

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, everyone, and welcome to the RZERC Teleconference, held on Tuesday, the 19th of October, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to start the roll call?

TIM APRIL: Yes, please.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Carlos Martinez from 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, PTI.

KIM DAVIES: Yes. I'm here.

---

*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: Tim April, IETF.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard Eland from the RySG has noted his regrets. Daniel Migault, RSSAC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. I'm here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane Wessels, Root Zone Maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Duane is here. Hello.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And Geoff Huston from the SSAC.

GEOFF HUSTON: Good day.

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All righty. Thank you very much, Tim. Back over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. The first thing for the agenda was the review of the minutes from last month. Any questions or comments about that one? Seeing no hands, we can move. Take that as approved and move on to the next item. I was going to propose we swap five and six, just for timing, because we would need to make sure we get six done before next week.

We have the public meeting as part of the ICANN meeting coming up. It's what? Nine days from now, next Thursday. We had the slide deck from the last public meeting last year. The workload has changed. I'm trying to find my notes—what I had written down for it.

My proposed changes to the slides were to change the chair name to me because I'll probably be the one speaking. And then add a slide saying we're going through the scoping exercise and the charter review process now, and then to indicate that the two documents, RZERC 002 and 003 have been published. And hopefully, the time we get to the public meeting, the recommendations will be finished through the Board Advice Register. I don't know if we have the link for the old slides to share.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Looking for that now. One moment.

---

TIM APRIL: I think I just found it. I'll throw that into the chat. I don't know if everyone can get to that or not. Is there anything else missing that we should be discussing at the public? Any things that we should remove?

DUANE WESSELS: Did you mention the charter review as something to put on the slides?

TIM APRIL: Yeah. One of the items I had was, "Add a slide covering the scoping exercise and charter review process that we're going through now." And then here. I'll copy and paste it what had written into the chat. And then, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: You've actually just put on the chat window what I was going to say, that slides five and six are a little bit overtaken by events and they need to be update to reflect what's happened since then. And yes, changing the chair name would help.

TIM APRIL: I was trying to run through in my head whether we should just basically replace what's on the page—on slide five and six—with just the basically short versions and the recommendations that came out of the document.

GEOFF HUSTON: As evidence of work completed, why not, Tim? Why not?

TIM APRIL: I think we have an hour and we only have eight slides.

GEOFF HUSTON: It's okay.

DUANE WESSELS: In the past, I don't think the meeting has ever gone the full hour.

TIM APRIL: I would hope not. Any other comments for the slides? I guess Danielle and I can work through the slides and try and get an updated draft out, hopefully before the meeting next week.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I can get the updates to you by end-of-day tomorrow, Tim, so that we can get something to the RZERC by the end of the week.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Perfect. Any other comments on those slides? Okay. We can switch back over, I think. The last thing on the agenda than any other business was the topic scoping exercise. Thank you to everyone who ... I guess everyone had finished the exercise. I was just looking over the results of it a little while ago. I'm trying to find my notes on that one.

---

All right. So I've broken it down into five different categories. Danielle converted it into the spreadsheet much faster than I did. So I tried to apply a first pass of throw something and see if it sticks.

Based on the scores of what people reviewed as in scope and out of scope for what they think the charter should be, I tried to apply a status in column L of which items, based on the scoring of ... If everyone said it should be in scope or most—either everyone said it was in scope or not sure, I marked it as “in scope.” If a majority of people had said it was in scope with only one or two saying out of scope, I put “likely in scope.” And then filtering down, if it was a split, we have to have a discussion about it. Then the list of things that were clearly out of scope, where basically everyone said “no” or “don't know.” And then the likely out of scope, where it's a little bit more gray area.

As I was trying to make this list, I tried to lean more towards leaving things in scope, where the RZERC would have a discussion about whether we felt that the topic was in scope, if someone brought it to us. And then, if there was any discussion about things, whether we should have a discussion on the call now, or on the list, or something like that about how we feel about the items that were marked as discussion here.

And then once we finish with that, it would be jumping into trying to propose a change to the charter text that would make this more clear. And then having everyone read through the proposed text, offer edits, and then potentially proposing a revision to what the actual charter is now.

