DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, all. Thank you for joining. This is the RZERC Charter Review Work Session held on Tuesday the 23rd of August 2022 at 20:00 UTC. Tim, over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So picking up where we were last week, we were trying to go through Sections 2 and 3 to see what, if any, changes we should make. We can jump into that document. We're now up to Sections 2, 3, and 9, which is the review [inaudible]. That's the only things left for the review.

I'm trying to recall. The last time we were looking mostly at the context of why some of the wording is the way it is in this document. And we're hoping that possibly Duane, who I think was around with the writing in this Charter, might be able to help with some of the suggestions that we have in here, specifically the removal of "content of" [inaudible] we start from there in how we should proceed with Section 2.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, Tim, I wasn't actually around for the writing of this Charter. So this was written before RZERC existed, I guess. The reason I am sort of hung up on the content, I guess, is because I think as written it's ... I don't know it's too prominent. It focuses, the Charter, a lot on content which I think RZERC doesn't necessarily need to limit itself to.

So my suggestion, I have 2 suggestions, I guess, for the group to consider. One is to remove that phrase "content" or to restructure the

sentence so that it's more obviously like a list. I think I put that in the document somewhere. So that it would say, like, changes to 1) the content or 2) the systems or 3) the components. Something like that. Hopefully, that's helpful.

TIM APRIL: Does anyone have thoughts on that? Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't know if you folk can hear me I'm using a different microphone. Adding more labels to the root zone is kind of humdrum and outside what I would call RZERC business. But adding new resource record types is probably in business, particularly if there's some particular processing involved. And therefore, "content of the root zone" is kind ambiguous in that respect. It's possible to change the content of a label. Totally humdrum.

It's possible to change the content, add some kind of resource record type or add a [whole] of zone resource record type such as ZONEMD, and you're in scope. And so the one word kind of means both at the same time. Therefore, it is about the content of the DNS root zone to a point, and I'm searching for wording that doesn't exclude the provision of new resource record types in the root zone, either per label or for the entire zone but does kind of exclude what I would call business as usual for the root zone maintenance and the general workings on the policy process and expansion of the root zone.

So I don't have any wording to proffer here. I would err on the side of inclusion. I would err on the side of leaving "content" in for that reason, with the ability of the future RZERC to simply say, "Well, we didn't mean that" if someone hands over, "Should we add Label X?" Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thanks. I might repeat what I said in the previous session. I do think that we are at least a step ahead and maybe not at the right flight level when we discuss very subtle wording changes without having a clear reason to do so.

So my understanding is that we did not arrive at the conclusion that the current Charter would either have prevented RZERC from taking any work that RZERC would have wanted to take and that was presented to it, nor the other way around in the opposite direction that RZERC was overwhelmed with requests and couldn't take them or would have wanted to refuse them and the Charter was either too limited or too broad.

So I'm not really sure how to explain to the community why we think that these changes are necessary. In that case, in terms of erring on one side, I would err on the side of stability of the Charter rather than proposing this, even if we ... And if the rest of the committee insists on making these changes, I do think that we need explanations for these

[diffs] that we apply. And they should point to actual work experience. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Not seeing other hands, I'll jump in on this one. After doing the topic scoping exercise and reviewing all of the data there, I can see where Peter's coming from with not editing something that we're not having a problem with. But it seemed to me when I was joining the committee, that this particular Section was confusing to me of exactly what was in scope and what wasn't.

I'm slightly in favor of modifying it to be more exacting in the language of what we're interested in looking at rather than just being open ended of "the content of the root zone." I like Duane and Geoff's suggestion of [possibly saying], but being very descriptive, that we're interested in reviewing any changes to the RR types in the root zone but not necessarily the content of the RR data of the root zone in something that's not technical speak. But it would be interesting if everyone else was [inaudible] that idea.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Geoff. I'm still sort of working out in my head where the boundaries would be. In a parallel discussion over an IETF plan, they're talking about alternative namespaces. And the only reason why I'm bringing this up—and the only reason—is the question arose about dropping the LDH rule for those kinds of non-DNS namespaces. And apply that to here, if someone proposed a top-level label that did not conform to the LDH rule, who would look for that? Would that be an RZERC issue as an

evolution into other forms of character representations and labels? It's not quite business as usual, but it's not another RR type.

