
DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Hello all and welcome to the RZERC teleconference held on Tuesday, the 18th of January 2022 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to start the roll call?

TIM APRIL: Yes, please.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: I've noted we have an apology from Carlos Martinez representing the ASO. Peter Koch, ccNSO.

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. Kaveh Ranjbar, ICANN Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, 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.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Kaveh. Kim Davies, PTI.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Howard Eland, RySG.

HOWARD ELAND: Oh yes, ma'am.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Daniel Migault, RSSAC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, I am here. Geoff Huston, SSAC.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Hi.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: And Duane Wessels, representing VeriSign as the root zone maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you, Tim. I'll pass it over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So first items are reviewing the agenda and the minutes from last month. Anyone have comments or corrections for the minutes? Seeing none. Okay. Take as accepted. The next item is kicking off the charter review process. Did you have all that info, Danielle?

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Yes, so for anyone who wasn't on the call last month, we went through and reviewed the proposed charter review process paper, which I'm sharing now. And I will put the link in the chat. And there was also a PDF attached to the agenda on the calendar invite. We went through the process review paper pretty thoroughly. And a couple of things were added from the original draft that I will highlight here.

The first is under section four, RZERC charter review team. We added this statement at the very end that the review team shall determine its consensus model at the beginning of the charter review, which will be recorded in the draft and final reports. This came about as a result of conversation about how the RZERC reaches consensus according to its operational procedures, but could be considered separate in the distinct review team. The committee members on the last call decided that's something for the review team to determine at the very beginning of the review process, and it will be documented for transparency.

The second thing that we added to the paper is step number four in the proposed review process, conduct feedback session teleconferences with each of the RZERC appointing organizations on proposed changes to the RZARC charter. So this came about from some feedback related to the fact that the proposed review team is the RZERC itself with no additional review team members.

One member asked a question if there was enough accountability baked into the process of the RZERC suggesting changes for its own charter. And so we suggested and discussed incorporating more active feedback sessions and committing to that in the process as opposed to sort of more passively sending the draft report out for review to mailing lists and just waiting for someone to email and write down their thoughts back.

We thought committing to teleconferences with each of the appointing organizations would be more active way of soliciting feedback, in addition to a public session at a public ICANN meeting and conducting a public comment proceeding on the initial report. So those are the changes. Does anyone have any questions? Duane, I see you have your hand raised, please go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thank you, Danielle. Those changes look good to me and match what I remember we talked about. I think we also talked about how there are maybe a small number of ICANN groups that don't have representation in RZERC currently, they're not listed in that list there. And we were going to sort of ask them if they wanted to be involved but not require

their involvement or something like that. Didn't we talk about that last time? I just wonder if those groups should be listed specifically, I guess.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: So the reason I didn't include that, I didn't want to commit to having feedback sessions with the—I think it's the GAC and the ALAC that don't have any representation on RZERC as of now, because they could turn us down. And I didn't want to commit to that, if that wasn't something that could be committed to. But I can include something maybe not set in stone, but extending invitation to GAC and ALAC in step four as well.

DUANE WESSELS: That might be good, because step four just says the pointing organizations, but I think we want to be even more inclusive, if we can.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. I agree with this inclusive approach. But I was wondering how these additional parties would be involved in the decision making, as in voting or non-voting or the equivalent if the committee decides by consensus. And that might be, might be important for the overall thing and might also at the same time not be important if we really strive for consensus.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: So if I understand your question, you're specifically referring to GAC and ALAC. So say, the GAC has something that they majorly oppose. How does that factor into like the approval process of any proposed changes?

PETER KOCH: That's actually another interesting aspect in how far would a representative be in a position or be equipped in working towards a consensus or being able to vote, especially when that representative comes from the GAC. But that's more or less a GAC internal thing. I was addressing it from the other side, because there were reasons that—not that I could quote them completely, but I think there were reasons that the RZERC is set up in a way it is.