---

So I think the final thought I had with it was basically anything that's now marked as "discussion," "likely in scope," or "in scope," I figured that would be, basically, the things that we say are in scope, and then we would review internally if we get a topic in that area, and then everything likely out-of-scope. Out of scope would just be written to be out of the scope of the current charter. I'll turn it over to anyone that has comments or other proposals of what we should do. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm going to make an obligatory comment about this RSS GWG work because I have the feeling that if it were ever to resume—and it has currently been in hiatus for many months—it may have some material impact on what this particular group sees as being scope and in scope, depending on the other pieces of the puzzle here.

But I feel it's more of a comment about putting it in for form's sake, as a comment, rather than substantive because the RSS GWG has managed to find itself in some kind of suspended animation. And while it might resume at some point in the future, I just can't tell. So while it's there as we might have to come back to this sooner than we thought, it's hard to say when or why.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Geoff. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Tim. There's a lot, of course, to consider here. There's questions and discussions about topics that we don't all agree on. I think that's

---

obviously something that needs to happen. And then the part about possibly changing the charter, to me, that's going to be a really interesting discussion.

I guess there's this assumption, or I feel like there's this assumption built into the topic survey that if people want the charter to be different, it's because they want more topics to be in the scope of RZERC. So I feel like, first, we need to have the discussion about these individual topic items and see where that discussion goes before we even start to think about how the charter could be different.

TIM APRIL:

Okay. Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Thanks, Tim. I agree with Duane said. In addition, I voted, so to speak, for in scope a couple of times where it would have been a discuss in IETF terms, maybe, probably just to make sure that things don't fall between the cracks. So I think the second, or was it the third part of the survey that asked for who else might be interested. That could be read as some random other entity or who would be the appropriate home if RZERC isn't.

So as a byproduct of this exercise, we might have this list of things that we aren't completely having on RZERC's plate but don't really know where they belong or can feed that into a discussion with the other entities or put it to someone to have these discussions with and



---

between these entities. I think that might help set the scene and partition the space a bit. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

All of this brings up something that I hadn't even considered it until while Duane was talking a second ago. As I was joining RZERC, about a year ago now, or a little bit over a year ago, I was unsure of the topics that would be covered. But when coming on board, Duane showed me some parts of the topic scoping from the last time. That made it much more clear to me.

But now I'm starting to wonder whether we have a discussion about whether we just keep the current charter and use this—keep this document as an internal RZERC document that we can refer to if a topic comes up and use that to help make the decisions and short circuit some of the conversations that we might need to have when new topics come in.

I guess that would lead to the question of does anyone feel strongly, based off of what you're seeing on this page or your understanding of the charter as it is, that we need a revision or if we should just keep what we have, put this document into a place that we can find it, and move on with the work that we have? Is that an old hand, Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Indeed, it was. But if I am the only one ... There are more people. I'll go back in the queue.

TIM APRIL:                               Okay. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:                               I'm a little bit confused about, I suppose, the model of RZERC inside this discussion. If one takes the model as being passive, insofar as matters are referred to RZERC and RZERC ponders the issue, in the period of which I've been a member, I'm not sure I have seen that happen to any great extent. What I have seen is more of an active model where RZERC, perhaps in response to some prompting from the folk behind some of these representatives in this group. It seems from the outside as if it's self-initiated.

Now, if RZERC picks topics and works on them, that's a different kind of model than if RZERC is a sounding board for topics the community is considering. I suppose that alters the way in which this list is promulgated.

I have no problem in making this list, if you will, a public document rather than a private one, if only to inform others with interest in the root and the functions behind the root to understand, I suppose, our perceptions of role and if there is some more discussion to be had on the basis of that, then I think that's enlightening and useful. So I'm less inclined to keep it as a private document.

And I think there is useful thing to understand. In terms of the charter at the moment, is this conformant? In other words, does our self-perception of that's in-scope conform with what the current charter

---

says? Because if our self-perception says we differ, then perhaps it's worth clarifying. This reflects both in and out of scope. So I suspect it's worth that little extra piece of sanity checking is the first point. We should do that check.

