DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello everyone, and thank you for joining us. This is the RZERC Charter Review Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 19th of April 2022 at 20:00 UTC. It's incorrect on the agenda on your screen right now. For the charter review work sessions, we can just do attendance via Zoom. Tim, would you like to run through the agenda?

TIM APRIL: Sure. So, we've modified it a little bit, just before the meeting. There were two important topics that we hadn't gotten to yet, that we were going to try and discuss, and then hopefully, redo the calculations with the spreadsheet to determine whether or not the group felt that was in or out of Scope. And then Danielle pulled up the—walked through all of the different consensus definitions across ICANN, and then there's the actual charter itself that we can go through. So, to start, I'd say let's start with the topic scoping exercise topics, and hopefully we can finish that part of the discussion today. So, I'm trying to pull up my—do you have the link handy, Danielle, for the survey, so people can see what they had selected?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes, give me one moment and I can pull it up. But here's the current standing. I haven't gotten any updated responses from our last meeting.

TIM APRIL: I don't know if it's just me, but I just see a single vertical white line. There it goes.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Can you see the spreadsheet now?

TIM APRIL: Yeah.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, these are the final two topics for the RZERC to discuss.

TIM APRIL: I guess we're split exactly the same way on both of these. Does anyone have strong arguments for or against either of these being in or out-of-scope? I guess let's start with number 26, the MTU, MSS issue. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, so I'm pretty sure that I put this as out of scope. I'm one of the out-of-scope votes. I see this as a largely operational detail, and an example of something where diversity can be beneficial. But having said that, just the two abbreviations. MTU, MSS doesn't give us a lot to go on in terms of—regarding a specific proposal about these parameters, but I would say leaning towards out-of-scope. Oh, I see there's more details here in the chat.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I put the topic definitions for each topic that were circulated with the survey when members originally took it in the chat. So, for MTU, MSS, its configuration of root servers with respect to MTU, MSS, fragmentation and truncation.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, Tim. This is Peter, for the record. I'll play the devil's advocate just for no better reason. And first I would agree that the choice of individual values or the values picked by individual RSOs will be out of scope for RZERC. But the discussions and the considerations about this intertwined system of all of these, including the more broader topics of fragmentation and truncation might at some point, be in scope, especially when it comes to adding particular record types or records that say go beyond current size requirements are something in that direction. So agreed only to the extent that yes, merely operational, but might have bigger consequences and therefore could be in scope.

GEOFF HUSTON: I was one of the people that actually said this was in scope, and I think I'm still pretty convinced that it is in scope. While we keep on using the current key sizes that we're using, and while we keep on with the prospect of rolling these KSKs in the future, then we hit pretty close into the area where variation, particularly downward variation, can be harmful. And while diversity does give you some levels of resilience, deliberately truncating the answer and forcing TCP, I don't think, does many favors here. And I actually think there is some argument in favor of having a consistent standard here on how we expect the root zone transport to be managed.

The current status, I thought, was haphazard, when I did some scoring of the root servers many years ago, and at the time, it wasn't necessarily a deliberate decision; it was whatever the platform does, which is okay, as long as all the answers are small. But when the answers tend to get larger and critical in the case of the DNS key answer, deliberately truncating, because you just can't fit it in, doesn't help anyone.

And that's why I thought this was actually a topic that realistically was part of what part is the common root service standard, and the parameters for a successful transmission of an answer, particularly relating to the DNS key resource record, as distinct from whatever you want. I think there is some substance here in saying, we need some of these resource records to be answered in UDP, from all the root servers, which is where I was heading with this. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks Geoff. And so I just pull up my responses, and we'll jump in. And I had put it out of scope, where I think this goes back to the discussion we had last month about in the purpose section of the current charter, it is fuzzy about what the distribution of the DNS root zone is, of whether that's the serving the zone file or actually serving the contents of the zone. The question of the DNS root zone is whether that's the serving the zone file, or actually serving the contents of the zone file from the root servers.

