer supervisors and got some feedback, and about this one in particular. And in short, we don't support removing content from this section. The reason is because when the charter was being worked on in 2016 and there was a public comment period, RZERC provided some comments, which led to the addition of this, it led to some changes around this section and the addition of this phrase. And VeriSign as a root zone maintainer also supports RZERC's comments and thinks that this should stay in.

KALINA OSTALSKA: I have a question. What was the reason why it was suggested during the previous review to add, like, this edition was suggested?

DUANE WESSELS: I mean, the comments were really RZERC's comments, and it's unfortunate that our RZERC representative is not here. But I went and found the report from the public review period. I didn't find the actual comments that RZERC made, but I found the report that ICANN staff had composed in response to the public comment period. And I think RZERC made a number of comments, but the one in particular that's

---

relevant to this was to limit the scope to the root zone and leave the root server system more to RZERC's domain.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: So I'm trying to sort of understand this in the context of the cotton thrust of adding new TLDs to the root zone, which I would have thought was clearly none of our RZERC's business per se and certainly not either the single editions or even the course that ICANN is following with progressive opening up of the root zone. I don't think that's RZERC's issue per se. And so I just not quite sure in what context the content of the DNS root zone would be pertinent to this this committee. That's a bit that I'm losing here. And just adding back-end content doesn't really help me here.

TIM APRIL: Kim.

KIM DAVIES: I mean, my recollection from discussions in years past was that generally speaking, when we talk about the workflow of root zone maintenance, it's roughly bifurcated into two sides. One is the production of the root zone, perhaps simplified as the content of the root zone. And then there's the dissemination of the root zone which is largely done by zone operators. And I think this was an attempt to try

---

and focus RZERC on that first half, recognizing that the second half is perhaps the provenance of RZERC.

I think the challenge is going to be any attempt to we know subtle distinctions down into a single sentence is going to be flawed in one way or another. So I think it's been that the perennial problem of this group is trying to draw, if not boundaries, but try to clarify the scope of what is in and out of RZERC's air of responsibility. Yeah, this is just one manifestation of that. Not sure if that's useful context, but that's my recollection is where all this going to stem from.

TIM APRIL:

That's how I remember the conversation as well in by mind, but the delineation where RZERC stopped was once the root zone was provided to the RSO. So it's the generation integrity and delivery to the RSO, not necessarily to the end users is where that distinction lies in my head. But, like, Kim said, I'm not sure how to put that into a single sentence. All right. Any other comments on this section? Or should we add a note to think about this and come back to it and keep going? Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, this is Peter for the record. Thanks, Tim. I just wanted to say that the question asked by Kalina is probably going into that very right direction. And I think we touched upon that in one of our previous discussions, which, of course, Kalina couldn't know, but hit the hale on the net, so to speak, a nail on the head. I'm sorry. It's late here. And we might want to discuss changes that were going back and forth here, which is in reference to the public comment periods. A link is provided

---

by Danielle in the chat. And I don't really see that reflected in the text. We don't need to go into epic detail, but one or two comments on that might be helpful, especially if we try to broaden the scope as the justification text under 433 suggests. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I was trying to understand this in context, and I was looking in this document for where the clean final is. Is it down the bottom? Is it just removing that phrase, "of the content of the root zone?" No, sorry, "of the content of the in the" in that sentence?

TIM APRIL: I believe that's the full change there.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, that's the only that's the only change that I'm aware of in that section in the paragraph.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm pretty sure, I think, we, at least here, understand that this is not about passing every operational change to the root zone through this committee. I think we all agree on that. And that was my concern about leaving it in that some latter interpretation would find that necessary when it patently is not. It's not a hill I'm prepared to die on.

---

I'm like, I'm happy to leave it in because the previous part is this issue around imposing potential risk.

And so, like I said, it's more as it states with content. You could phrase it as a sweeping territorial claim of role or you could simply say no. And the sentence doesn't make it clear what is the proper interpretation. But like I said, not a hill I'm prepared to die on. If there are issues around meeting it, I'm happy to leave it in personally. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Are there other? I think, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I mean, just I guess, also, it's maybe appropriate to note that we sort of had the same discussion about a very similar phrase earlier in the documents, and it does remain there in the, is it the purpose section? I forget the intersection.

TIM APRIL: It's the purpose.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Yeah. So we decided to leave it there in that section. And like I said VeriSign thinks that it should also remain in this section based on the 2016 public comment period report.