And secondly, I think this list of our current perceptions of scope with respect to potential work items be a public document. I see no problem with that. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: So I think, Tim, you posed two questions. One was do we keep this document private that we can refer to. I guess the other alternative is what Geoff is saying. Do we make it public? I don't have a super strong feeling about that. My inclination would be private but I could probably be convinced to make it public if that's what the group wants to do.

Your second question was along the lines of do people think we need to consider changing the charter. There's one aspect of the charter that I struggle with a lot and maybe others do, too. That is that it uses the word "content" in that opening sentence. So I don't know, necessarily. I like it that the charter is narrow. I'm not necessarily advocating for expanding the charter but I do think it would be good to maybe clarify some of the wording there. Thanks.

---

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Oh. I'm sorry. I think it's a bit early to determine whether or not we need a new charter or a revised charter. I think there is still, I'm pretty sure, in the community but also in parts of the committee, or I'm at least partly confused. There is a bit of confusion as to what RZERC is about. The charter is the right place to solve that confusion. But it could actually help to make it clearer in the charter itself, rather than in any mission statement or something like that, what RZERC is about.

My understanding is, reading from that charter and the draft versions that were circulated earlier, it is this function—the little NTIA that we had already talked about—and making sure that everybody who should be involved has been involved. That may or may not be the ICANN constituencies. That could be some entity beyond that. In the questions that we discussed in the survey, there were lots of things that would affect resolver operators. And there is no natural focal point for them in the ICANN structures—so things like that.

Obviously, RZERC should not compete with existing committees about being in charge of particular topics. So maybe the more detailed it gets, the less likely it is that RZERC is in. But that's something that we should discuss along the lines of the items in the survey and in this spreadsheet. I am now less inclined to keep it private but I think it would need explanatory text when we would make it public. Maybe we need to add some explicit questions to the community with that.

---

We might also just start sharing it with some committees. But then not all our constituencies—all the groups that we represent as members—have these semi-closed channels. So we should keep that in mind. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Is that an old hand, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm sorry. Yes, it is.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Thanks. I don't have a view of whether the charter needs amending or not. But I think the product of this spreadsheet would be useful as a public document. I don't think this spreadsheet itself is necessarily useful. But as I think I said on our last call, I find myself in a bit of a bind because we do have activities planned on our roadmap, in the next couple of years at least, that will touch on some of these areas. But it's not entirely clear to me how to interpret these in a specific way, as to whether they warrant being brought to RZERC or not.

So anything we can do to elaborate or understanding and get a better sense of where the RZERC members feel that these things are in scope or out of scope, I think that would be very beneficial. So omitting the

---

ones where there's a clear strong view towards being in scope or out of scope. But for the 50% in the middle, I think it would be nice to find a way to talk these out.

Just to pick on one line item, for example, significant KSK DPS change. We do DPS changes annually. Are they significant? I don't know. I don't know how to even test significance. If that's not definable, what's the presumption? Is the presumption that it will be always brought to RZERC for RZERC to make a determination if it's significant? Is there some other kind of guideline we can follow? What does "significant" mean? Does "significant" mean, for example, that there is a material impact on resolvers. I don't know. But I think these things can be talked out and we can perhaps get greater alignment as to what would really warrant crossing RZERC's plate versus not.

I'll just finish by saying when I filled out the survey, I found myself writing "not sure" for a lot of these because for a lot of them, I felt like, "It depends." I could think of scenarios that would fall under this category, where I think it would be wasting RZERC's time to bring it to RZERC's attention. And there's others where ... You could certainly consider a scenario where it absolutely deserves review by RZERC.

I know this is a very complicated problem but I would like to get out of the bs of it being in the judgment, I would say, predominately as myself and Verisign as well, that as the operators and implementers here, we're making a judgment about whether it needs to come RZERC or not. So the more that we can clarify the expectations, I think we'll be in a better place as we embark on some of these things. Thanks.

---

TIM APRIL: Any other ...? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I agree with Kim here. I'm actually looking at the charter again in the light of these 46 items, or 45, and thinking to myself the term "review proposed architectural changes to the content of the DNS root zone" is such a vague mechanism. There are a number of more clauses about the systems including and the software components, etc.

