DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello, all, and welcome to the RZERC teleconference held on Tuesday, the 21st of December, 2021, at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to do to do the roll call?
TIM APRIL:	Yes, please.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Tim April, IETF?
TIM APRIL:	Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Carlos Martinez, representing the ASO, I note, is not on the call yet. Peter Koch, ccNSO?
PETER KOCH:	Yes. I'm here.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Kaveh Ranjbar, ICANN Board.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Yes. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kim Davies from PTI has sent in his regrets. Howard Eland, RySG?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Daniel Migault of RSSAC has also sent his regrets. He will not be on the call today. Geoff Huston from the SSAC is not on the call yet. And Duane Wessels, Verisign, as the RZM.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you. Tim, over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. If we can begin the first item of reviewing the draft minutes from last month. Did anyone have any questions or concerns with the minutes from last month? Not hearing anything. All right. We can take those as approved unless anyone objects. And then meeting time for … I assume that's discussing whether we're changing the meeting time for next year.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. This is something we normally review at the end of each calendar year, making sure that this meeting time and cadence still works for everybody. Just want to confirm before I send out any calendar holds for 2022.

TIM APRIL: Does this time not work for anyone? Seeing, "Works for me," from Peter.

KAVEH RANJBAR: It works for me, too.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. I will send out calendar holds for the 2022 monthly meetings, then.

TIM APRIL: Then the next item was the charter review.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I sent this paper out, I think, a little over a week ago, maybe two weeks ago. Just checking to see if everyone has had a chance to review it. I can walk through the paper. But this is basically the culmination of talks within the ICANN Org between leadership about how the RZERC review process will take place. This is more about who the RZERC charter review audience is and who the RZERC is accountable to in this review and less the nuts and bolts of the individual meetings taking

place in the review. I can just walk through the paper if that works for everybody.

TIM APRIL: I think that's a good idea. Thanks, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So initially, the background section, this is just why are we doing an RZERC charter review, essentially. We have some background on what the RZERC is and why it exists. And essentially, we're doing the review now because when the RZERC was first stood up by the ICANN Board, the RZERC charter requires that the charter of the committee shall be reviewed at least every five years. This is now five years afterwards and we're putting this process in place to fulfill that requirement.

I'm getting some notifications from Zoom about my audio. Can everyone hear me okay?

TIM APRIL: I can.

DUANE WESSELS: It was fine for me.

PETER KOCH: Yep. Same here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. The intent of the review. The first review of the RZERC charter is intended to consider whether the charter is adequate and provides a sound basis for the RZERC to perform its responsibilities as envisioned in the development of the CWG stewardship proposal. Essentially, does this work? Is there anything that needs to change in order for the RZERC to operate as envisioned?

The scope of the review. The charter will be reviewed to determine whether the charter enables the RZERC to fulfill its roles and responsibilities as envisioned. If there are any aspects of the charter that are ambiguous, that require amendment, there are any typographical errors in the charter that require amendment, and if there are any elements of the work of RZERC that should be captured in the charter that were not captured at the time the charter was originally drafted. Any questions about the scope of review?

I'm not seeing anything. So I'm just going to take this chance to say that there was a lot of discussion on is this review an effectiveness review of the RZERC as an organizational review? Should we be talking about the operational procedures and any possible updates to the RZERC operational procedures.

I just want to say that because what was required is a review of the actual charter, there's nothing in here about the effectiveness of the RZERC, which may naturally occur is discussions under the first bullet point. But also, there's no mention of the operational procedures

because that's something that belongs to the RZERC as an operational role.

There may be things that are discussed throughout the charter review that do result not in charter amendments but in operational amendments. And that's something we can always take on as an extra working item. It's not included in this process paper, specifically because we don't want to add requirements to a process that can take place up to every five years, that's not necessary.

RZERC Charter Review Team. Duane, yes. I see your hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. It's not really scope but one thing I'm wondering is—

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, if you're taking, I can't hear you. Can other people hear him?

TIM APRIL: I can hear Duane.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can hear Duane as well.