But I think I was thinking the same way as Duane, of the question of DNS root zone is whether that's the serving the zone file or actually serving the contents of the zone file from the root servers. I think I was thinking

the same way and as Duane of having … It's not necessarily up to us to determine how the root server operators define their network and how they serve the content. Or could easily sway the other way. Anyone else? Is that an old hand still, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: It is old, yes. I'm lowering it now. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks. So, kind of along to Geoff's point here. While I agree that—I was actually looking right at the purpose paragraph as well. I think I can also make the argument that whenever you start doing things like truncating and shifting protocols in order to facilitate the use of critical records, that you are speaking towards stability, and that is indeed included in the, under the scope of responsibilities in the third paragraph. So, based on that I can lean towards that being in scope, over.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, Howard. Anyone else?

GEOFF HUSTON: Let me add one more thing here. It's certainly been a longstanding, almost article of faith, and I'm not sure that it's been written down anywhere. But the whole issue of why 13 letters, why this, why that, has

been a distaste to have the primary response answers to be fragmented. That resilience and stability was about being able to deliver the critical elements of bootstrapping in the DNS, without relying on tools like fragmentation or reversion to TCP as being part of that critical path to bootstrap up DNS resolvers.

For that reason, if one takes DNSSEC into that same umbrella of this is now, "You can't stray into clients," then the whole MTU, MSS issue is relevant, because we've moved away from 576 into this area of well, something greater than 1280. But, if we're going to have to rely on fragmentation or fall back to TCP, I think we're doing stability a disservice.

And if it's left up to root server operators to do individual responses, I'm not sure the result is more resilient and stable, than one that effectively tries to say, we're going to draw a line at a certain point where we understand we're not reverting to fragmentation on critical responses. So, on that basis, I've sort of came to that conclusion that it was in scope. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:	Any other comments about this one? Okay. Not sure we're going come to a clean agreement on that one, but we can talk about it later on. And then number 42, the software to manage the root zone.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	So, the definition of this topic, includes upgrades to the software used to manage the root zone and root zone workflow. And then Kim has his hand raised.

KIM DAVIES:	Yeah, so I can take a crack at kicking this one off. So, I think I responded in the negative, and the reason for that is I think that this is too broadly scoped for the remit of RZERC. I think that there are definitely software changes that can be made that would alter the architecture of the root zone, but I don't believe the vast majority of them are, and I suspect that RZERC could be getting involved in day-to-day operational activities, should it be gating any upgrades to the software that either ICANN or VeriSign make quite regularly to our platforms.

So, what I would seek to have here is sort of acknowledging the scope of where sort of the boundary is to architectural changes, and making sure that sort of the scope was limited to that as opposed to any software changes made by either of the parties. So that was my perspective on why I didn't think that this was sort of the right topic to be in scope for RZERC. Thanks. |
TIM APRIL:	Anyone else?
GEOFF HUSTON:	I believe I've marked it as out of scope for very similar reasons to Kim. Thank you.
TIM APRIL:	Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I am not completely sure, but I think I might have marked it as in scope, taking a broader architecture view on this. So, definitely not every patch or software update would be in scope for RZERC, but maybe some significant changes, say in the roles involved in applying changes. Changing the current model, maybe from these various contexts to other methods that could be, might be in scope. But I agree that the question is … Well, the key word is leaves so much room for interpretation that either choice is arguable. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks Peter. I'm putting my hand up. I just looked at my notes for it and I had also put it as in scope, thinking more along the lines of like the ZoneMD change with RZERC003. Not considering the, like sysadmin day-to-day management of software part. Scoped down to like being involved in managing the software operations, I feel that would be clearly out of scope. Well, if that's just wordsmithing, that needs to happen in the charter. Any other comments on that topic? Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, so like question then because it does it behoove us to discuss narrowing the definition for this particular topic, or just considering this to be in or out of scope based on our new understanding?

TIM APRIL: Kim, is there something. to follow on to that?

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah, it's related. I think that there is a role for RZERC to play for certain types of changes that are more fundamental in nature and significantly alter the architecture. And, you know, I think it's entirely appropriate RZERC review those kinds of changes. And the trick will be coming up with a common definition of where the scope of that architecture is. And the reason I put up my hand was actually to use Peter's example, where he talked about sort of more customer facing features, from the IANA side, and it's not in entirely clear to me whether they should be deemed architectural or not.

Again, we're actually right now actively working on significant upgrades to our platform. There'll be new user interface features for our customers that are opt in, they're not mandatory, but there'll be new functionality that they can use.