But I think without some form of either changing this charter or the current interpretation of that charter, as shown by this scoping exercise, it's not very helpful as a standalone document. And I think it is really up to us to understand how to interpret that. So either we change the charter with the explicit words, based on our understanding from a scoping exercise, or in fact just simply share an interpretation of the charter applied to a list of items, which is currently where we're talking.

And to my mind, I think that's helpful both to us and to others, and to folk like Kim, and to folk like Verisign and so on, who have a direct operational interest in this, to understand where and why RZERC may have an interest in helping that effort. So I think it's useful to instantiate and publicize this list as an interpretation of the charter and then actually look at the charter again, going, "How does this become architectural?"

A classic is the DPS of the KSK. Is it architectural? Not necessarily. It's a practice statement. Does it have impact on the root? Yes, it does. So is it

---

in scope or out of scope? And those are the kinds of things that I think are useful, at least for this incarnation of RZERC—to make a call and go, “This is our call on this date.” Future incarnations might well differ as this committee evolves and that’s fine.

But yes, I think it’s worth making public. It’s worth reviewing the charter in the light of our current interpretation to see if we can alter some of these words to make them less rubbery and then figure out what’s important. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

I’m trying to coalesce everything. It sounds vaguely like the proposal would be to move forward by creating some sort of a document. I don’t know whether we go into each of these items or a selection of them and provide examples of where we think it might be something different to RZERC and examples of places where we believe the operators—so IANA, PTI, and Verisign—can proceed on their own without having to bring it to us.

I’m on board with making this, or some version of this sort of document public to make it easier for anyone to view what we think is in scope. And then I think, in the process of that, we’d probably find places where potential revisions to the charter would help with the clarity.

I’m just trying to catch up on the chat. Carlos says, “I like the idea of making it public and get feedback.” I hadn’t though of the feedback process as well. Are you suggesting a public comment there, Carlos?



---

CARLOS MARTINEZ: I'm not sure about that. Some feedback would be nice, I think, because I like the scoping exercise but it's still just our opinion. And I think if we are going to revise the charter, some comments from a broader audience would be nice.

TIM APRIL: I think Geoff and Kim, and I guess Peter some extent, were talking about making this document public to some extent. Do you think it would make sense to make this a numbered RZERC document or just some other document that we publish, that goes into a little bit of detail on each of these items with examples for and against RZERC involvement, and then share it with the constituencies that we represent? I would send it to IETF and IAB, Geoff sends it to the SSAC and so on, to solicit feedback and then publish from there, similar to how we did the last two document. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm not sure it needs to go through such a degree of formalism. But I think there are a number of interested parties, not the least of which is, of course, because we are in some ways representative of our various constituencies, we share it with those constituencies.

But interestingly as well, there are a number of other interested parties that are not directly represented here. I think it should be shared with the chair of the RSS GWG. It should be shared with the Root Zone Maintainer in their own right. And it doesn't necessarily need a formal document but I think it is, a, for information. And, b, we would appreciate comment if you have any. It's more a situational report. And

---

of course, feedback is welcome and we'll consider it but I think that's as much as we need to do.

So mine would be to remove a lot of this, other than ... Column L is an interesting column. These scores are less relevant. I'm actually even unsure as to whether the line items need more text. For those familiar with the subject, it's pretty self-explanatory. And for those unfamiliar, I'm not sure how much text would make it credible.

I would actually, I suppose, package up the purpose, section two of the charter, as a header, and then say, "These are what we think are current topics in the root zone and our interpretation of the scope of RZERC in relation to the charter. This is, a, for your information. And, b, if you have comments, then get in touch with your representatives or with the chair of RZERC. And please let us know if you think there are serious omissions, or there are things, or more information that would help RZERC better understand the concept of scope," and leave it at that, as a communication, without necessarily going to a published document with a document number.