DUANE WESSELS: Talk, talk, talk. How about now, Danielle?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can hear you. Sorry about that.

DUANE WESSELS: That's okay. No problem. My comment isn't really so much about scope. But one thing I wonder is … I think this is something RZERC has struggled with a little bit. It's not clear who has the final say in RZERC's charter. Is that something that's clarified in this process?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: It is. I think that's section five or six. But the answer to the question will be … Initially, the results of the review will go to the ICANN Board Technical Committee and they'll make a recommendation to the full ICANN Board.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter, did I see you have a hand up?

PETER KOCH: Yes. I did. I retracted but I would raise it again, given your short conversation with Duane. I raised a hand because I was going to support that. I think that given the RZERC is not a bylaws committee, it was introduced late in the game, that the actual question that you, Danielle, also raised in your early introduction saying, "Who is RZERC accountable to?" that is also interesting.

I have read the document. I'm not sure I remember what is going to come up in section five. We can deal with it there. But I'm just wondering how this process paper came into being. Did I hear you say that that was a discussion with the ICANN leadership?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. This is a conversation that Steve Sheng and I had with ICANN Org policy leadership. And also, we consulted with Adiel, who's in OCTO and supports the ICANN BTC, the ICANN Board Technical Committee. Essentially, we know the charter literally only states, "The charter of the committee shall be reviewed every five years. A review may be initiated more frequently if determined necessary. All reviews of the charter shall be subject to ICANN public comment processes."

So there's only two sentences that mandate this requirement but there's no subsequent requirements. That makes it very different than a lot of different supporting organizations or advisory committees who have organizational effectiveness reviews—so something like that SSAC and RSSAC go through—reviews conducted by external parties. And it's not a bylaws organization within the ICANN community where there are very specific requirements for a charter review or an effectiveness review that are mandated in the bylaws.

So we're coming at this almost from scratch. This paper and this process is modeled off of the CSC's charter review process because the CSC had a similar charter review requirement in the first, I believe, two to three years after that committee was stood up. So does that provide the background and context you were looking for?

PETER KOCH: Yes. Absolutely. Thank you. But then I think that question is probably valid. Even at the risk of prematurely jumping into the charter discussion already, my understanding is that the process was modeled after, as you said, the CSC, and experience, and so on and so forth, partly taking into account that this is not a bylaws committee but something special, in a way.

So the end question could also come up in the charter review and ask for clarification, which is a bit of recursion that we have here, "Who are we addressing this to?" And then, if that question is part of the review, that makes it a bit more tasty, I would say. But I am happy with the path you chose as a start. Then we can deal with the, maybe, differing ideas in that review. Thanks a lot.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I will just clarify. Just the skeleton of the process is what's being modeled after the CSC charter review. There's quite a lot in the in substance that's different, simply because the CSC charter review did have more stated requirements in the ICANN bylaws.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I misrepresented what you said. Fully understood. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Specifically here, one of the things that was discussed extensively was the charter review team. There are no explicit instructions, obviously, in

the ICANN Bylaws, as the RZERC is not mentioned in the ICANN bylaws. But also, in the RZERC charter, the CWG stewardship proposal, staff recommended having the RZERC conduct a self-review on its charter.

So the members of the review work party will consist of all nine members of the RZERC. And then I've listed the cross-community—all of the appointing organizations of the RZERC. And then you will have myself and Steve Sheng supporting the RZERC for the RZERC charter review team.

Essentially, the charter review will be conducted in the normal fashion of an RZERC work topic—just putting that explicitly that there's no additional budgetary people. You have the normal ICANN Org support staff for this endeavor.

Moving along, the proposed review process. It's spelled out here but I just want to answer Peter's question and I think maybe Duane's question. As the RZERC was stood up by an ICANN Board resolution in 2016, the ultimate decision was that any RZERC charter review would go to the Board for review and approval. So the RZERC will conduct its review. So we will officially need to initiate the review process by sending an official correspondence from Tim, as the RZERC chair, to the ICANN Board, informing that the RZERC will begin its formal review and detailing the proposed review process.