My rough guess, personally, is breaking that rule is a significant change to ... You'd either call it architecture and content or significant change to the rules of content. So it's not just another label and would probably merit some of this consideration from RZER, if only to kind of think about what that meant and what the implications would be.

Could we, as you propose to push examples through in this Charter to talk about what this means? Possibly. Would we get it right? I don't know. It's trying to guess what folk come up with in the future. I'm inclined to err on the side of generality and allow a future RZERC to be able to go, "No, not us" rather than err on the side of specificity and for others to say, "Well, we don't need to send this to us, no matter why."

So I would actually argue that the wording "in significant architectural and operational changes to the content of the DNS root zone" kind of works for me for a future RZERC. It's not specific. We're not trying to guess too much. But the word "significant" says there's a certain sanity filter going on that's going to get applied, and I would certainly advocate leaving "content of the DNS root zone" in that sentence as a result. Those are my thoughts. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: I'm pulling up the original Charter right now. I guess I've got to ask the foundational question of does anyone believe that we would actually need to make any significant changes to Section 2? Or should we take

the ... No. No, like leave it as is and save that for the next review in five years.

Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. So it's just a comment from my side. I clearly have the impression that RZERC is positioning itself regarding the content of the zone itself, as opposed to most of the operations that are related to the distribution or other aspects. It's just a personal comment. I'm not trying to carry on some ideas from RSSAC.

So if we remove the word "content" ... Either I had a very bad understanding of the purpose of the RZERC or maybe we're in ... I'm concerned that we might remove what happened to be pretty clear on what the scope of RZERC is. So what I'm actually wondering to myself is aren't we making the purpose more complex to understand than it is now by removing the word "content?" That's only a personal comment.

TIM APRIL: Duane

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim.

DUANE WESSELS: So I'm not hearing a lot of support for removing content, which is fine. I can probably live with leaving that in. But I do think that some of the

other changes to this section are good changes. Like the addition of "significant and operational." Again, to make it align more with the document that this came from. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: It would be better if I hit the mute key. For what it's worth, I completely agree with Duane. But I would actually leave the other proposed changes in. So the sentence would read "propose significant architectural or operational changes to the content of the DNS root zone, the systems ..." And also leave in the final phrase "within the Root Server System." So I have to agree with Duane completely on that.

If you enumerate them, as whoever's typing is proposing, that's fine with me, too. But I think at that point, that seems to me to be a reasonable summation. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Are there any other comments about ... Sorry [inaudible]. So if we were to reject the [content of the removal] but accept the other changes in this section, does anyone have any objections to that change?

Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, I maintain what I said in the previous statement. And meanwhile, Danielle had posted the questions from the Charter Review Process in the chat. And maybe when we want to address this, then we should first answer the questions and then propose changes that follow from those observations. I think we are, again, at least a step ahead here in that structure of the process.

And I'm not saying that because I liked that structure so much for being a structure, but because it also helps guide us and also guides the community in understanding what the motivation of the proposed changes are. I hope that makes sense.

GEOFF HUSTON:

In reacting here, Peter, the problem that I have is that I found it difficult to comprehend what the original text meant. "Significant architectural changes to the content of the DNS root zone." So it didn't even have the word "significant." "Proposed architectural changes to the content of the DNS root zone." If indeed that was the original wording, I'm finding it difficult to parse. I don't understand what an architectural change to content might be. It sort of left me dangling.

I think the words "significant architectural or operational changes" makes it easier to understand why content is being included here, and I think I would regard these changes as clarification and not necessarily a dramatic change in envisaged scope. There's my reaction to the original wording. So that was why I would advocate to us to actually adopt the changes as proposed but leave in "content." Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

I was going to say something very similar to that. I think this addresses part of the ambiguity about the requirements. But I was having issues when I was reviewing this the first time.

Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks. I agree with that observation, or understand that observation about ambiguity in there. And I would probably agree that there is ambiguity. I'm not sure that it was ambiguity that prevented RZERC from doing something one way or another.

But in one aspect, Geoff, I think you were actually supporting my point in a way. Because the last time we did that, we went back to the Draft Charter and then the Charter. And I'm not sure which was the word, but I think "operational." So there was a draft version that did contain "operational." The final Charter did not contain the word "operational," and nobody in RZERC could actually understand why it was kicked out. Now it is proposed to push it back in, and we are kind of repeating that "mistake" of maintaining the discussion record a bit.