And by the way, that doesn't only include GAC and ALAC. We also know that Howard is from a GNSO substructure, and at the same time, one could of course, argue that if the Registries Stakeholder Group or the Contracted Party House is involved, why not extend the invitation to others? And so on and so forth. We should keep that in mind and maybe think about these two additional as liaisons or advisors, or what is the other term that is usually used, something with members instead of participants or the other way around, but usually in ICANN terms, denotes people who are participating and who can speak but who cannot decide. Just to have a symmetry between who is acting in the committee and who is framing or shaping the charter.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: I'm thinking about that. Steve Sheng, do you have any thoughts on that? Or does anyone have any thoughts or feedback for Peter? Duane, I see your hand is up.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Well, I guess one, ambiguity, that Peter's question pointed out is that there's a difference between a feedback session with the GAC and ALAC versus having them represented on the review committee. I wonder if that's a step we wanted to take, was to invite them to join the charter review committee if they want to and give them a more formal voice, vote, if you will.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, so that's up for discussion, then. Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think in continuing this theme, there is an issue of how a review team gathers input and from whom, and how a review team itself functions, makes decisions and coordinates within itself. I find it personally somewhat anomalous that a body might be able to nominate a representative or individual onto a review team without necessarily being a member of that body. And it strikes me is almost an expression of no confidence that that body is able to process input other than by having members in the review team. I would have taken the contrary position that I'm sure a review team should be perfectly competent and able to gather input from all kinds of parties, irrespective of whether they put representatives or members into our review team itself, that it

should be quite capable of gathering input and creating conclusions from that input, which is necessarily its role.

The question as to whether the membership of RZERC is sufficiently broad, and whether others, like ALAC and GAC should be invited to be members, I thought, would actually be the subject of the charter review itself, what this review team should consider when it looks at the charter, as distinct from this rather confusing approach of inviting these folks to be members of the review team without necessarily considering the RZERC charter in the first place.

I think it's putting the two concepts in the incorrect order. If there is a substantive issue around the members of RZERC, that's fine, in terms of a charter review, subject, or as part of the issues considered in a charter review. Inviting those same organizations or others to be members of the charter review team, kind of, as I said, begs an answer in the first case to the question that you'd actually like the review team to consider. And it seems a bit odd to me that we would want to do that.

So I would actually advocate that the review work party will consist of all members of RZERC, because they are delegates or representatives of those organizations, and it's perfectly reasonable for that review team. It's part of its work to consider the charter and the members who are able to nominate individuals to RZERC as part of its order of business, either as a standing order or as a periodic items. Thank you.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, thank you, Geoff. Peter.

PETER KOCH: It occurs to me that I accidentally put the cart before the horse. What Geoff just said makes perfect sense to me.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, so it sounds like we want to keep the proposed review team as the nine members of RZERC, and then we do want to put in feedback teleconferences with the GAC and ALAC into step four, but it doesn't sound like there's a ton of support for adding additional review team members from those advisory committees. Is that correct?

GEOFF HUSTON: That's consistent with what I'm saying. Yes.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I just have one comment. I think reviewing the charter is one aspect. But the other aspect is to more globally ask the question whether the group still has a position within the organization. And that's another question that might be related to the charter as well. But really, that is more related to the existence of the group. And in that case, it might be good that we extend the committee.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: So you would be in support of adding review team members.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So what I'd like to point out is that if it's defining the charter, maybe not extending so much the committee makes sense. But we should also be able to ask a more fundamental question, do we still fit within the organization? And at that point, I think it's better that we have more people than only the people constituting the group when such questions needs to be responded.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I think the second question you raised is outside the scope of the charter review. The charter review is taking place now because it's mandated in the original charter to take place five years after the original founding of RZERC. and it's very specifically a review of the charter, and not an effectiveness review of the committee. That being said, I think that that could be a discussion for the review team once it gets started, if that review mechanism you proposed is necessary and desired by the RZERC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, sounds good to me.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Are there any other thoughts or questions related to the review process paper other than adding teleconferences only with the GAC and ALAC to step four of the process? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing anything in the chat. Okay, so I will take this review paper with the addition of feedback sessions with a GAC and ALAC as approved or confirmed by the RZERC.

The second item of business under the charter review process, to formally initiate the review process—Oh, sorry, Peter Koch said what about the GNSO at large? Peter, is that a feedback session? So having a feedback session with the GNSO Council, in addition to the Registries Stakeholder Group?

PETER KOCH:

I do not have any strong opinion either way. But I was just pointing out what I mentioned in my kind of confusing intervention a few minutes ago, that we do have a representative from the GNSO. But strictly speaking from the Registries Stakeholder Group. if we now add structures that are not represented on the committee and gather feedback from them, that might include the non-Registries Stakeholder Group part of the GNSO. Or people might ask why that was not included. But again, I'm not suggesting in either way, and maybe Howard can shed some light on that.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD:

Okay, thank you for the reminder. And that's exactly what I was going to do next, was ask Howard, do you have any thoughts on this? Or does anybody else have any thoughts or reactions here?

