

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Welcome everyone. Thank you for joining. This is the RZERC Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 16th of May 2023 at 1900 UTC. Tim, would you like me to do the roll call?

TIM APRIL: Sure.

DANIEL MAGAULT: Tim April, IETF.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll note Carlos Martinez from ASO is not on the call yet. Peter Koch, ccNSO.

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: We've received regrets from Wes Hardaker. Kim Davies, PTI.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

---

*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.*

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kalina Ostalska, RySG.

KALINA OSTALSKA: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll note Daniel Migault from RSSAC is not on the call yet. Geoff Houston, SSAC.

GEOFF HOUSTON: Yeah. Hi.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And then we've received regrets from Duane Wessels for RZM. All right, Tim, I'll turn it over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So, the main topic we have for discussion this week is the feedback from the public comment of the charter review. We've received two submissions to the public comment portal within ICANN and then one from the RSOs. And then Danielle had created a document that was shared with everyone. She and I did this both pretty much in parallel, but hers was in much better shape than mine. My reading of the first response to the public comment was mostly

---

agreeing with us and supporting the work that we've been doing, and that was rows two through five of this document.

And then I don't remember the exact numbers of rows, but I think there were three or four rows for the second? Sorry. There's two rows for the second comment from the process, and then an additional two for the RSOs themselves. Not all of the others seem to require response from us, but I figured we can take this one row at a time and have a discussion and see if the proposed change to the charter seems reasonable to everyone, and/or if there are other changes that we should be making. So, starting with the first four rows, did anyone who'd reviewed that think there was anything we had to do?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hi, Tim. I'll just note also looking for confirmation that the information in Column C labeled RZERC Response has the support of members on the call. And then in addition to the possible changes, but anything agreed in Column C will be kind of the basis for justification in a response to the public comment. So, I want to make sure that that has the support of community members.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I see Peter saying he agrees with the suggested for all of those. I'm just rereading them quickly. That's what I remember. Okay. Seeing no hands and seeing Peter's agreement, if we move to Row 6. This was mostly, my quick understanding was this is mostly about the phrasing of how that differs of what significant means within the two documents. With the other being the CWG stewardship transition. I'm reading it

---

again. Does anyone have any comments on Column C or D within the context of this request?

I'm seeing Kim says the proposed text works for him. I'm seeing Peter agreeing that this shifts the current definition to reference the CWG. Yeah. And then not I'm seeing any other hands or comments. Row 7, when I read this in the initial comment, I was kind of confused because we basically have no governance over how the appointing organizations manage their member appointments. So, I think what we have here made sense. If anyone has other thoughts on that, please chime in.

Okay. And then the last two are the ones that we have options of. And Peter's saying, agreeing with no action there. So, the last two are where we have options of there was a meeting that I think everyone was invited to with at least Verisign a while back where they were expressing concern about removing the background section and potentially losing context for later charter reviews or with new people or new members who come onto the RZERC. So, the first part was around the background where there's a bunch of context in the current charter that would be removed. They were proposing either keeping that.

One of the things we had discussed on that call was potentially moving it to an appendix of the charter. And I guess the first part is to try and get an idea of if-- I guess there's three options, I guess, of keeping the background where it is, adding it to an appendix or providing some further justification to the RSOs, and in the initial report or the final report that discusses further why we would remove it. I'm open it to anyone who has thoughts on that. Peter?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter from the record. I'm trying to speak. If my background noise is too bad, please let me know, and I'll just write in the chat. I think we've had this discussion, this suggestion at one of the calls, and I think we had the opposite suggestion, which is what we actually did. And that seems to be dependent on what's a philosophical background you come from, as in preserve this for history, or clean up to not confuse people, new people with the old history. A compromise might be what you just suggested, Tim, putting the history in the background so people don't have to wait for those. But I understand there are two different schools of thought that it's just a judgment call. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Peter. Kim.

KIM DAVIES: So, I think I was the one that proposed removing this in the first place. For me personally, I mean, I think Peter's correct, it's a matter of preference. Since this is meant to be the current charter, I see a value in sort of providing a lot of historical details from 7+ years ago. All those original establishing documents are still available. They're published, easy to reference, easy to find. To me, having all that additional data clutters the document.