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Big comment. Yes. Okay. I can see the point. I can see where you're coming from here, Duane. And it's a fair comment. Yes. So I'm happy to leave it in.

TIM APRIL: Any objections to leaving that phrase in and basically just leaving that section from the charterer, that charterer document. I'm not seeing anything. Okay.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So on draft charter section, I'm actually going to reject this suggestion so that in the scope of responsibility section, the text remains. Then I'm going to come up to the section 4.3.3, and looks like Tim you've already gotten that deleted. Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: I think some of what you've deleted there may have applied to other parts of the document. I'm not sure. That bulleted list was quite long, and I think it referred to other sections maybe, but just double check.

TIM APRIL: I thought that was only for that section.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, you know what? I think it has some of the earlier justification notes for 431 and 432. So I'm going to do this. I'll delete.

---

TIM APRIL: Oh, yeah. Because I ended up splitting that up. And then I thought I saw one other comment from you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, yeah. Just agreeing with what you had said here.

TIM APRIL: About removing the topic skipping exercise from this document.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Not referring to the topic skipping exercise.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: We'll go ahead and delete that section then. In reviewing the notes, I didn't see any other things that came up. The RZERC wanted to note that we're out of scope for the charter review. That wasn't simply just let's talk about this and maybe an operational procedures update. But this is a section that's come up in other similar reviews to this. So that's why I called that out. But I think if there's no reference to the topics scoping exercise, we can just delete that as a section.

TIM APRIL: The only thing I know of that I would potentially expect to see questions about is the, how we're going to define the quorum process within the operating procedures as part of the meeting against the meetings section. But I didn't feel a strong need to include that in this document,



---

and we can respond to it as part of the public comment process if it's necessary.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah. I agree, Tim. I think that's appropriate. It sounds like we'll have to update the procedure document regardless, but I don't see that it really needs to be discussed here.

TIM APRIL:

Yeah. I figured it would be something we could discuss in the normal monthly call and do in parallel with preparing for the public comment once this is ready to go. And then just I guess, I'll open it up to any other comments or suggestions or questions of any of the other sections that people might have. I'm not seeing anything. And just to get an idea, has everyone had a chance to review the document fully, or should we plan for another call in two weeks and give everyone a chance to read it carefully and add more comments and then have another call? Or are we ready to finalize it and send it? Right. I don't think we have the full white glass call procedure within RZERC. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

Oh, I had a chance to review the whole document, but I'm fine with another couple weeks as well especially since there's at least two members that are not on this call today. Right. One still TBD, the new Board representative.

---

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I think Danielle and I had talked about waiting to go through the publication process until we had the new [00:20:33 - inaudible] potentially wherever future replacement [00:20:37 - inaudible]. I noticed that Peter had said that he hasn't had a chance to look carefully. Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. I was just observing that we typically only have a subset of the members on these chartering discussions, and it's usually the same subset more or less. And I think most critical is ensuring that the full composition of RZERC pours over this. So I'm not sure having additional review by this smaller group is as useful as making sure it gets in front of everyone else that hasn't been actively involved in these smaller discussions.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can't raise my hand, but can I make a suggestion? So I'd suggest that if there's nothing left to discuss today, we put this out for review for two weeks for people to more thoroughly review, pick apart, and comment on, and then come back together in two weeks to finalize. And that way every member of the committee has had two weeks to review and possibly do input. The next phase prior to publication is to once we have a finalized initial report, is to reach out to each of the appointing organizations and see if any of them would like to have a feedback session with the RZERC prior to opening it up for public comment.

---

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thanks, Danielle. Kalina.

KALINA OSTALSKA: How much time will we have to present the review with our groups?

TIM APRIL: I think the proposed timeline had this going, which a public comment right around the time of the next ICANN meeting in March. So we have at least a couple months to go through that final review and meeting process. If my memory is correct on that process, Danielle?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. I believe the original goal was to time it around the same time as the public ICANN meeting so that we didn't have to do an off-schedule webinar to publicize this.

KALINA OSTALSKA: So that means we will also have a public meeting during ICANN76.

TIM APRIL: I think that was the intention. And that proposal sounds good to me, Danielle, unless anyone has objection to moving forward that way. Sounds good. We can chat in two weeks. Hopefully, we can get an update from the Board in the next couple weeks on their appointment. All right. That sums up for your point. All right. Thank you all for your time. Feel free to drop comments in the doc or if you have questions or

---

the text that was not clear at all. Just send me a message, and I'll try and clean it up. All right. Talk to you in two weeks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. See you. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]