I think, at first blush, don't consider them architectural, but I'm certainly happy to have that discussion as to whether it's appropriate. Well, put it a different way. Is it necessary that those get approved by RZERC? Or I'm happy to bring them to RZERC's attention for just consideration, just for awareness. But it's not clear to me where those kinds of changes would lie in the scope of this. So, I'm not sure if that's some useful additional context. But I think ultimately, it's about getting common understanding of where the scope is that I believe is narrower than all software changes.

TIM APRIL:

So just tried to propose a potential narrowing of the scope of things that I feel like would be in scope. I don't know if that helps. I put it in the chat.

GEOFF HUSTON:
Look, if we're talking … I think it's kind of moved away from software into something else. Impact on the generated output of the root zone is not really about the machine you're writing, but the outputs of that machine. And it's sort of a bit like in the ZoneMD discussion, a recommendation not to use the ASCII text, [ZOMD], but to actually use the generic record label format, which has been a decision that has been notionally undertaken by RZERC. And in some ways, that's a fine decision, and someone had to make it, and RZERC was kind of as good as any.

But that, to my mind, doesn't fit within the category of software to manage the root zone. That's kind of the root zone—the ASCII representation of the root zone. And that's not a software question. That's a root zone question. So, I'm kind of tripping over your text that says, "impact on the generated outcome of the root zone," going, "What do you mean? This doesn't seem like software to manage the root zone anymore, it seems like the root zone." Thank you.

TIM APRIL:
Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:
So, I guess on this particular topic, the software to manage root zone, I'm really struggling, I guess, to see the need for any changes to the charter that would, I don't know, change how we felt about this being in scope or out of scope. To me, I think—well, first of all, I think while this topic scoping exercise is interesting and useful, really, in practice, we would be looking at much more specific situations.

A much more specific thing would have to be brought to RZERCs consideration for the committee decide whether it's in scope or out of the scope. And I don't see how making changes to the charter would really affect that decision process regarding this kind of topic. Maybe I'm getting a little bit ahead of the discussion of charter changes, but I don't know.

TIM APRIL: I think that made sense to bring it back, I think, as we're basically done with the topic discussions. Before we move to that, any other discussion about that one? So, if we can move to the next topic, which I believe was the consensus model.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: The one thing that came up as we develop the procedures for the charter review and the work plan was how will decisions be made throughout the charter review. The RZERC charter itself says that decisions and actions of the committee shall be taken by consensus. Such consensus shall be documented and may be determined via Internet-based discussions without the need for a meeting.

The RZERC operational procedures spell out the levels of consensus using the committee being … Apologies. It just recentered the document. There might be a bit of a lag. But the levels of consensus used in the committee are full consensus and a rough consensus. And this was something sort of discussed about in the process stages, when we included that we would determine consensus for the charter review before proceeding with the content of the charter review.

So, I've put together some of the different versions of consensus across the ICANN community. Of course, it's up to the committee, if they want to stick with full and rough consensus, if the committee would prefer to stick to full consensus only, and if there's going to be a way to register minority opinions. And so, I'll open that up for discussion and response. I've put the link to the consensus definitions in the chat. Yes, Duane, I see your hand is up.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. So, given that, the direction we're heading is that RZERC is potentially rewriting its charter, it's hard for me to imagine using anything other than full consensus to do that. I guess I really struggle with the idea that under some kind of rough consensus model, we could rewrite our charter. That seems really problematic to me. Hopefully, I'm not alone.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Responses? Yes, Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: There is a difference for me, I think, in the way I interpret my role. In an area of rough consensus, where I am unable to prevent something moving forward, I feel empowered from SSAC to exercise my best judgment. But in a full consensus mode, and I'm referring to my role on the RSSGWG, I feel that where there are issues, which I think I am not clear about, I have to go back to my nominating organization, going, "What's your view here? I'm going to be your mouthpiece," because I

don't want to stand in the way of a full consensus, unless my nominating organization is on board with what I'm about to do.

And from my mind, that is a practical outcome, a full consensus, that in this context, as your friendly SSAC person, where I find things that I think are not absolutely clear in my head as a priori having the full support of their SSAC, I would seek their support, before coming into any outcome that could possibly veto the emerging full consensus.

It is a much harder position, when I am indeed a representative of an organization, SSAC, and therefore, have more power than I had bargained for in preventing things moving forward. I would find rough consensus easier insofar as I could not prevent something that had the evident common support of the others. And while I might consult SSAC, in any case, I would not feel it incumbent. Whereas in a full consensus mode, I would certainly feel it incumbent on me to go back to my nominating organization on such matters.

