

## Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC) Meeting Minutes 16 May 2023 | 19:00 - 20:00 UTC

### Attendance

<b>PTI</b>	Kim Davies
<b>SSAC</b>	Geoff Huston
<b>RSSAC</b>	Daniel Migault
<b>IETF</b>	Tim April
<b>GNSO RySG</b>	Kalina Ostalska
<b>ccNSO</b>	Peter Koch

**Staff** Danielle Rutherford, Steve Sheng

**Apologies** Duane Wessels (RZM), Wes Hardaker (ICANN Board)

### Call to Order

Tim called the teleconference to order at 19:03 UTC.

### Roll Call

Danielle Rutherford conducted a roll call.

### Agenda Review

There were no amendments to the agenda for this meeting.

### Review proposed response to public comment submissions

Tim April walked through a spreadsheet with a summary of the public comment submissions and discussed possible RZERC responses to the comments received.

Tim April summarized the public comment from James Olorundare. James's comment stated that in order for ICANN to take action to address concerns regarding the RZERC's ability to fulfill its important role in the Internet governance ecosystem, ICANN could provide additional staff, funding, and access to necessary information from various sources. Tim April stated that he did not think the comments from James indicated overall support for the RZERC and agreeing with the contents of the report. Tim April stated that he did not propose any changes to the Charter or Initial Report. Peter Koch agreed. No other members objected.

Tim April summarized the public comment from Daniel Getahun. Daniel's comment stated the Charter is ambiguous since it does not clearly define what constitutes a "major architectural

change" to the DNS root zone and proposed a possible definition. Tim April shared a proposed response that explained the RZERC chose to include the word "significant" in the charter because it is the same language used in the Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community (the "CWG-Stewardship Proposal"). Tim April proposed including additional text from the CWG-Stewardship Proposal in the charter that states "Since it is not possible to formally define 'significant,' all parties should err on the side of prudence and raise issues for the consideration of the standing committee when there is any question of it being required. The standing committee may decide that it does not need to consider the issue." Kim Davies and Peter Koch agreed with the proposed addition. No other members objected.

Daniel's comment also stated that the Charter does not specify how the RZERC members are selected, appointed, removed, or replaced and recommended that the Charter be revised to include clear and transparent rules and procedures for RZERC membership. Tim April stated that the RZERC Charter already states "Appointment of members shall follow each organization/group's internal process." Tim April suggested no changes to the membership appointment process. No members objected.

Tim April summarized the comment jointly submitted by eight root server operators (RSOs). The RSOs' comment recommended the RZERC not remove the Background section of the original Charter. The RSOs stated in their comment that the background gives the motivation for the very narrow scope of the RZERC, and helps the reader to understand that other parts of the system are in place to deal with issues that are outside the scope of the RZERC, for example in the wider top-level domain, root zone, and root server system. The RSOs also stated in their comment they do not see a need to add a general operational aspect to the RZERC charter, and suggested that the words "and operational" be removed from the Purpose and Scope of Responsibilities sections of the Charter.

The RZERC members discussed the first comment from the RSOs' statement regarding the Background section of the Charter. Kim Davies stated that his reasoning for removing the background is similar to what PTI did with IANA documentation. IANA documentation no longer references the transition as it is no longer relevant to the daily operation of the IANA function. Kim Davies stated that because the original establishing documents are online and available the charter for the current RZERC does not need to contain references to the past. Geoff Huston agreed with Kim Davies. In the course of the discussion, Tim April proposed and the RZERC discussed the following options:

- Option 1) Keep the Background section in the Charter in response to feedback
- Option 2) Provide further justification for removing the Background from the charter
- Option 3) Move the background from the main body of the Charter to an appendix of the Charter

- Option 4) Remove the background section of the current charter AND add language "Charter reviews shall review the previous charters and the circumstances that lead to the creation of RZERC in 2016 as part of their review process" to Review section of the charter

RZERC members discussed the different options. Tim April asked if anyone disagreed with pursuing Option 4. No members disagreed with pursuing Option 4 in response to the public comment from RSOs.

The RZERC members discussed the second comment from the RSOs' statement regarding the Purpose and Scope of Responsibilities sections of the Charter. Peter Koch asked if it was possible to mitigate the concern of incorporating "operational." Kim Davies stated the challenge is there is not a bright line between what is architectural and what is operational. Kim Davies suggested using the term "significant" to focus on important changes that require review. Tim April agreed. Geoff Huston agreed and stated review is normally beneficial to all concerned and that the text in the Charter would not apply to mundane changes to operational procedures. Peter Koch agreed in the chat.

### **Adjournment**

The RZERC concluded the teleconference without objections at 19:43 UTC.