The reason why is I don't think this is a document that is going to stand the test of time. It's a document for now and it guides our work over the next few years. But I would certainly hope that it gets overtaken by subsequent events. And that's fine. So that would be my concept of getting feedback, to actually use the channels of our representative communities, and they can do what they want with it, and also a selected number of other parties who have direct interest in the root and its operation. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: I see Carlos agreeing with we don't need the formalizing and agreeing with the comments and point of view. That seems like reasonable approach to me. Anyone else have another approach to take? Would that be helpful to Kim and Duane in your discussions and decisions? Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think it's helpful. I'm trying to think of how to structure it. I don't necessarily agree that every topic is self-explanatory because, again, I think for many of them, yes, the overall topic is self-explanatory, sure. But to pick on another item, PTI technical checks. For me, what would be useful, noting that it's basically a split as to whether it's in scope or out of scope. What makes it RZERC-worthy? What is of particular interest about the technical checks that would put it above the threshold of being worth bringing to RZREC?

Maybe one way of structuring such a document that results from this discussion is instead of things that are clearly operators' prerogative, if you will—essentially the day-to-day business of running the root zone and doesn't ... It's accepted that that is just started business, doesn't require RZERC review. On the other side is stuff that clearly belongs in RZERC and there's no debate about that whatsoever.

But then some interpretational guidance about what's in the middle. What is it specifically about some of these edge cases that has an architectural impact that is of concern? And is there a way to articulate

---

that architectural concern in a way that we can make a judgement against it?

I know that there will be cases where it's just very ambiguous. I think the default will always be to bring it to RZERC when in doubt. But if they can be a little more precision around some of the topics, I think maybe that would be beneficial output from this. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thanks, Kim. I'm not trying to duck work but I think if we add commentary, we actually add judgment and add opinion. And this issue of PTI technical checks, on the outset, it doesn't look to be architectural. But there is an interpretation that one could add, if one took a particular bid, about are the checks entry checks or ongoing checks? What happens when a delegation goes lame? Whose responsibility is it to, a, detect it and, b, notify?

And that then gets into an architectural decision about the roles of operators ongoing as distinct from entry. I put data in but good data gets bit rot. Who's responsible. And that gets into the architecture of what is the root zone? A historical record of entry conditions or a current snapshot of things that work? Is that an architectural consideration? That's where it gets gray.

So in some ways, adding a commentary starts to make decisions and actually make calls that, in circulating this around, maybe we should be

---

a little bit more open about saying, “If you don’t think this is in scope, please, a, say so. And, b, if you’d like to add some reasons as to why, that would help us.” Because, “What are we talking about?” is part of this. That’s why I’d be, I suppose, more interested in brevity in what we’re saying in these topics and actually leaving it to others to interpret them so that we understand the interpretation and the reasons why the interpretation would lead to a scope comment if one exists.

So while I’m not trying to duck work—or maybe I am—there is some benefit, I think, in keeping this brief and open to interpretation because it’s those interpretations that I think give us the meat and the substance of our discussion and consideration, which then would allow us to clarify it for everyone. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

I’ll propose a potentially middle ground there. If we were to take this sheet, or the items in this sheet, and possibly the expanded text that went along with each of them that we had in the survey itself that provided a little bit more framing, and if there are areas the either Kim, or Duane, or anyone else that has boundary questions about what would probably be in scope or out of scope, or an idea of how to express that, if you were to add text in the areas that you think that more clarity would be helpful and that we review it in the document itself.

Just provide examples of what we think are normal operational business practices that don’t require coming to the full committee, what things are on the border, and then what things are clearly in scope for the

---

committee. Not to throw a pile of work at you, Kim, but I think that would be ... Having a starting point of what you would propose, and then we can discuss or review, and then have that as part of the document that we would share would be, I think, the quickest way to nail something down. We can get feedback from anyone that is interested in providing it about things that could be in or out. Yeah, Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

I'm happy to work on that. I just want to say I think Geoff raised a very good example of some of the discussion that I would love to see in RZERC—rather than talking about talking about process questions but actually digging deep into some of these matters. I think you raised some very good questions about how we conduct technical checks, and their place, and being proactive versus reactive, and all those kinds of things. I think this is precisely the kind of meaningful discussions we do want to elevate to RZERC. So yeah. In short, I'd be happy to participate.

TIM APRIL:

Okay. And then I'd say we can probably try and take a stab at producing the first version of that document between now and the next call. I believe it would fairly short—well, fairly light on text, just with a bunch of spacing for each of the different subject areas.