I do know we do have the records of the meetings here and the recordings, and so on and so forth. But what I'm trying to suggest here is that we actually capture the discussion in a way that we can present to the community and say, "Well, we looked at this ... And for this and that reason, we believe that there is an ambiguity, and 'operational' would benefit the Charter and the committee members in the future because this and this and this might be things that would be considered out of scope." Detailed wording to be smithed later.

TIM APRIL: If my understanding is correct of the process, I think that's part of what the supporting documentation that we submit with the proposed Charter changes will include to try and capture that context. I don't recall the final part of the review process. Maybe Danielle has that off the top of her head.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. The Draft Charter would be accompanied by a report detailing the summary of proposed changes and the rationale behind the proposed changes as well as the process and the public comment leading up to a final report. I can give a little illumination to Peter's question as to why "operational" was originally removed from the Charter. Posting a link in the chat.

                                So the original Draft Charter was put out for public comment in 2016 and originally contained the phrase "architectural and operational changes." I believe the suggested change to remove "operational" and add "content of the DNS root zone" was to clarify the remit between RZERC and RSSAC, based on comments the RSSAC submitted during the public comment.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. So, trying to get an idea of a path forward with this proposition of ... I'm debating whether we try to just [inaudible] [where the group is]. I believe Peter's of the standpoint of we potentially should leave the Charter as is. I've heard a couple people discuss these minor

modifications to allow it to be more specific. But the public comment from the RSSAC makes me question the incorporation of operational changes. It's been whether or not [inaudible] the most identical comment [we propose this on].

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, it really, in my mind, hinges on the addition of the word "significant" because if you don't have it, it kind of overplays architectural/operational content, all changes. And that doesn't make any sense to me. I'd hesitate to speak on behalf of an RSSAC because that's not my role here, but it doesn't make any sense to RSSAC, I'd guess, because it is an overplaying on [inaudible].

The word "significant" in my mind actually applies across the remainder of the sentence, and it's talking about change that is more mechanical. And whether it's architectural or operational and, certainly in the content, the word "significant" is the modifier. Equally, "significant" applies to changes of systems and software components and distribution mechanisms.

And it's the word "significant" in my mind that actually adds meaning and context to this entire paragraph. And rather than saying "everything goes through RZERC" it actually says, no, very little goes through RZERC if it doesn't alter what is currently being [inaudible]. And the remainder of the RSSAC comments from last time objecting to inclusion of "content" is, I think, a recognition that without the word "significant" it can be read as "all changes" which makes very little sense, absolutely.

And so to my mind, that that word "significant" is the key differentiator, which I'd hope, in the comments about this Charter, we would include as being the major filter here on proposals that these are substantive changes that have no impact on the way the root zone is and operates, as distinct from the normal course of events in the management and operation of the root zone which would not be expected to be reviewed by RZERC.

I don't know if that helps anyone else, but that was the key word I found that actually gave this paragraph some sense that wasn't there in the past. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I'm thinking we possibly had addressed this in [inaudible] but the word "significant," adding the "or operational" clause ... Which I also remember now was, from our previous discussion, we talked about how in Section 3 there's the "architectural and operational." The last sentence of the paragraph on Scope of Responsibilities had "architectural and operational" to begin with, conflicting with the Purpose. And then the third was the rest of the edits except for the "content of the" clause removal.

I was trying to think of ... I guess we could do voting with thumbs up or something like that. I guess we can go through each of the three if everyone ... Those in favor of adopting the "significant" word in the first sentence, if you put thumbs up [inaudible]. And of course, they go away after a second. That's ...

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Do you want me to do a poll real quick? I can ...

TIM APRIL: Oh, I didn't realize Zoom had polls.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Let me see if I can. I have to do it from the web browser. Never mind, I cannot do one on the fly.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I guess we can take the opposite approach of ... Anyone who's opposed to accepting the word "significant" if you raise your hand. Then we can count that as the opposite. Okay, I'm not seeing anything.

HOWARD ELAND: We could always do "aye" or "any" in the chat. I threw an "aye" u there.

