DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello, all. Thank you for joining. This is the RZERC Monthly Teleconference held on Tuesday the 25th of July 2023 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to do the roll call?
TIM APRIL:	Yes, please.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Representing the IETF, Tim April.
TIM APRIL:	Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Representing the ASO, Carlos Martinez, I note is not on the call yet. ccNSO, Peter Koch.
PETER KOCH:	Yes. Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Thank you. ICANN Board, Wes Hardaker.

WES HARDAKER: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: PTI, Kim Davies, I notice is not on the call yet. Registries Stakeholder Group, Kalina Ostalska.

KALINA OSTALSKA: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. Representing the RSSAC, Daniel Migault, I note is not on the call yet. Representing the SSAC, Geoff Huston, I note is not on the call yet. And Verisign as Root Zone Maintainer, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All righty. Tim, I will turn it over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So we only have one thing on the agenda for this week, and that's finalizing the review. I saw a note from Duane with some minor edits that I believed Danielle made.

And then I had heard from Daniel offline that there were no updates from the RSSAC, and that he was going on vacation. So I don't know if he'll make it to this call or not.

And then there was the one comment from Geoff that came in from the SSAC that I think [Kim] provided a response for.

Are there any other open things for the Charter that we need to address before proceeding with the process?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll just ask a question. Did everyone see Duane's comments on the mailing list and see how I addressed them? Because I want to make sure. There are a few slight tweaks—

DUANE WESSELS: And I agree with my—

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: —I made throughout the document.

DUANE WESSELS: And I agree with my concern, I guess.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Well, Duane. I will note your concern was in the full text of the proposed amended Charter, so I didn't have to change anything that the community agreed on there.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Okay, good.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: This had already said, "Expected to review proposed significant architectural or operational changes." Nothing will have to be changed here.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And so using that as the authoritative source, I made sure the other references to it were consistent with that text.

DUANE WESSELS: Right.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I note Peter has a hand raised.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, Danielle. But I didn't mean to interrupt. Just continue on. Happy to—

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Oh, no. I was just saying I took what Duane's comment was, and I checked this Section 5. I took that as the authoritative thing. And because what Duane was saying is that it ... He was suggesting it should be "or" because it wasn't consistent in several parts of the document. This is something, I think, when this was a separate document, that's what the committee had agreed to. And so I just went through and made sure that the language in 4.3.1 ... So the title would stay the same. This, I think, was a transcription error. So now that reads correctly as "or" not "if the committee agrees, I'll accept this change after this meeting."

And then checking that in the redline version of the Charter, there was another transcription redline error where we had an additional use of the word "changes." So making sure that all three instances in the document are consistent with the proposed amended Charter.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, okay. So then, let me maybe chime in here. I just recently saw the contribution by Duane. I think the observation is spot on, and "or" seems to be the logical solution to that. Other than that, I have a bit lost track, I must admit, of a statement regarding significant versus not and things. So I trust that the text is unchanged in that regard and reflects what we have been discussing. But I remember that this went back and forth a bit in verbal discussion as well as in the text. So no position on that from my side.

TIM APRIL: And that's how I recall. Where there was a couple comments about the use of the term "significant" and the rest of that phrase. What is it? "Significant architectural or operational changes." We went back and forth with both. I think the RSSAC ... And there was a comment in the public session at one of the ICANN meetings where I think we just responded to that when we replied to those public comments rather than making changes to the document of why we believed it was that way, mostly referencing the Stewardship Transition document.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: The committee also decided to add "in this context" that came from the Stewardship Transition document to add more context to the term "significant" since the public comment.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I believe the understanding is that "significant" applies to both terms, as in "significant architectural" or, in that case, "significant operational." And we don't need to spell it out. It's not "significant architectural or any operational." But I guess we agreed "significant" is, how do you say that, the important term. And then it applies to everything else. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Right.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. If this were a math expression, I would put parentheses around "architectural" and "operational."

Beyond that, are there ... Thank you for noticing that, Duane. I missed that when I read it the other night.

DUANE WESSELS: [inaudible].

TIM APRIL: Any other comments or questions? My expectation here is that if no one has anything here, knowing that we don't have everyone on the call, I guess we do have a simple majority. But I had figured we'd put this out to a actual vote or ask for responses on the list or something like that before sending it to the Board.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So when we prepared the draft report for public comment, we put it out on the list. And I believe we looked for affirmed approval. So having every member respond on the mailing list and signal their approval or non-objection to the report. And so I recommend we do the same thing for the final report.

And then, yes, once the committee has approved the contents of the final report, I will package it and submit it to the BTC. And the BTC will review it and then make a recommendation to the ICANN Board for adopting the Charter.

PETER KOCH: That sounds good to me.

TIM APRIL: Yep. I agree.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Those might be—

TIM APRIL: I guess the only other thing was Any Other Business. I don't know of anything that's coming up. We have one meeting in August, but I guess we don't have any topics we can cancel.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So moving forward, if there's no more need to discuss the RZERC Charter Review, I can put out calls for agenda topics two weeks before meeting. And if we don't receive anything, we can cancel the meetings a week in advance. I don't know if any committee members know of any discussion topics or anything that would be potentially coming to the RZERC for review before then or if the RZERC, once the Charter is approved, wants to do an operational procedures review.

But the next scheduled meeting is on August 15th, and I can just put out a call for topics around August 1st and see if we need that meeting then.

DUANE WESSELS: That works for me.

PETER KOCH: Yeah.

TIM APRIL: And the only other work item I knew of was the topic scoping discussion paper we had talked about at one point. But I know I won't have time to deal with that until the end of the summer. Possibly a September meeting.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I don't have anything else for the committee to discuss.

TIM APRIL: Anything else? All right. Hope everybody's enjoying IETF.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you.

JAN JANSSEN: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, everybody. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, all.

KALINA OSTALSKA: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]