It's a minor thing. I can live either way. But it is, to my mind, a line that gets crossed as to the degree of interchange between me and the nominating organization that, in this particular body, I believe I represent. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Are there other comments and responses? Tim?

TIM APRIL: I've been having similar thoughts to what Geoff was just talking about. In my case, I'll have to go back to the IAB and ask for better opinions, which

I probably will have to do anyway. But I had been wondering whether we go with something like the GNSO consensus model here, where it's not—so basically two thirds majority or something like that, where there may be something less than full consensus, but more than just a simple majority. Also noting the fact that we'll probably go through a full public comment period as well, to bring feedback in from any other interested parties throughout the community. The combination of that made me think that two thirds majority might be a reasonable path forward but I don't know.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, Tim, are you saying there would be two levels of consensus—full consensus, which is unanimous support, and then consensus, which is defined by at least a two thirds majority?

TIM APRIL: Yes, I guess, or just only define the term consensus as two thirds majority or more or something like that. If we get into a discussion where we would end up having a stalemate of one person has dissents, and that blocking the entire process from moving forward.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: One thing to consider, and I'll put this out to the membership, is if an individual committee member dissents, how will the full committee handle the appointing organization objecting during the feedback sessions? And Peter, you have your hand up. So right now, Duane has supported full consensus only. And then Tim has put forth an idea of

consensus being defined as a minimum of two thirds majority for a concept. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks. I understand that this two thirds threshold might work in some environments, especially when you have a committee that is comprised of lots of individually-picked members. Given how this committee is put together, I think that could be a problematic choice.

My stance would be to strive for full consensus with with—well, of course, then there are no dissents. But sorry, then it's somewhere between full consensus and consensus. That's it. The two thirds is tough to reach here, because it might be … The dissenting third might have something in common and that would probably be indicative of a bit of a bigger issue.

But I was also going to ask a clarifying question in the direction of Duane, I think, who mentioned that yeah, we shouldn't be supposed to change the charter. And my comment now was only about the report of the findings of the review committee, not about any charter changes, of course. And I agree that we should not be the ones changing the charter ourselves, of course. Interesting question is who could actually pass the changes that we might want to propose or work on those, given that we are not the Bylaws Committee. But that's maybe that's for further discussion. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter, I think I'll just respond to your clarifying question, and then return to the queue. The way the process is set up right now is that the final report out of this review team would include any proposed changes to the charter. And then that would be reviewed and then potentially approved by the ICANN Board, as the board is the one who originally approved the RZERC charter. So, I hope that answers that question. Next, I see Geoff, and then Daniel.

GEOFF HUSTON: I would like to speak in favor of consensus as distinct from full consensus and allowing some level of dissent. And part of the issue is for me, full consensus is tough, insofar as I can certainly see SSAC has published an enormous collection of documents. And something that we might be considering in this context in RZERC might be countered to some SSAC document of the distant past.

I guess that SSAC might say, "Well, that's contrary to what we've said in the past. Geoff, you should not support that," which is fine. But the common interest might well say, "You know, if everyone else wants it, who are we to stand in the way?" And full consensus kind of requires a dilution of dissension, because there is a strong urge to follow full consensus. The veto vote is extremely hard to actually do.

In a consensus mode, you can record this dissension—record, if you will, points of divergence—but not interrupt the common will. And that certainly feels more comfortable, I think, to folk like SSAC, who would, if you will, betwixt and between prior advice that they've gone on the record in stating, but at the same time wanting to see the state of the art

improved for all, and having sometimes to compromise in ways that are constructive.

Full consensus doesn't really admit that. Consensus with a small minority disagreeing, to my mind, is more reflective of reality. And I don't think it dilutes the strength of the outcomes in many ways. It in some ways adds to them by simply being able to state why there is some area of dissension and quantify what's going on for external observers. So I would be in favor of a consensus model in this case. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, so speaking only for myself. The problem of full consensus is that it gives someone or one organization of a position of a veto, which might used to disrupt or which may make it very hard to object anything. So, I'm not sure it's actually the most effective thing. I think I agree with what Geoff just said. So, maybe consensus might be a little bit more appropriate.