And just in terms of broader context, I think operationally within IANA, as we're going through an updating documentation, we had a lot of references to pre-transition, post-transition, etc. in a variety of

---

documents. But I think now in 2023, seven years later, drawing a distinction between pre- and post-transition is more something for the record books than it is about current application. So that's my take. I'm not particularly persuaded. We need to keep referencing what happened in 2016, but happy to go with the thoughts of the group. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Kim. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Look, I have to agree completely with Kim here. The charter is a today document, a document that defines scope of responsibilities, etc. for the current operating group. The path that got the group to where it is today is of historical interest, but it doesn't shape or alter the application of the chart. So, I see no reason to carry it around like some kind of ball and chain attached to the charter. It's the documents, the previous background and so on is readily available. Keeping it in the charter just seems to be to be extraneous baggage. So, my own view is with Kim. It doesn't need to be included in the current charter. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Geoff. I think as Kim was talking, I was wondering if we were to take a compromise, rather than put it in appendix, put something in the operational procedures for when a charter review happens to review previous charters to inform the discussion. I don't know if that would

---

help alleviate some of the concern presented by the RSOs, but I agree that I think this came up in the public review session at the ICANN meeting where someone was concerned with removing the charter—I can't remember exactly who it was—removing background from the charter. And we didn't discuss any solutions in-depth that I can recall, but I mostly fall into the, yeah, I'm okay with either keeping it or removing it.

Oh, and Daniel just joined the call. So quickly bring it up to speed Daniel, in case you want to comment on this part, we were discussing Row 8 of the public comment responses from the RSOs about either-- and you may have more context or have discussed this further with them. In our charter review, we removed the background section from the proposed charter. The RSOs had expressed that that was-- They're concerned about losing the context of the RZERC and where it came from. We had posed two options, I guess, technically three of one keeping the background, two, removing it and providing further justification of why that was removed then the other was to potentially put it into an appendix of the document. So far, we're mixed on the approach.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Just to clarify because I've heard two different things. Would Option 3 be an appendix of the charter or an appendix of the operational procedures?

---

TIM APRIL: At the beginning, I had question it being an appendix of the existing charter. As Kim was talking, I wondered if we add it to that as a part of the operational procedures for the review, but I haven't thought too much about that one yet.

DANIEL MAGAULT: Yes. So, I was a little bit surprised by the public comment. I think for them, the main concern was that people do envision a larger scope of RZERC than the one it was initially thought. And so, they wanted that historical background to be accessible to the reader so that they understand better where RZERC is coming from. I do think those options will fit their request, especially as we have the one adding back the request.

The other one, which is putting the request into the appendix, is also something that might be envisioned. Explaining why we've removed it, I think that's going to be longer than-- or it's opening a new discussions where I'm not sure we will find-- I'm not sure it will respond in the sense that it's going to bring back-- it's not going to bring some precision about the scope of RZERC. And I think it's pretty obvious why it has been removed from the current text. But I guess those options are fine. From what I understood.

TIM APRIL: So just to clarify, Option 1 or 3 as listed in the sheet make more sense?



---

DANIEL MAGAULT: Yeah. I think 1 or 3 are going to be-- My expectation is that we provide them those three options. And I have the impression that 1 or 3 are going to address their concern. I'm not sure Option 2, but that's only me. So, maybe. But I guess it's fine to propose them though to leave those 3 options. They just don't have to select it if they don't want it.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thank you.

DANIEL MAGAULT: Now, I'm wondering, do we want me to contact them and to ask them if those are three options are fine or do we use the regular channel or?

TIM APRIL: That was going to be my question, I was about to ask Danielle what was the process here within ICANN public comments. Do we have to respond to people who submitted a comment to us directly or is it just reincorporate feedback and roll that into the final report?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: More like this one. I've submitted a summary report, but in the chapter where the analysis and the response, I was overseeing that-- All right. Let me start over. I'm a little talking over myself. I envision a prose version of this spreadsheet being a chapter of the final report where we explain the comments we received and how ours are incorporated or responded to each of those comments in that final report once we have a decision. Does that answer your question?

TIM APRIL: Yes. Mostly. We don't have to formally respond to them and publish it somewhere directly.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: No. That's correct.

DANIEL MAGAULT: But how do we make them select an option then?

TIM APRIL: I think the options were more intended for us to choose from as how we would like to proceed.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Correct.

DANIEL MAGAULT: Okay. Right. Okay. So, yeah. Okay.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, the options would need the consensus of the RZERC, and then once this is put into a final report, this would go to the board for consideration. So, the board would know what the public comments contained. The board would see in the final report how the RZERC responded to those public comments. And then if the board has an

---

issue with the way that the RZERC responded, then they might come back to the RZERC with feedback on the report if they don't intend to approve the charter as is.