TIM APRIL: That would work, too. I'll put text in there so we can capture it from the chat log.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I was able to get the poll going.

TIM APRIL: There we go.

HOWARD ELAND: Can you throw the document back up, though, on your screen?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Oh, I'm so sorry. Yes, I can.

HOWARD ELAND: Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. We have seven responses from the seven committee members. We have five in favor and two abstaining. You can see. "Share results."

TIM APRIL: Okay. That works for me. I guess we can do the same for everything else. Is there anyone strongly in favor of removing the "content of the" clause that there's a cursor over right now? Not seeing anything. Okay. So if we reject that one and then accept the other proposed changes on this Section. I don't know if we want to do another poll for that or if we just want to do hands or in the chat.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry, Tim. Just to be clear, are we rejecting the proposed edit or are we accepting the proposed edit which is to remove the three words?

TIM APRIL: My read of the committee was to reject the proposed edit. So, to leave that text in there. But I'll let anyone object if they want you to now. Okay, then I guess we can reject that. And then any objections to accepting the text as it is now with the edits in this Section as [inaudible]? I see a thumbs up from Daniel. Okay. And the same from Geoff and Duane. Okay. So [inaudible] gotten through that.

Any other comments on this section? Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, sorry. So I'm still not sure I'm 100% convinced on the bit about "within the Root Server System" just because ... I envision the scenario where a proposed change somehow breaks a significant portion of those hyperlocal root folks out there. I know you can't contact those folks and say ... Right? Because you don't know who they are and they're there numerous.

But I'm not sure that means that a change to the mechanism by which they might get the root zone that would be a significant change that could break some of that ... I don't necessarily know if that would not be in our purview. So I'm not saying take it out. I'm saying I'm not quite sure I'm there yet. Over.

TIM APRIL: At least in my understanding—and I think I was the one who proposed that text—the method for which the hyperlocal root users receive the content is different from how the rest of the Root Server System receives their zone file. My interpretation was that it was expanding the

scope of RZERC to leave that clause out with the current landscape. But I'm open to removing it and leaving it ambiguous there.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. That's why I was, like I said, more vacillating than necessarily raising an open objection to it. I'm okay, I guess. Over.

TIM APRIL: Duane. [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. I think it's a good addition and clarification because without, I think it's very, very broad and it extends RZERC's reach, really, into places that … I don't want to say they shouldn't be, but that are probably even outside of ICANN. So I think it's a good clarification.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think it's an interesting discussion we're having right now, insofar as is hyperlocal cast off into the wild and is nobody's problem? Or not? And the whole idea of leaving that phrase in was to say, "Well, it's just those 13 letters and those 12 servers that is the concern here." I don't think that's a responsible thing to do as RZERC. I think RZERC has a responsibility to the users, the clients of the DNS, however they get the root zone, and should be mindful of other distribution mechanisms as it

moves forward to facilitate various forms of use as legitimate clients of the root.

So I had read the words "the Root Server System" as the larger word of going, "I've got a root zone. I've going to serve [them]." And whether I'm a letter or whether I'm a hyperlocal, I'm still part of that broader system. So I can take, I suppose without any reason, a very broad interpretation of the words "Root Server System" to include others who have a legitimate, signed, vindicated copy of the root zone and are serving it locally.

If the intent was to narrow this right down to the 12 server operators and the 13 letters, then I'm not sure why that would be the case and why the broader interests of the clients of DNS would be served by such a narrower scope.

So Howard raises an interesting point there, and I'm now questioning, within the Root Server System, what it was meant to actually do in terms of scoping. So that's an open question. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: I think that goes in the very same direction. It appears that we introduce another ambiguity by enabling two different interpretations, at least of Root Server System. And so that addition doesn't really help except for the case where we want to limit RZERC's ability here. And even if RZERC can't control, and maybe nobody can control the hyperlocal instances,

we still need to remember that there's going to be a need for a reliable distribution mechanism which arguably is not within the Root Server System as it currently stands. And then somebody should think about that as well.

So regardless of what I said before about the stability of the Charter, this again demonstrates that we need a longer, longer explanation for the changes we propose. And that explanation cannot just be a copy of the transcript of the sessions. And in this case, it is probably counterproductive. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. So I guess I feel like we're at risk of going off into the weeds here or whatever. But I think there's already an example of this that we can turn to. Right? There's the ISI LocalRoot project which is distributing root zones to people. But it's very hard for me to imagine RZERC thinking that the way that ISI's LocalRoot project works or the mechanisms it uses is within RZERC's scope. What could we possibly say about that? It seems very strange to me.