But what I would like to warn is that if we're using two third or some numbers, we should not forget that we're a very small number and sometimes it's pretty hard to apply those ratios. So, I would not have any ratio if we are moving to the consensus.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, Geoff, and Daniel, are those old hands? Yes. Kim is next.

KIM DAVIES:	I think one of the more unique aspects of this committee is its composition. And I suspect that if we get to a situation where most of the members support a particular outcome, and there is a dissension, that dissension might be for reasons that are unique to that one particular participant. And so, I think to follow up from Geoff's comment, I think it's crucial that if there was a lack of full consensus, that the reasons of the dissension are articulated, so that they can be considered as part of, you know, the board's consideration or what have you, as to the final outcome.
	You know, for example, I, representing PTI/IANA, or Duane representing VeriSign, we might have unique concerns that we feel, for example, that that particular recommendation conflicts with our contract, or is operationally impossible, or something of that nature, that might not be shared by the rest of the group.
	So, I think, because there's only one representative from each community of interest here, whatever model is decided upon, I think it's important that if there's room for dissension, that that sort of gets explained why there is dissension so that can be considered as part of part of the adoption of any changes. Thanks.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Thank you, Kim. So, it sounds like you would be in favor of a not full consensus model, as long as the reasons for any dissension are clearly articulated.

KIM DAVIES:

I'll follow that by saying that's my personal view. I think, much like the rest of you, I would need to speak to ICANN as well to make sure that's consistent with the opinions of others in the organization.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:

And there's, there's no need for the committee to make a decision today. I will leave it to Tim to make any final, final declarations on how this conversation is going. But perhaps what we can get through today is teasing out the different things and then seeing what comes with that, and giving everyone the next two weeks to go back to their appointing organizations and gather any input.

But it seems like we have three people who have voiced support for some version of consensus with a majority, with some room for dissent. And I've got Geoff, Tim, and Kim having voiced support for that. And then full consensus, only I've heard from Duane and Peter on that. So, anybody else want to speak up, have observations, comments, responses? Yes, Duane. And then Tim. Tim, Tim April.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks. So again, to reiterate, one of the reasons I'm saying that I think full consensus is important is because we're essentially proposing a new charter. And while, sure, you can you can note the dissent in the process, that dissent is not going to be present in the new charter, right? That's, that's going to be lost. Once the new charter is approved, then that sort of information is not there.

And as maybe a silly extreme example, as part of this charter review, we could change the composition of the committee. We could decide, for example, that we no longer want a representative from the ICANN Board. And assuming the ICANN Board member would dissent to that, in a non-full consensus model, he may be overridden. And I just think these potential changes are so significant that full consensus is really important.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: To clarify my point from earlier a little bit more, I would fully hope that we could reach full consensus but I don't know if it's achievable in all cases. I'm worried about the same thing you were saying there, Duane, of making a change that the only dissenting opinion is the organization that has dissented is a concern to me.

And that's part of why I would want to see the logic behind any dissent clearly articulated in the final document, so that it's visible to … I assume anything that we propose would have to go to the board and be approved by them. And I would like them just to be able to see any opinion of any of the members of the current makeup of RZERC in their deliberation. But I'm just trying to think through the process of how we can—if we get into a stalemate situation, how do we get out of that as we go through the process?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard and then Peter.

HOWARD ELAND: So, perhaps I'm wondering if I could suggest splitting this. And by that, I mean for an individual topic or section of the charter, we use the consensus model, where we need the majority or the two thirds majority. But when it comes to the final product, the full charter, we are ready to send that up to folks for ratification.

There, we need full consensus, because by doing that we could, in collaboration with the dissension document, if you will, that could be submitted alongside. There, I think the folks' individual points may be heard on one piece or another. But if they say, "But overall, with this, I'm good," then maybe that helps alleviate some of these issues. Over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, Howard, just to summarize, or make sure that I got what you said, sections of the report could have consensus or sections of the report could have consent. But the final—the full total product, and the full total proposed—any proposed charter changes would need to have full consensus. Is that correct?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, as long as long as that report either included or had alongside of it the dissenting opinions section as well, to Tim's point.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I wanted to maybe amend or clarify the remark that I made in the first round, where I well felt the need to pick between this two thirds or the full consensus, and then would think that full consensus is the one to go because two thirds actually is a voting and I think that's not a desired outcome.

With the other contributions, I think, and I also think I said that we should strive for the full consensus. But coming from the rough consensus part of the world, so to speak, it is more important that the dissent gets voiced and recorded, but the decisions don't get completely blocked.