Next, the RZERC will conduct its review of the RZERC charter in accordance with the scope. The RZERC will produce an initial report on the outcome of the review, which should include any suggested changes or amendments to the RZERC charter.

EN

Next, once there's an initial report, we imagine that the RZERC will want to solicit feedback first from any RZERC appointing organizations on proposed changes. So socializing that report with each of your appointing organizations and seeing if there's any strong feelings or feedback.

In accordance with putting this through the ICANN public comment process and making it a more interactive review process, we suggest conducting a public session at a public ICANN meeting—so probably ICANN 73 in March or ICANN 74 in June or July—to give the community a chance to provide input to the process, perhaps more informally. After we conduct a public session at an ICANN meeting, conduct a formal public comment proceeding on the initial report. Those take at least 40 days.

Then the RZERC will prepare a final report that includes a revised RZERC charter, if applicable, to the ICANN Board's Technical Committee for adoption. The BTC will review the final report and revise charter and make a recommendation to the ICANN Board for adoption. Then the ICANN Board will consider the final report an approve or reject the revised RZERC charter. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Regarding the BTC, or OCTO in general, should we have …? There doesn't seem to be a feedback mechanism first for them. Should there be a round of that as well, after the public comment period? Or do we think that they will …? Because to me, I'm missing the part of ICANN—

OCTO, or BTC, or somebody—has an objection to some or part of the final report and how that gets looped back in. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can provide an initial response but I think Kaveh might want to chime in here. The ICANN Board is an appointing organization so Kaveh is here on behalf of the ICANN Board. So I think that is also captured in step four to solicit feedback from appointing organizations. On our end, ICANN staff is going to work to bring this up to the Board Technical Committee so that they're aware of it going in, from the beginning of the process. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks, Danielle. Getting back to my earlier question a little bit, I would just like to check with the other committee members if I'm off-base here. But this feels to me a little bit strange the RZERC is essentially reviewing its own—or proposing its own modified charter, perhaps. I don't know how common this is in other ICANN groups. In my experience, the Board very rarely disagrees with recommendations that come out of groups like this. So I feel like that's almost a bit of a rubber stamp. I would just like to hear from other people if I'm being too paranoid here or not.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry. I see Peter has his hand so I will go next.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter?

PETER KOCH: No. Please, Kaveh. Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Peter. I just wanted to add I agree with Danielle's interpretation and also what Duane said because basically, this is a review committee. So the expectation is the Board, via BTC or directly, either way, takes whatever comes from RZERC as expert advice. So basically, that would be with actually a lot of weight that would count in any decision. So in general, the expectation is the Board wants to be as neutral as possible so they can get the expert advice without any bias, at least from their side. So in that since, I fully agree with Duane.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks. I tend to agree with Duane that it feels a bit awkward, or maybe at least different from other committees I've been on—the IANA functions review team, for example. That was staffed or seated with, of course, representatives from the various communities, as are we. So in part, I believe that the genesis of this committee is already, in part, reflecting this participation of the various groups, SOs and ACs.

What I'm wondering is whether or not—and this might be a theoretical example—but I'm trying to figure out where in this whole post-transition ecosystem the RZERC actually really hangs. Would the Board have the power to actually dissolve this committee? Or is the Board … If we come to the conclusion that, "Well, okay. We've done two, three, or four advices. But in the end, maybe we don't want to continue." Or is this something that couldn't happen because it is one of these "constitutional" things that was implanted into the ICANN ecosystem by CWG and so we need to go ahead.

That is a theoretical example but it might also address the question of accountability and who is going to make changes and to what extent? Then again, maybe I'm making things complicated. Apologies.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll just respond to that briefly to say I don't know but I can check with ICANN legal on that and get back to the RZERC. But I do not want to speculate on if the Board has the power to dissolve this committee. I don't know if there are any other reactions to that but, Howard, I see that your hand is raised.