Also, the fact that the zone is signed and then hopefully soon verifiable, that should take away a lot of the concerns about distribution of invalid data. That's sort of the whole point. When it's signed and verifiable, where it comes from doesn't matter quite as much.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I appreciate the practical comment, Duane, that goes, "At present, there's not much RZERC can say about such projects within the scope of the way it works at the moment." And that's true. But could, in a Charter document, RZERC constrain itself now and in the future to be mute on that particular way of serving the root zone—is the bit that I think I have a problem with.

I don't think it should constrain itself. I think the door should be left open in a Charter, even if at present it is problematic to understand how that aspect of the Charter would be applied in the current circumstance.

But the thing about the future is, it's not the present. And the way things change is sometimes unguessable. And I would like a Charter to at least be focused on the use of the root zone rather than the current structure of the operation of the root zone, which is why I would argue that hyperlocal has a role in the Charter even if, at the present day, there is very little RZERC would have to say about hyperlocal.

And it's not the only fish in the sea. [inaudible] other forms of distribution of that information may be formulated, and we might have something to say about that. So that was why I would argue it is reasonable to at least include that at this point so that it does not preclude a discussion that might be helpful to users later on. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND:

I'd agree with Geoff's interpretation there. And the reason that I mentioned this I the beginning was because we are specifically talking about the mechanisms used for distribution, not necessarily just the verifiable content of the zone. So that's actually where my consternation came from in the first place.

So because of that, I think I really am inclined towards, as Geoff said, maybe just pulling that ... Maybe it's sufficient to just pull the words "within the Root Server System" out because also, as Peter mentioned, it may be not closing the ambiguity much to begin with just from this discussion. Over.

TIM APRIL:

So it's roughly sounding like the consensus is swaying towards removing that last proposed edit of "within the Root Server System" and favoring using the position paper that we've been talking about as a way to constrain it and be [editable] later on. But to that end, I was just back chatting with Danielle and she had prepared a poll so we can do that aga for keeping or removing that particular phrase.

If you could hit the go button on that again, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:

All right. The poll is live. All right, we have seven out of seven committee members who have responded. So I'm going to end the poll in a few seconds. So, we have one person who responded Yes, five who responded No, and one who abstained.

TIM APRIL: Okay, that sounds like we reject that phrase. And it looks like merge everything else that's there. Are there any other comments on ...

Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I'm sorry. I hate to raise this, but I thought we'd agreed to work on full consensus and not democratic votes.

TIM APRIL: I'd forgotten about that full consensus part. Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: And also, we have some members who aren't present today, I believe, who haven't weighed in on some of these questions.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. And I didn't mean to say that that was going to be the final decision on all of that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

TIM APRIL: I was trying to get to a state where we could then have a further discussion about ... I was trying to get to a more stable piece of text rather than a whole bunch of edits.

[Got to think of] how to move forward with that. So I'll have to think about that part and how we'd move forward there—

DUANE WESSELS: I'm not saying we can't get there, but I just feel we're not there yet.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I'll have to fix some more on that one. And knowing we have about 10 minutes left, I had noticed that there's only one proposed change in the next Section. Sorry, there are three proposed changes, but I think we've had most of this discussion so far. So to try and resolve these to be able to have a more concrete discussion about them later on. Is there any objection to accept—

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I would argue, Tim, that they're precisely the same 3 repeated. The resolution of Section 2 resolves Section 3 to be consistent. And within the scope of a) this meeting, b) the larger group and the consensus mode we're operating in, the answers to Section 2 give us the answer to Section 3—is what I would suggest. And they really aren't independent, for the sake of consistency of the document. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: I agree on the middle 2 changes in this document. The first one is just watching "and" to "or" because operational was not in Section 2 to

begin with, which is why I was ... I think that was just more of a grammatical change [inaudible] want to check on that before I propose mirroring the changes on the previous Section. So, does anyone object to switching "and" to "or" there.

[GEOFF HUSTON]:   Nope.