DANIEL MAGAULT:

Okay. Right. So, regarding the three options, if we have to decide, I'm sure the comment was about-- My guess is that RZERC would probably take Option 1 and Option 3 might represent a compromise between what we initially decided and what SSAC is asking for. Option 2 if it's for us, I think we should probably not consider it as for us. But this is my personal opinion and I'm happy about what the group will decide.

TIM APRIL:

I'm just seeing Peter's comment from a couple of minutes go of, does process foresee an interaction at all? Peter, is that with the RZERC in response to their comment?

PETER KOCH:

Hi, Tim. This is Peter. No. That was the interaction with the commenters actually, and I think that was answered in the discussion. But now that I'm holding the microphone, if time allows and if we're not under pressure, then maybe going back to the constituencies and ask them, in my case, the ccNSO council might be an option. I do understand that both ways of the argument. I think both camps, both school of thoughts are reasonable, and they're different preferences. So, I could offer my opinion, but I would like to back that with what the organization that sent me thinks, even though that is not so

---

fundamental, but maybe for some people it is because it's about constituents and charter.

TIM APRIL:

Daniel agrees with going back to the SO and AC to get more-- and possibly delaying this a little bit is possible potentially-wise. It seems like it's leaning towards keeping it in some way. The path forward I would propose would be either appendix or moving it to the operational procedures. What do people think about where it should end up if somewhere? Peter says the operational procedures is probably not the right place. And Kim said suggestion for some lightweight text to the operational procedures, chart reviews shall review the previous charters and circumstances that led to the creation of RZERC in 2016 as part of the review process.

KIM DAVIES:

So, I'm just offering that as a starting point. I think my position on leaving the background in hasn't changed following this discussion, but I'm completely fine with just more explicitly, somehow making future reviews cognizant or aware of this history and imploring them to review it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:

This is not like a recommendation, but I will just point out there is a review section of the charter where that text might also go.

---

KIM DAVIES: That probably makes more sense in that spot then.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I was about to ask if we could revise that language slightly and put it directly into the charter itself, then that might appease both options. And then Peter says that, I'm summarizing, that it probably fits better within the charter itself. So, to clarify Option 4 that Daniel added to the process or to the sheet that's being displayed. So, it would be remove the background and add that language to Section 5 or the review section of the charter. Does anyone disagree with that approach?

Okay. And since we're missing a few people on the call, we can include that in the summary that goes out to everyone and propose that as a path forward, if the rest of the members agree with that. I think Daniel's suggestion of passing it or having the SOs and ACs review it quickly before we submit the final report seems wise. And then the last item from the RSOs was also their suggestion of removing the phrase "and operational" from the purpose and scope of responsibility section of the charter.

So, my understanding from reading that was they suggested doing the opposite what we did of copying—I'm trying to remember the exact phrase—architectural and/or operational. And I figure it sounded like it was removing "or operational" from both sections, purpose, and scope of responsibility rather than adding "and operational" to the previous section. What does everyone think of that? I'm not seeing any hands. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. So, I'm trying to remember where this came from [audio glitch - 00:27:51].

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter, I think we lost your audio, but I put from the charter review initial report that proposed change to the charter and the justification for why. The history here is that the language in the CWG stewardship proposal included the term significant architectural or operational changes, and in the original version of the charter, the purpose section just had proposed architectural changes and the scope of responsibility section referred to architecture and operation of the DNS route zone. And so, the proposal from the RZERC was to change the language so that it was significant architectural or operational, in line with the CWG stewardship and so that the charter was in agreement with itself. That is the background and context, and I see that there are hands raised. So, I see Peter and then Kim.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you. That's actually an old hand, but I wanted to save you from the German train announcements. So, I think in that context and discussions that the change made sense, even I don't think it's 100% mandatory, but I'm wondering whether the concern is about the wording operational when it comes from RZERC and whether we should or could mitigate that concern that we don't mean operational changes on the side of the route name servers, but on the side of the

---

maintenance. Trying to compromise and just keep the text that it is.  
Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Yeah.

KIM DAVIES: I think part of the challenge here is that there's not a bright line between what is architectural and what is operational. So, it's a little hard to diagnose this one without having common definitions for what sits on what side of the line. And I know that's something as a group we've struggled with and with all those scenarios that we've evaluated a couple of times over history. We have varying opinions on what's in scope, what's out of scope, etc. I suspect that this is rooted in a concern that RZERC has or the roots of operators have that this group would seek to delve into day-to-day operations of roots of operators. It's a concern I share just as I don't want the day-to-day routine operational matters of IANA to elevate to this group either.