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks, Danielle. So two comments. As far as should we be the ones doing this, I think the question is if not us, who? I feel like I would rather see us in the driver's seat than other people that may particularly have a different opinion and end up steering the work that we need to do. And I feel better about us doing it because of the fact that there is a public review process, as well as an appointing organization feedback process.

If those things weren't in place, I would be more hesitant to do the self-navel-gazing to review the charter. But because of those, I feel pretty good about that.

I think Peter actually raised a really good point on the dissolution stuff. That is if it is determined that nobody has direct power, but it's possible to do it, but maybe that is part of the review process where we throw it in the charter—the ability to set parameters for how to dissolve, should it come down to that that. But that, of course, would be after the legal review would determine that, other entities or any contractual obligations notwithstanding. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Howard. I see Tim and then Duane.

TIM APRIL: I was just going to agree with Howard. I'm not sure who else would do this review if it wasn't done by us. And I feel the control of having both the appointing organizations and the public comment helps control some of the chaos that could potentially happen if we were to just do it ourselves.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. Howard raised the question, if not who, us? Which I think is totally valid, and in a way, a little bit part of the problem that we're having here. There is no one else. But maybe it doesn't have to be only RZERC. Maybe there are other groups that could join in, at least a little bit, as a second opinion on the committee itself. Maybe the BTC or maybe the ICANN Board could consider something along those lines. I don't know.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So are you saying you want to BTC to take a more active role in the actual conducting of the RZERC review?

DUANE WESSELS: What I'm saying is I'm a little bit uncomfortable with only RZERC reviewing its own charter. I totally get that we have the public comment period and whatnot, which serves as some kind of safety net. But I don't know. I feel like, I some sense, those are often too little, too late. I would personally be more comfortable if there was other folks more actively involved in the review itself.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Howard and then Peter.

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks, Danielle. Duane, I think that was what I was getting at with bullet number four. I thought that that was exactly the function you were describing. I realize it's more of a feedback loop than help with

your initial drafting. But to me, that's where I feel the BTC gets its fingers in and can make recommendations that are moderate to drastic—however they feel is appropriate. So that's why I was okay with the way it was. I don't know if that addresses your concern or no. Over.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know, either. I think that would remain to be seen. Regarding what step four here says specifically, where the appointing organizations provide feedback, I think that can be good. I also think that sometimes the organizations are just going to say, "Whatever you think is best," and there wouldn't be a lot of other feedback than what's already been put forth by the representatives or the committee as a whole.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, real quick, for step four, would you feel more comfortable if there was … "Solicit feedback" is a really open-ended statement and that was intentionally written as such. Would you feel more comfortable if there were almost like an interview session between … We could sit down with each of the appointing organizations, and have a conference call, and go through the discussed changes—something at least with the SSAC chair but any SSAC members who want to participate. We could have a call with the SSAC and go through the nine organizations that way.

DUANE WESSELS: That could work. That's an interesting idea. That sounds like a lot more work than maybe you had initially envisioned. You talked about staffing and whatnot but something like that could work. Yeah. Sure.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I would not want work that I have to do to be limiting factor here to putting together a process you're comfortable with. I'm just thinking of ways that we can make it more … Because if we put that in the process for at least this charter review, that's something that we can commit to and then we're definitely accountable for. I'm just thinking of a way that we may get less passive feedback, which is just sending out an e-mail and then saying, "Okay. No one said anything for three weeks so I guess they approve," making it more of an interactive, active feedback session. We can put that in words if people agree with that. That's something I'm comfortable leading.

Duane, I want to get your feedback on that and then I see that Peter has his hand up.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that's a good idea. Certainly, if others support that as well, that would be great. But again, I think some of my concern here stems from the fact that it seems like RZERC, in a way, is just left to its own. It's been this way for a long time. Since the CWG no longer exists, there really is no one that RZERC is accountable to or takes direction from. I guess I was looking for something like that as part of the review process.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter, do you have any feedback or responses to that?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks. I think we might want to distinguish two aspects of this. One is that we, as individuals, of course, would review our own work or track and so on and so forth. That might appear as a problem or might not add enough perspective and so on and so forth. I think I remember that other reviews that, of course, then were conducted by or supported by external consultants, and doing interviews, and so on and so forth, also asked former members of committees. I don't know the exact example where the happened but I'm pretty sure it did. I'm not saying we should copy this but maybe think about that when it comes to giving more insight.