HOWARD ELAND:

For anything like this, I think I'd have to almost poll the constituency first to see how they're feeling. And it's hard for me to—I don't know, for a topic such as this, it'd be tough for me to just kind of speak out without doing that. So I'd almost have to defer to for the next call to do

that. Hate to punt that one, but that sounds like—there are lots of folks, I think, that each would have very strong opinions I almost need to poll to get that information.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: I understand. Steve Sheng, so your hand is raised.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Danielle. So to respond to Peters question. I would suggest not to be very specific including one SO or AC the RZERC could solicit feedback, but to say very generally, solicit feedback from other ICANN SOs and ACs, supporting organizations and an advisory committees. So in that way, we could cut off the trouble of specifying very precisely who to engage.

The specific issue regarding whether to consult with GNSO at large, that's a question to be considered. Because strictly, RZERC is about root zone evolutions. So I think in that regard, that's why the nine members does not include the GNSO, but rather gTLDs and ccTLDs. Because these are the parties that are mostly impacted by the evolution. I wouldn't say that GNSO at large is impacted. So, I think that's a question to be considered. But that's my original input here. Thanks.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Steve. And I will say there is also going to be a public session at an ICANN meeting that we will publicize, and the policy webinar leading up to the meeting and newsletters, as well as conducting an open public comment proceeding on the initial report. So there will be

plenty of venues for anyone across the ICANN community to provide input and feedback, whether or not we have a one-on-one feedback session with that group. Okay, so I've added the words "and other supporting organizations and advisory committees" to number four, and I think that that should fulfill that requirement.

All right. Any other questions? Looks like Peter's in support of that. So that answers his question, according to the chat. Awesome. Great, so in order to formally initiate the review process, I will draft a correspondence from Tim April to the head of the BTC, which is actually Kaveh Ranjbar, letting the BTC know that the RZERC intends on initiating this review process and attaching this paper as an addendum to that letter, and that should formally initiate the review.

Once this correspondence is sent and made public, the charter review team will need to set up a meeting time and cadence. I propose that the charter review team meetings take place separate and aside from the hours of monthly teleconferences. I can send out a Doodle poll this week for timing availability, but I'm going to propose that the initial cadence be once every other week. Any thoughts or considerations related to the charter review team meeting cadence?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Just to add, on 25th of January, there is a BTC meeting and I suggested to basically have it on the agenda. Just introduction that it will come to the to the BTC page. So I guess for the next month in February that this will be on [inaudible]. Just for information.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, thank you, Kaveh. I can work with Adiel on that. Geoff Huston, your hand is up.

GEOFF HUSTON: I certainly think it would be reasonable to check with Tim as to his available time and resources to also chair this review process and see if Tim would like to nominate another member of RZERC to explicitly focus on this activity to assist in the effort. I know all of us are busy and all of us are committed. I'm not sure Tim took on this additional work when he took on chairing RZERC. And it's not meant in any other way other than to be helpful in terms of sharing some of the workload here in undertaking this review across the other RZERC members. We might want to make that provision to allow another member to focus on this particular review to make sure we stick to the timeline. Thank you.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: All right, thank you, Geoff. Peter, and then Duane.

PETER KOCH: I was not going to respond to Geoff's question, but wanted to raise another thing. So if Duane is going to respond.

DUANE WESSELS: I'm not gonna respond to Geoff, so go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thanks. Maybe I missed this, or I read the interpretation in a wrong way. But are we proposing to appoint the individual sitting members to the review committee? Or are we proposing that the sending constituencies/groups appoint someone in particular? The reason I'm asking is that if we do the latter, then that might—or is very likely to influence the timing because that would trigger at least I know, for the ccNSO, it would trigger an internal process for nomination and so on and so forth, which also other ACs or SOs might be subject to.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Peter. The proposal in section four does state that we recommend having the sitting members of RZERC conduct the review.

PETER KOCH: Okay.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter asked the question I was going to ask. Where's the text you referenced? You said section eight?

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Section four. As there are no explicit instructions in the ICANN bylaws, RZERC charter or CWG Stewardship Proposal, staff recommends having the RZERC conduct a self-review on its charter. The members of the

review work party will consist of all nine members of RZERC. And then I include for reference the RZERC consists of these nine bodies across the ICANN community.