And again, I also would need to go back to the organization, to the ccNSO, and clarify this. But my gut feeling is that we would be able to support a consensus model that will be stronger than the two thirds voting, but take into account the probably blocking effect of a full consensus. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Peter. I thought there was another hand in the queue. Any other comments or questions? Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'll relate my experience from SSAC here, because I think it is relevant. SSAC does not require full consensus and allows consensus with dissent. And at times, it's been incredibly painful. Most folk would prefer, I think, in these kinds of situations that we find ourselves in here, to actually have something that enjoys the support of all stakeholders and interested parties, absolutely.

And striving for a full consensus isn't impaired here. But allowing one person to exercise the veto strikes me as, at times, destructive to the common endeavor, particularly when the reasons for not being part of that consensus might not be—might be more pro forma on the part of the appointing organization than substantive objections.

And so, this doesn't mean that the majority should ride over the minority. And it doesn't mean that the minority are silenced. They should not be. I think dissents are important and painful. But nevertheless, I think vetoes are much cruder and actually invite a form of group thinking because the desire to let something through almost irrespective of niggling doubts, overwhelms us at times. And I would be happier if those doubts were at least recorded, and for external folks who are looking at these outcomes to be able to assess the full range of thinking behind the consensus outcome. The full consensus would mask that out. "We all agreed. So, what, that's it."

So, while in SSAC, this has proved incredibly painful at times, I think it's been useful for the community to actually air these issues. And I think from SSAC's point of view, coming from that culture, I would feel entirely happy in this conversation saying—I believe SSAC would agree with me in saying—consensus with dissent is certainly a reasonable way of moving forward, and perhaps has some advantages over requiring a full consensus in every case. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right, we've got about five minutes to the top of the hour. Are there any other thoughts, responses, comments related to full consensus versus consensus? Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So maybe it's just a clarification. Currently, the two modes are enabled by the charter. Am I correct?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes, so the current RZERC Charter is these two sentences that are italicized on the screen. "Decisions and actions of the committee shall be taken by consensus. Such consensus shall be documented and may be determined via Internet-based discussions without the need for a meeting." In the operational procedures, the RZERC spells out two levels of consensus—full consensus where no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings, sometimes referred to as unanimous consensus, and rough consensus, a position where only a small minority disagrees but most agree.

In the RZERC charter review process paper, the charter review team section explicitly states, "The review process shall determine the consensus model at the beginning of the charter review, which will be recorded in the draft and final reports. " So, I believe in the discussions the committee wanted to leave open and not commit at the time of writing the process paper. But it is something we need to agree upon and document before we open up the charter to any sort of review discussions and edits.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, so basically, the discussion was here, how we're going to agree on the charter modifications.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Correct. Are there any other comments or questions for today? Duane, just checking. I saw your microphone levels start to move, but I didn't hear anything.

DUANNE WESSELS: That was my dog, sorry.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Does he or she have any input?

DUANE WESSELS: No, he just wants to go for a walk.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That's fair. All right. Tim. So I think right now, there's not yet agreement among the committee on how to proceed. They did hear several people say that they wanted to consult with their appointing organizations. Our next meeting is scheduled for two weeks from today. I would propose that members take back these discussion points to their appointing organizations and try to get input before our next meeting.

TIM APRIL: Yeah, I agree with that. And then hope we can try and check in next week or early the week after and see how that's going. And possibly, we may want to delay the next call after that, depending on how quickly people are getting responses from that.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, yeah, so I'll make sure that we confirm from everybody that we have some form of input before we have another call. So that's the action item for the committee now. Geoff Huston, yes. You can confirm the Zoom URL for the next meeting. I can work with you on offline on that.

GEOFF HUSTON: I have no idea why I didn't get this one, Gmail, blah, whatever. But yes, found myself without one. That was all. So, if you could email it out again, please. I would appreciate it. Thank you very much.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. I'll be sure before the next one to make sure it's on the calendar and in email format for everyone.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Tim, do you have any other final remarks? I think that's it from me for today.

TIM APRIL: I think that's it. Thank you everyone. I'll talk to you in a couple of weeks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you all. I'll send out an action item email sometime today or tomorrow depending on internet connectivity. So, everyone has clear understanding of what to expect before the next meeting.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]