The other thing that might make this complicated, that RZERC is so little visible, that we might not really be able to find a lot of people to add to the review committee, that did not sit on the committee before but still have enough insight.

The other part is this representation idea. Duane just said that the CWG does no longer exist so there's nobody else. There is, of course, the empowered community. But then again, the empowered community consists of the ACs and SOs and all of them are already—or almost all of them are already—present on the very committee. So if we think about the groups represented, that might not change much. We could, of course, invite more people. But that would then easily double the number of members of the review team and I'm not sure that that is helping.

EN

So getting the other way---and I think that was the suggestion—being a bit more outgoing or engaging with the various appointing organizations and maybe share our observations and concerns and get direct feedback. If that was the suggestion, I would support it. It would, of course, be more work but maybe help us shape an inside and an outside view. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. Thanks. Maybe another angle … Can you hear me?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes.

HOWARD ELAND: Another potential angle to look at this might be from the folks that, to date, we have potentially tried to influence the most. Maybe that means we should do a specific feedback call-out to RSSAC, SSAC maybe, and maybe some folks within OCTO—just as an idea, just because many of the recommendations we've made have had directly or indirectly affected those folks. So they may want to have a say in how we move forward, as a thought. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter, is that an old hand?

PETER KOCH: Yes. I'm sorry.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter convinced me that your suggestion to expand number four, I think that's sufficient here. I don't think that there's really a lot we can do to address my other concern about the oversight and accountability. So I think we should move forward with actively soliciting feedback from the appointing organizations.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. One thing that was interesting, that got mentioned, is the ACs that are not already represented with the appointing organizations. The only ones that are not included within the RZERC already are GAC and ALAC. Do we want to commit to adding those within the process or is that something that we want to attempt to add and schedule as we're scheduling the other sessions? Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I think it would be appropriate to invite them, if they want to participate, but maybe not require them to if they don't want to.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That makes sense. Okay. So I am going to … We have a thumbs up from Howard and Tim. I am going to update with more detailed language here.

And then the general timeline for the proposed review schedule. Initiate the review process. Conduct a public consultation at an ICANN meeting. Produce an initial report three to four weeks after the ICANN meeting. Hold a public comment on the initial report, finalize the report, send it to the BTC for review. BTC reviews the final report and makes a recommendation to the ICANN Board. And then we would see an adoption of the final report by the ICANN Board.

I think the only thing that I think, based off this conversation, is we might not want to commit to the first ICANN meeting after the review initiates. This might be the first ICANN meeting after initial report is drafted, depending when in the process the RZERC wants to take the review of the charter to the full ICANN community. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: The one thing that occurs to me, reading this section, is … Again, I forget if it's from our charter or our bylaws. But basically, RZERC is expected to work by full consensus almost exclusively. So we maybe want to clarify here if this review work falls under those procedures, if the committee has to have consensus, or if dissenting opinions will be represented and so on.

EN

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That is a very important thing that has not been discussed. I think that that was just assumed. But I think we should definitely explicitly put it in here because I'm envisioning that we would send this as an addendum from the RZERC to the Board. We'll have a draft letter and then include this process. So I think that's really important to include.

So I'm going to throw that back out to the committee members on this call and find the charter language about consensus decision-making. But what do people think about including and making that explicit in the review paper?

PETER KOCH: I think I remember we had discussions about that—full versus other consensus—when we first wrote the operational procedures. Because the consensus is already built into the charter but the language in the charter didn't really make clear whether that distinction that was probably later introduced in wider ICANN circles—whether there was a distinction between full and rough consensus or something like that. I think it's an interesting discussion to have but I'm not sure why we would mention that explicitly.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That might be something that we discuss and include in the report of the charter review. But I pulled up the operational procedures and it's included in decision four. Duane, I see your hand's up.

