
ICANN76 | CF – RZERC Charter Review Information Session
Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – 15:00 to 15:30 CUN

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, and welcome to the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee or ZRERC charter review information session. My name is Danielle, and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. I will read them aloud during the time set by the chair of the Session. If you would like to ask a question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note, this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to RZERC Chair, Tim April.

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.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Danielle. Hi, everyone. Apologies for being remote. Today we're going to go over the results of the RZERC's charter review process and where we stand within it. So here's a quick agenda of the things we're going to cover. You can jump right in. The slide is being shared. I can't see them in my side. There you go.

So here's the agenda of what we'll be going through. We can jump to the next slide. So the RZERC is chartered with reviewing proposed changes to the architecture of the DNS root zone and the systems and hardware system, both hardware and software components used to execute those changes in the DNS root zone. As we also have the scope of responsibilities, both of these are pulled out of the existing charter that we're currently in the process of reviewing. And as a background, the RZERC was established during the CWG-stewardship transition. And there's a little bit more context about that on the next slide. In two slides, sorry.

If we go to the next slide, you can see the membership of the RZERC. It's currently nine members that are appointed by different organizations throughout the ICANN community. Some of them are in the room or online virtually. And I'm currently the chair. And I was appointed by the IETF. The review committee for the RZERC charter was made up of the members of the RZERC at the time that we started the review process. A couple numbers have switched in and out, but this is the current role of the RZERC.

And next slide, please. So for the charter review, the RZERC was originally chartered back in 2016. And in the RZERC charter, it mandates that we review the charter every five years. We initiated this

review process back in 2021 and spent a little bit of time trying to actually figure out what the review process should be since it wasn't well defined in the charter. Now that we have the idea of what we needed to do, we then began the process of actually reviewing the charter proposing changes.

And in the next slide, you can see the rough process of what we went through. We're currently at, oh, I think that was two slides. There we go. So we're currently at step four of this process. We've gone through the steps one through three. And then following the conclusion of the ICANN meeting, the public comment period will be getting for the initial report that we've drafted. Once we finish through that, we can come back to the RZERC. We'll make any review changes that we need to do and then pass that off to the Board Technical Community for their review and approval.

So the scope of the review that we did was to make sure that the RZERC was able to fulfill its role and responsibilities as envisioned by the CWG Stewart's transition document. We also included the clarification of any ambiguous terminology or make amendments as needed to try and make the charter clearer. We also reviewed for typographical errors, and tried to assess whether there were elements of the work that the RZERC was doing that either were not captured accurately by the charter or if there are things that were captured by the charter that we don't believe are actually within the remit.

And then the general findings of the review process, which we had concluded, was that the charter does enable the RZERC to fulfill its responsibilities as it was envisioned. There were some minor

inconsistencies within the charter and omissions to make the document more exacting of what the group is supposed to do. And we also, in the discussion process, determined that the RZERC wasn't receiving too much work or missing things that should have been within its scope to review.

So the next set of slides goes through the individual sections of the charter and what the decision out of the review was by the consensus of the review committee. So for the initial section, there's the background. The general consensus of the review party was that this section was not appropriate to fit into a charter document. Back when the RZERC was initially established, it was helpful for scoping and explaining why the committee was being formed. Now that the committee is established and is generally understood what the committee does, we felt it wasn't necessary to remain within the document. As for the most part, it's redundant and repetitive of what's in the CWG-stewardship transition report that instantiated the charter of the RZERC.

On to the next slide. So you can see the original and the proposed text. The main substantive changes to the proposed text is unifying the text with the next section of the charter where the phrase proposed significant architectural or operational changes appeared. That was also part of the text that was in the CWG-stewardship document as well. So we opted to retain that language and copy it back into this section as well. We also tried to make the document a little bit more readable because without the roman numerals that were then added, it was somewhat hard to parse. So the intent there was to try and make it more easy to understand.

Then next section within the group we reviewed the current membership. And we discussed whether or not there were any other bodies that needed representation or that wanted representation within the group, none were determined that we needed. That section was not determined. It's something we needed to revise.

The next section. So that there's a section that describes the meetings and how we conduct them. We noticed that there was no required definition of quorum to hold a meeting. We put the text in here, mostly delegating the definition of what a quorum is to operational procedures so that could be changed without having to go through a full review process. But establishing the expectation that committee members would be present during meetings whatever possible.