TIM APRIL: Okay. And then the same thing with the "content of" section from above. If that was unanimous for the ... There were five for and two abstaining from the previous section. I'm not seeing any objection to that.

So I think we need to continue the conversation. It looks everything else has been discussed to this point, except for "within the Root Server System." Hopefully, the others that are not on the call today will be able to either review the transcript or recording. I can try and contact them to get their opinions of the "within the Root Server" clause in both Sections 2 and 3. The next meeting can be discussing that clause and any other comments related to the Charter.

Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Since we have just a little bit of time, can I ask for maybe just a little bit more discussion on the "within the Root Server System" part because I think this could ... We could be thinking about different things here. You know, "within the Root Server System" is, let's say, it's sort of well-defined to the RSOs and RZM and IANA, and whatnot. And then people

talk about a hyperlocal root, and I think one way you can interpret that would be a project perhaps led by ICANN to distribute the root zone more widely.

Another way could be a project by anybody, of which ISI LocalRoot is an example, to distribute the roots zone however they want. And I would just like to know if people are thinking of one or the other of the latter two. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Good question, Duane. And I was certainly thinking about something a little bit different, which is ICANN signaling that there has been a change in the root zone and allowing folk to subscribe to the signal to say, "Go get your hyperlocal copy from wherever you get it." That's not ICANN's problem. But the signal that it is timely to do so now might will be something that could be considered.

And so it's this hybrid of not managing the distribution of hyperlocal, not doing any of that, but trying to facilitate hyperlocal folk to stay current with the current copy of the root zone might—and I stress the word "might"—be within scope if there was some viable way to provide such a broadcast signal that a change has happened.

And it's that kind of thinking, I thought, that would benefit the community in a meaningful way that might well be part of this that is

not strictly within the scope of Root Server System. If that helps you at all. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: I guess it does, but I feel RZERC's Charter can't really extend beyond ICANN's scope of influence. We can't insert ourselves into processes or procedures by other parties that are not participating in ICANN, for whatever reason. So if we can find a way to word the constraints that way, then I think it would be better.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, let me instantiate this, then. If the hyperlocal grouping, whatever it might be, came to ICANN and said, "We'd like you to give us a signal when you do a change, exactly when you do a change." At that point, ICANN has received a request. Where would they send it? And RZERC would be a potential place to consider that? And so it's not that RZERC's looking for work or that it's initiating work for ICANN.

Others have done that part of the legwork and have asked ICANN for a service. "Give us a change [inaudible]." And then it's a case of, "Well, here's a change [inaudible] proposal, RZERC. What do you think? What's your view? How could it [inaudible]?" And so on. And so it's a conversation rather than an initiative taken by ICANN without external impetus. But nevertheless, a useful piece of work for the larger DNS user community. That was why I thought it would be useful to have that conversation in the context of RZERC.

Again, this is all just very, very hypothetical because, of course, this is really just a Charter scoping discussion. I'm trying to defend the concept that we should be looking beyond the servers to the clients of the root. And this is one way of looking beyond that. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Along that line, as the discussion was happening, the reason I had switched from voting for that phrase to going for not having it was ... My thought is that if there were something operationally that would impact any of the local root options, that RZERC could make a recommendation to PTI or to the Board to have either OCTO or PTI do something about that may make it easier or more performant or more stable for anyone running the root on their own, having this phrase in the Charter, might restrict us from doing so even though ICANN could have some influence rather than immediately restricting [inaudible] our ability to comment on.

Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Well, thanks for the discussion. This is good stuff to think about, but we're out of time, I guess. So, next meeting.

TIM APRIL: Howard.

EN

HOWARD ELAND:	Actually, I wanted to get a word in here with one minute left. This is my last meeting after being on for six years. So, I wanted to say it was certainly a pleasure and I look forward to seeing you all in other venues.
DUANE WESSELS:	Yeah. Thank you, Howard.
DUANE WESSELS:	Thank you for your service, Howard.
[KIM DAVIES]:	Yeah. Thanks [inaudible].
PETER KOCH:	Thanks, Howard.
TIM APRIL:	Anything else before we adjourn? Otherwise, I'll talk to you all in a couple of weeks. Thank you, Howard, again.
HOWARD ELAND:	Thanks.
GEOFF HUSTON:	Thanks. Bye, all.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]