DUANE WESSELS: I was going to … Peter, you were certainly here for this but in some of the early documents that RZERC produced, this is something we struggled with. It was a lot of work to reach consensus. So I think, first of all, if RZERC's report on its charter review is supposed to represent the full community consensus, that's going to take just a long time to get there. It's going to take a lot of discussions, and wordsmithing, and whatnot.

I think that the charter review is a little bit tied to our topic scoping exercise that we're going through. In that, I see a lot of different opinions about things. So I guess I'm expecting similar here. I'm expecting a lot of differing opinions about the charter as we go through the review process. I guess I'm hoping that differing opinions would be represented in the final output and that we wouldn't necessarily have to use a full consensus approach with this. That's just my feeling, having thought about it for a few minutes here. I think Peter responded in the chat.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. If I may add one sentence. Of course, the review team isn't necessarily bound—is by no means bound by the RZERC internal operational procedures, even though the review team now consists of the RZERC members. I do not see a reason to follow those or to copy those and apply them to the team itself—as in, strive for full consensus and if that's not achievable then use the rough consensus, or dissenting votes, or whatever the actual text was that we had on the screen a second ago. Is that what you were suggesting?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think as long as we all agree, Peter, I think that this review process document should state that, for example, the normal operational procedures will not be followed. It doesn't necessarily have to represent the consensus of the committee or the participants—something like that. Is that reasonable, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. My earlier question was pretty much useless, of course, because it's not the committee. It's the review team. Since we are following the examples of other review teams, I don't know what other review teams—what consensus mechanism they apply. But I would assume it's the same spirit. Try full and if that's not achievable then allow for dissenting opinions to be recorded. Does that make sense or did you want to go for a rough consensus as a default?

DUANE WESSELS: My first concern was really that it didn't say either way in the paper that's before us. So I think we should just all agree on what approach is going to be used.

PETER KOCH: And you convinced me that that is necessary. Absolutely. Yes. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I might state that this might be the first thing that the review team discusses once the review initiates. It might not be for the review team to declare before the review takes place. But I think it is for the review team to decide at the beginning of the review process and document in its report. Or do you think it needs to be declared in the process paper? The scope of this paper is more to determine once the review takes place, how does it go through formal ICANN process to be approved. And what this discussion is, is more how does the review team operate.

DUANE WESSELS: I could go either way on that, I guess. I think we could save some time if it was in this process paper. But if there's reasons that it can't be done, then it can be the first thing that the review team talks about. I think Howard's been waiting patiently.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks. I'm a little bit concerned here that we're going to start heating up the ocean, in that if we say we should not follow the normal RZERC operational procedures on the review team, the next question that comes to bear is going to be, "Okay. Then what operational procedures does the review team follow?" And I loathe having to build a new set or even trying to review the procedures and decide which ones are good and which ones are not before we even get started. That sounds like a setup backward to me. So I'm a little bit concerned about it.

I absolutely agree that we do need to look at the level of consensus needed. So I think that does need to be addressed. But I'm very concerned that that doesn't open up a can of worms for this review committee, which of course, is this committee. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, do you have any thoughts on that?

DUANE WESSELS: I share Howard's concern. I definitely don't want—because RZERC doing its own procedures took many, many months and we don't want to do anything like repeating that. That's one reason why I think it would be good if we could put it in the process paper. But I see Tim has a suggestion in the chat. It sounds like what you were suggesting, Danielle, that the review team—that's the first thing that they would talk about.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I added this text at the end of section four. Does this address your concerns, Duane and Howard, or is this insufficient?

HOWARD ELAND: I like this. I think that addresses my concern. If I could tweak that just a hair to say that the review team needs to determine this at the beginning of the process or something to that extent. As worded, it sounds like we can make a determination. We can change the model as we see fit throughout the process. I think that's not what we want to

do. Other than that, I think that does a really good job of addressing my concerns. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: How does this work for everyone? I've amended it to say, "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." I see a thumbs up from Tim and Howard. Duane, Peter, Kaveh. I'm seeing lots of thumbs up. Okay.