DUANE WESSELS: I guess my interpretation was different in that members meant the appointing organizations. But that's probably my mistake. I'm sorry. Okay. Members means individuals, means us, right?

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. Is it unclear still with the second part of this, "and will consist of all nine members of the RZERC?"

DUANE WESSELS: Well, it's a little confusing, because the list says like IANA function operator or their delegate, or the list says a representative selected by the ccNSO. So that's where I got a little confused.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. What if I took this out? Because this is specifically—this is just kind of copied straight from the charter and operational procedures and I don't think it adds anything. And it sounds like it's just adding confusion.

DUANE WESSELS: I would support that change. And I would also support being more explicit in I guess the last sentence that says something like the current nine appointed members of the RZERC or something like that.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: How does that look, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I think that's an improvement. Makes it more clear to me at least.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Geoff, and then Howard.

GEOFF HUSTON: I was actually looking at this sentence and then wondering why—the one part of this document where if you will, the origin of the recommendation is called out, is actually in that first sentence where it says staff recommends. Presumably, if we adopt this document, which is, I understand, the intent of why we're discussing it, surely, RZERC recommends would actually be the outcome of adopting this document. Because the origin of these recommendations kind of didn't matter if RZERC itself adopts and endorses these recommendations. So I would propose removing staff recommends and replacing it with RZERC recommends as being consistent with the document and its intended adoption by RZERC. Thank you. I can see you've made the change, so I'll shut up. Thanks.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: I agree with that. That's kind of a holdover from when this was an internal work document. Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, thanks. So on the sentence you just put in there, where it says currently appointed, not that it's an imminent problem, but there are those of us that will be term limited, that are term limited out this year. And I don't know if that could get into an extension or a weirdness where they're on the review team but not on RZERC. So that part's potentially a little tricky there.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you for pointing that out. My interpretation based off of Duane's suggestion was that it will be these nine members through the end of the review. That's something to put back to the RZERC, should it be the nine of you plus Carlos, that make up the RZERC at the beginning of the review? Or should this be something that if somebody was termed out, would be subbed in by their replacement delegate from their appointing organization? Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: I think we're overloading the word "members." Maybe it will consist of the of the nine individuals fulfilling the roles or—that's not right. But you see what I'm saying? It will consist of the individuals fulfilling the nine roles of the RZERC membership. I'm trying to say take the set that you just deleted, because it was a duplicate from the charter, take the

current representative throughout the process will be the one that's responsible for the review, is what I'm trying to say, but I'm not sure I have a better wording for that.

Yeah, I think so. So for you, between the nine people saying the same, no matter how long this takes, between that and the alternative of whoever is an active member of the RZERC is also an active member of the RZERC review charter review team, you would prefer the second option there. Is that correct, Howard?

HOWARD ELAND:

I think the latter. And of course, subject to others' opinions. But that would be my view. Because if not, it will start to get cumbersome as people roll out.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD:

Right. And that's an important thing I hadn't considered, so I want to hear from more of the committee what the preference is. Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm a little undecided about this. I understand my role as a delegate from the nominated organization, in this case, SSAC, as I recall. And if SSAC loses confidence in my undertaking on this committee, it is SSAC's, almost right and obligation to replace me. And I think that that would actually involve displacing me on any charter review team that I might be participating in. Because my participation in that charter review

team is not as an individual without a nominating or delegating organization, but as a role conferred on me by that organization. And the act of conferring that role implies the ability to remove that.

And I think it's a little bit presumptuous for us to then say what this one is sticky against that individual for the length of the review team, even if it is anticipated to be not that long, up to an ICANN meeting and then six weeks thereafter. So I would be hesitant in saying the individual's role in RZERC outlives the nominated role as a nominee/delegate of the appointing organization. And while it might be cumbersome for a charter review team to accommodate such changes, I also think it would be more consistent with the membership of this particular committee not being an individual who is absolutely at will to follow their own desires and dictates and judgment about an individual who is anticipated to act as a bridge between the nominating or delegating organization and RZERC. So I would be, I suppose, hesitant to say that the review committee usurps the tenure of individuals on RZERC. I would probably not go there myself, but others might see otherwise. Thank you.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Geoff. Duane, and then Peter.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, so first of all, I agree with what Geoff just said. And I guess I hate to belabor this point, but it seems strange to me a little bit that we've invented a thing called the RZERC charter review team, which is really just RZERC. It seems to me, we should either just say RZERC is going to