So, to me, it's probably likely sort of comes back to that word significant that's been added, where really the intent here is not so much to divide a line between operations and architecture, but more to make sure that it's only really significant changes to the status quo, get the proper review that's needed. So, I don't know if there's a way. If that is truly the underlying concern, I don't know if operational is necessarily the word that's problematic, but again what crosses a threshold to be of sufficient importance that this group should be activated on the topic. I don't know the answer to that, but that's my two cents.

TIM APRIL: I agree with that. I think we had a discussion about this too where when we were talking about adding or operational to that section of the charter, we also had a discussion with how it might scope creep into RZERC or SSAC. And so, the significant was also added to try and mitigate some of that. So, I agree with leaving it in there. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, I have a similar view, and I think the issue is review is not harmful. Review is normally beneficial to all concerned. And in essence, if you're looking at the security and stability of the root server system, it's both architecture and operations. Now, mundane changes to operational procedures are still mundane changes to operational procedures. They're not significant changes. And even if they were referred to RZERC, I think that we answer would be, well, it's not our business, thanks and bye.

But if there are substantive changes to the way the root zone is operated for whatever reason, then having more eyeballs to look at that, having greater review is actually to the benefit of all to assure the community that the change is being contemplated, mistake, secure, and in the interests of all in terms of continuing route service. So, to deliberately say, well, we're not going to look at that because that's operational, seems to me to be short sighted and actually counted to the intent of what RZERC is all about.

So, I would argue that the current charter wording actually is beneficial to having review around these topics, and that's in everyone's interest



---

in the longer term. So, I'm supporting of keeping it to propose the language in of adding operational explicitly into the purpose and scope. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Geoff. And to put my hand back up again. I also remembered that with how we added the roman numerals to the scope section, we also would be by removing operational, we remove the operational oversight of the other two, of the operation review of the other two aspects of that or in scope for the charter, which is why I would be even less inclined to remove the and operational. The other thing I had wondered is potentially adding a clause of, like, excluding the operations of the root server system or something like that, the root server operator or something like that to the end of the third clause. But I don't know if that makes sense.

I'm seeing Peter's comment that we discuss this back and forth while we're going through it. And the ASO's comment didn't add any new aspects we hadn't already considered. So, it generally sounds like everyone on the call has agreed that Option 1 is the proposed path forward here. Does anyone disagree with that? If not, we can propose that as the plan. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm sorry. Option 1 of which column? Is it C?

---

TIM APRIL: The Column C of-- Oh, sorry. No. No. I'm reading the wrong row. Option 2 is. I was confusing which one is which. So, Option 2 seems to be the consensus from everyone in the call. We should get the consensus from the others and the chance for feedback, and move forward with Option 2 unless there are objections to that. Seeing no hands, I think that's it for the review. Okay.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, we have tentative agreements with the people on this call for the proposed path forward. Tim, I can work with you to draft the text, to draft some of the explanatory text and some of the changes to the initial report to be responsive to the public comment, and we can put that back out to the RZERC for review and consensus. How does that sound?

TIM APRIL: Sounds good.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. And then the path forward from here would be we generate that text, send it to the RZERC for review and comment once we resolve everything there. It sounds like there was some interest in sending it back out to the appointing organizations for a couple of weeks and then

---

submitting the final report to the board. Is there any other process that we need to go through there?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: No. I think that's it.

TIM APRIL: That's good. All right.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: The last item I had was in the next meeting, but I just included that line in case we didn't come to agreement and consensus on the call for the path forward, but I think there's not a need to increase the meeting cadence for RZERC to discuss this between now and next month.

TIM APRIL: Seems good to me. I just saw Daniel's comment in the chat of you think one week is a good enough time frame for a review from the RZERC?

DANIEL MAGAULT: Yeah. I have the impression that the changes are not significant enough to delay that for multiple weeks. And if we say one week, it might take two, but if we say two, it might text four.

TIM APRIL: Okay. My hope was to try and get the changes proposed in the next couple of days and hopefully we can get a response by the time the next

---

meeting rolls around, or the next meeting slot comes up. I'm not sure we actually have a call next time. I think that's-- And agreement from Peter. Anything else from anyone on the call? Not seeing anything. Thank you everyone. Talk to you in the next meeting.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. Bye-bye.

DANIEL MAGAULT: Thank you. Bye.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**