Any other questions about the process paper? I know not all of the committee members are on the call so I can accept the changes, spell out step four in this proposed review process a little more and send it to the full committee for review. Perhaps through—and hopefully we can get more people on the January call to formally approve the process paper and get the review initiated by the end of January. How does that sound to people? Is that too long? I'm just cognizant that the next two weeks in the calendar tend to not be productive ones for people reviewing items like this.

HOWARD ELAND: I think it's a necessary length of time we have to take. One other bit. I will also refrain from commenting on the fact that we need to reach consensus about the bit about consensus.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane and then Tim.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think your plan is fine, of course, because we don't have a lot of the members here today. But I had a follow-up question about the schedule in the next section when you're done with this section. I don't know if, maybe, Tim wants to talk about this section still.

TIM APRIL: I was just trying to say that waiting until next month seems okay because that gives us a little bit more time to talk about the scoping exercise and get closer to finishing that.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Great. Duane, what was your second question about the schedule?

DUANE WESSELS: Can you say a little bit more about the public consultation at ICANN meeting step? Are we expecting that the broader ICANN community, at that point, will have things to say to us?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I think this might be more about possibly previewing the contents of the charter review and any possible amendments or discussions that may

result from it, presenting that to the community, and getting initial feedback. This is before the public comments. So brining this item to the community, bringing it to the forefront people people's thoughts, and bringing it into the conversation before a public comment period takes place so that people know that this is happening, they get an idea of what the review team has been discussing and we can get an initial temperature check of how people might respond to any amendments.

DUANE WESSELS: How do we get the word out to potential attendees that this will be happening?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That's a great question. That's something that I'm very involved in the preplanning webinar that takes place before each ICANN meeting. So that's something that I can highlight in the webinar. I can also highlight it in the policy outlook report before that meeting. Then I can also make sure it's included on the daily newsletter, like the highlight of meetings for the day, to really get the community engaged and aware that this call is taking place.

DUANE WESSELS: That's sounds great. Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Tim, I see your hand is up.

TIM APRIL: I had the same question as Duane, of how would we get people to read the document and look at it before that and had wondered whether swapping the order of the public comment and public meeting at ICANN would make sense, to have it overlap. But I don't know if that makes sense or is reasonable to deal with.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry. Can you say that again?

TIM APRIL: I was wondering if I had the public comment period begin the week before the ICANN meeting so people had a chance to read the document and comment, either in-person or through the public comment portal.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I think we can definitely do that. I think we can definitely time the public comment. I see what you're saying. Yes. I think I want to, then, amend this. It's not the first ICANN meeting after review initiates. I think we want to move this step down here. This doesn't really have a timeframe. The initial report will take as long as it takes. Then we have a public consultation at the ICANN meeting—the first ICANN meeting after—

TIM APRIL: After draft prepared.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Draft initial report prepared … Public comment, we can start it one week before ICANN meeting. Okay. Does that address why you have your hand up, Tim, or do you have another comment?

TIM APRIL: That was it. I just forgot to lower it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I did have something else on the agenda about the meeting cadence for the review team but I think if we're going to bring these changes to the full committee for next month, we can discuss that in January.

Cognizant of time, I don't think we have time today to discuss the topic scoping exercise results. We did not get a chance to send the survey out again but I did note that that might … Do we still want to resend the survey out and have people conduct the survey again, based off of the last two months of discussions and have that prepared to discuss for the January meeting?

TIM APRIL: I think I would propose sending the same links as before. Everyone can see the answers they gave the last time and then modify rather than … Because when I've gone to the page again, I was able to see my responses and modify them if I needed to.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I can send that out before the January meeting. Are there any other final thoughts or questions for this month on the process paper? Okay. Not seeing any. Tim, any other things? I'll hand the mic back over to you for the end of the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]