review its own charter, or we should make it an option that the appointing organizations could appoint different persons to the review team. I think there's some benefits to that, both in terms of the workload, and maybe also in terms of the roles that we fulfill on the committee. But I think there's advantage to having the option of other people on the review team besides those of us on this call today. Thanks.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Thanks. So I'm also in this unfortunate situation to first of all, being term limited this year, and therefore probably subject to this transition question and having to have an opinion one way or another. That said, I am wondering who is actually going to appoint these individuals. And that is probably along the lines of what Duane just said. If the desire is to keep as much of the accumulated experience with RZERC that we have, then I think that was the motivating factor here given that the committee is a bit esoteric and outside RZERC, only few people have experience with what we do. If that was the driving factor, then it might make sense to appoint the individuals if the board is actually the appointing organization, or the appointing body.

If the fiction or the truth is that the organizations represented in RZERC are the appointing organizations, then first of all, that goes back to my previous remark that we need to reflect that to those organizations and then they will trigger their internal nomination and selection

procedures. And of course, then, still they might follow depending on what their rules are and what their options are, they will appoint the sitting member or somebody else, which would again mean that the start of the team would be properly delayed in a way, but I think we need to make that decision one way or another or go back to our appointing organizations and ask them for advice.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, so it now sounds like the conversation is between either option one, whoever the current nine members of RZERC are, that is who is conducting the RZERC charter review, or two, create a static RZERC charter review team that is included by nine individuals from the same nine appointing organizations. And then those individuals would stay through for the duration of the RZERC charter review independent of if they are also an RZERC member, which would be allowed independent of their RZERC membership appointments.

So it sounds like that's what the two options we're discussing now are. Howard, your hand is up.

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, thank you. So I like the first option. I think it makes things simpler, just saying RZERC is the review team. So there isn't a separate callout for that. Makes things a lot simpler. The other thing I'll mention is a bit to Peter's comment. And that is, on the comment about having the individuals remain for reasons of past experience and stuff with the group, and that is, this process is about the review of the charter going forward. So I think that is less, to me, of a necessity than making sure

that there's nice continuity flow for the folks that are going to be working forward and have to live with this charter, as opposed to the folks like us that will be exiting out and can then wipe our hands from it. So from that perspective, I am in favor of option one.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: So I have Howard in favor of option one. Geoff Huston, your hand is up.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm also in favor of option one on the basis of simplicity, and ease of process. I think the risk of disruption by members standing down and being replaced by a new nominee can certainly be worked out between the individuals involved if there is a change of individual during that review team's lifetime. And I think that's the lesser of many alternatives here that involve greater overheads in startup, and also involve, if you will, additional decisions by other bodies, over what I would consider to be, at least at the outset, a charter review to be a relatively uncontroversial, and I wouldn't say necessarily mundane, but certainly more procedural issue than the more substantive topics of discussion that Daniel touched upon. A charter review should be relatively easy. So I would favor option one. Thank you.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Daniel, please go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, so I think I agree with what has been said. I don't see the need to make things more complex than what is needed. So I am personally in favor of option one. As far as the term of the member, we are only liaisons. So it's not that we are a free electron. We are still representing a group. So I don't think it's a huge problem or even an issue to change members while doing the review process.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Alright, thank you. So I hear that out of the two options—I've kind of put them up on the screen for people's reference—for the charter review team, Howard, Geoff and Daniel support option one. Do other members want to voice feedback or ask more questions? It's not quite clear where the full consensus is at this point. Peter has no objection to option one. Maybe Duane or Tim. Any reactions or thoughts based on the current discussion?

TIM APRIL: I support option one as well.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I can support option one. I'm not particularly worried about sort of the term limit issue. But I won't argue too stringently for option two.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Duane. Kaveh has noted in the chat that he has no objection to option one. Kim, I don't know if you want to speak up or voice an

opinion here. I know sometimes the board and PTI reps prefer to be neutral to the discussions and decisions.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks. I think that's exactly right. I try to stay out of these kinds of discussions, but I have no objection to option one. It's fine.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD:

Okay. Then for simplicity's sake, on the clarification, I actually propose removing all language of a separate work party so that it's just very clear that the RZERC is conducting a self-review on its own charter. And then the important stipulation that ICANN Org support staff will support—for the RZERC will support the RZERC for its charter review. Okay. Any objections to these proposed edits for section four? Geoff and Daniel, I think those are old hands in the queue. I'm seeing support for this in the chat and no objections. Okay. Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Sorry, one clarifying question. So in the earlier discussion, we had the team existing as a shell more or less being filled by RZERC and then it made sense to have a consensus model and so on and so forth. If we now explicitly say that RZERC is doing a self-review, then it's RZERC doing the work and then the RZERC mode of operation would apply, wouldn't they?