The next slide is how we make decisions as a body. So we proposed the text of locking or actually codifying how we make decisions as an organization right now, where it would be through a poll that is sent out to all of the members with a meeting ahead of the time, unless there's some urgency that makes the meeting not possible to happen ahead of time. This is how we currently operate. It's just actually writing it down and putting it into the chartered itself.

One of the other goals that I've tried to mention here is that we're trying to ensure that we can support a diverse geographic representation within the RZERC. Right now, it tends to be mostly US and Europe. We're trying to make it more receptive to other parts of the world. We do have one person currently from Australia, but sometimes the time zones can be difficult with these meetings.

The next slide is the recordings or proceedings. As it stands now, we record the audio and take minutes. No proposed changes with this. And same thing with conflict of interest. No changes to the current text that's in the document. And then the review. So the final section of the charter covers when a review has started. Right now, it's a little bit ambiguous of who can trigger a review and how the review is triggered. We've proposed the text, seen on the screen now, to basically say that either RZERC or the ICANN Board can trigger the reviews and then prescribing that any reviews are subject or to be done in accordance with the ICANN public comment process just to make sure that we or with it, that was intended to clean up the language to make it very easier to understand.

I believe that was all of the changes that we've made that we've proposed to the document. And just as a reminder for anyone, the public comment processes hasn't been started yet. I believe it will be started shortly after this meeting is concluded. We'll review the comments after they come back in, make any changes that we need to the report, and then it will be passed off to the ICANN Board and for technical review and approval. I'm happy to answer any questions, take any comments.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Does anyone in the room have any questions? Namra, go ahead.

NAMRA NASEER: Hello. I am Namra. I'm an ICANN follow. And I'm not a part of this group. I'm new to this. But I was just wondering about where you

mentioned in the proposed amendments that there should be proposed significant architectural operational changes. So you have added the word of significant, but who's defining what is significant? Like, how do we define that? I was wondering about it.

TIM APRIL:

I don't know that it's well defined, but the attention with the wording there was to enable regular and operational changes that are well understood by PTI. So, like, Kim Davies and his team with an IANA to make those changes. So take for example, signing a zone and adding a DS record for a TLD. We wouldn't believe that to be significant change. Having Kim on or having someone from IANA on the RZERC helps with negotiating what a significant change is and where they feel that there is a potential impact of the root zone.

So negative impact to the root zone, Kim would now bring it to discussion at the RZERC of whether or not it needs to be brought to the RZERC for review. There's an internal document at the RZERC that has a list of potential changes that could come up that we've been discussing of, is that a significant change? Would it require RZERC review? We may potentially make that public document by cleaning it up and actually publishing it so that those types of actions can be well known. Our current focus is to finish the charter review process, and then we'll reconsider that document.

KIM DAVIES:

Tim, it's Kim Davies here. I can just add to that answer briefly. I think you summarized it well. In addition to that working document that

we've been developing as RZERC members, our practice to date has been to be very communicative with RZERC about what we're working on. Because you're right, there's no bright line definition of what is significant. So by sharing with RZERC our evolutionary plans for the root zone, keeping them informed, that provides the members an opportunity to flag where they feel formal RZERC review is warranted. Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Are there any other questions in the physical room or online?

KALINA OSTALSKA: Yes, Kalina Ostalska, Registered Stakeholder Group representative to RZERC. Tim, I actually have a quick question. So we looked at the process of changing the charter and where we are at the moment. But I was wondering, do we have like timeline? I forgot. We probably didn't discuss it more in details in terms of like exactly the timelines. Are we going to be done by the end of the year, or any other amounts, or just general time life? Question.

TIM APRIL: I think I'll probably have to defer to Danielle on that one. My understanding is that the public comment process is about 60 days long. And then it's up to the RZERC to consume and act on any of the public comments that come in, and that I don't have a great idea of how long the Board process would take.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah, so I think we're looking at hopefully wrapping things up by ICANN77. If we get an influx of comments during the public comment proceeding, that might delay things a little bit, but we're hoping to have things done by ICANN77, or by the end of summer.

Any other comments or questions? All right. Tim, I'll turn it over to you to wrap it up.

TIM APRIL: All right. Thank you everyone for attending. Feel free to send us any questions that you might have. We're look forward to receiving the public comments and reviewing them. Thank you for your time.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you very much. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]