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: I think so, but maybe not necessarily. I think it's still prudent for the RZERC to declare its consensus model at the beginning of the charter review, because I think we wanted to include this thought in the process paper for the potential to record any dissent or differing opinions that may arise during the charter review. It's true that we've removed all language related to review team. I see Geoff has his hand up.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, in which case, if you change the word team to process, maybe that addresses the particular issue that it allows RZERC, operating within the construct of the review, to adopt a consensus model that might be at variance with RZERC's nominal operational model, but equally calls it out that it shall be considered within the context of the review process, and shall be recorded in the draft and final notes. And rather than a consensus model, I would say it's the consensus model. Because what you're really saying is, it might be at variance to RZERC's procedures, but it's going to be explicitly adopted. And that's a good thing. That's a very good thing. Thank you.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Geoff. I think that works really well. Any other thoughts on this section and the edits we've made? Okay, I propose that I will put this final review paper out perhaps for just a 72-hour final review period on the RZERC mailing list to make sure that it's stable and has the full support of the RZERC. And I will work with Tim to draft the official correspondence to the ICANN Board.

In addition, I will work with Tim and send out a Doodle for the charter review meeting time and cadence. I did not hear any objections to meeting every other week. So I will make that clear in any communications, in any Doodle polls for members' time and availability. Are there any other questions, comments or feedback related to the charter review process before we move on?

Not seeing any hands in the queue or chat, I think we can bring this agenda item to a close. Thank you, everyone, so much for your feedback. Looking forward to getting this work started. Tim, I will pass the reins back over to you.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Danielle. So a quick thing, I'll cut it short on the second one so we can give Duane a couple of minutes to discuss his item. For the topic scoping exercise, we've gone over most of the topics, there's still a small number for us to discuss in the discussion list. I'll try and work with Danielle to get the list of the subjects that we have either discussed or should still discuss out to the list and to ask everyone to go to that form link that Danielle sent out and adjust any of your votes for those items so we can get a better idea of what the group opinion is for those items. And then we can discuss that on the call next month. And then Duane had the ZONEMD deployment plan to introduce.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thank you, Tim. So just an update on this item. Kim and I have been working together on a deployment plan draft, which is now basically ready for RZERC to look at. I sent it to Danielle and Tim a few days ago.

But I believe it hasn't been shared with the whole committee yet. Is that right? So I guess we'd like to get this on the agenda for the next meeting and start to get people's feedback on this.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, just a quick logistical question. Is it okay to share the contents of the plan and any committee members' discussion on the public mailing list, or does that need to remain confidential for now?

DUANE WESSELS: I think it's certainly more than fine to share it with the committee members. I guess I hadn't thought about the need for confidentiality. Off the top my head, I don't see that being a big concern. But Kim should also weigh in on this. One reason I say that it's not a big concern is I have been giving some presentations at conferences about this. And so some of this information is already out there and being discussed publicly. And nothing the draft plan is really deviated very much from that. So I don't see any concerns about confidentiality, but Kim might have something.

KIM DAVIES: Yeah, I have no specific concerns about confidentiality either. I'll just canvas this paper as a draft and noting that the formal adoption of RZERC 003 as advice is still ongoing. So obviously, as that continues on, there might be constraints or requirements that result from that process. Seems to me, fairly unlikely, but I don't want to assume that that's not going to happen. But in the meantime, we didn't want it to

necessarily be delayed getting RZERC's advice on this draft deployment plan. So it was in that spirit that it seemed the right juncture to share with this group. But as long as it has that caveat upon it, I don't see a particular problem with confidentiality. Thanks.

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Thanks, Kim and Duane. I will distribute the draft plan then on the RZERC mailing list shortly after this meeting. Members, please feel free to discuss on the mailing list, but we will add this as a work item for the next RZERC teleconference in February. Duane, any other thoughts?

DUANE WESSELS: [Great, thanks.]

DANEILLE RUTHERFORD: Awesome. Alrighty. Tim, back over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks all. I think that brings us to the end unless there's anything else to discuss. Seeing nothing. Thank you all for your time. Talk to you in a few weeks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]