I wonder about just breaking them down into subheadings of in scope—like is in column L right now—and then expanding it with a little bit more text and then the examples that we were talking about with Kim. And then sharing that, hopefully before the next meeting, so that we

---

can discuss any comments or questions that come up on that next call.  
Does that work for anyone? Any objections? Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that all sounds reasonable. I'm probably getting a little bit ahead of things here. But I do think, in this public document, we're going to want some text that talks about the theoretical aspects of this as an exercise and that specific proposals brought to RZERC in the future might result in people feeling differently about in scope/out of scope. Just so that we aren't necessarily going to be held to these decisions by other parties in the future.

TIM APRIL: Some level of hedging before we get the questions later on.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

TIM APRIL: Seems reasonable to me. It just reminds me of the safe harbor statement for US publicly-traded companies. Okay. Any other questions or comments about the scoping exercise? We can try and produce that direct document.

DUANE WESSELS: I guess I've got one. Sorry for jumping in here. I'm just wondering if before we go to the step of producing this document. Would it be useful

---

for RZERC to discuss some of these topics in particular, especially the ones that are marked “discussion,” on the chance the discussion might change people’s minds about how they feel about that survey?

TIM APRIL: That sounds reasonable to me.

GEOFF HUSTON: I thought that was entire intent of saying “discussion,” Duane. So yes. I agree.

DUANE WESSELS: I agree but it sounded like by the next meeting, we were going to have our draft public document. It seemed like maybe that was a little bit premature. I don’t know.

TIM APRIL: I probably should have been more clear about that. My expectation was that we would probably have a discussion through either the document or on the next call. I’m happy to start that now if people would like to.

GEOFF HUSTON: I’m a bit uncertain, Tim. Do you want us to pick some of these items that are particularly in the discussion set—those 10—and talk through them a bit more?



---

TIM APRIL: Sure. I was off trying to find my notes of what I actually voted for all of them. I guess we could start at the top and work our way down. Anyone else has a proposal on how to handle this? Is there anyone with a strong opinion of it should definitely be in scope or out of scope. I guess we should start with another one, as in TLDs, and work our way down. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. I think the 1,000 makes more sense in connection with the 100,000 that were the other example. So apparently, there is a threshold that we collectively think is not problematic but there's some not-determined threshold that might imply architectural changes to the distribution system. I'd be interested to learn why people think the 1,000 is already—take 1,000 as a metaphor, of course—doubling the current size, roughly, is already a problem or is something that RZERC should be concerned with. And I think I wrote in “not sure” because I'm not sure.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. I'm pretty sure I voted out of scope on this because just from an operational perspective, I don't think an additional 1,000, on top of the 1,500 we have now, will materially change our operations in any meaningful way. And certainly, it doesn't trigger rethinking the

---

architecture of the root zone, or how it's produced, or how it's published.

To me, that gets to the definitional thing, which is rather than just two arbitrary numbers, I think what we probably want to focus this topic on is the sufficient amount of new TLDs that will require significant changes to the way the root zone is produced, whatever that threshold may be. It's not entirely clear if that's a specific number. But less than one order of magnitude is probably not going to trigger those kinds of changes. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Peter and Kim already said what I was going to say, that to me, there is a threshold. It's somewhere between 1,000 and 100,000. For 1,000, I put "maybe" but for 100,000, I would say yes. So I don't know. It's going to depend on the specific situation that comes before us. But I don't think 100,000 itself is enough to really trigger RZERC.

TIM APRIL: You said 100,000 is not enough or 1,000.

DUANE WESSELS: 1,000 is not. To me, that's below the threshold.

---

TIM APRIL: Okay. I was just looking. I could send around the form URL. If any of these discussions tend to sway people, you can go in and change your ... It looks like you can change your survey responses or edit your survey response. The next one was the AXFR service by RSOs. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Time is of the essence so I'll jump in. Actually, this this is a substantive architectural discussion because we have currently promulgated the root in pieces as our primary service. In other words, it's a query-based on-demand service. We have never really moved to broad-spread pre-provisioning outside of the RSOs themselves. In other words, we haven't, if you will, made the zone in the determined and structured way available to anyone who asks. So RFC—God, is it 7706—whatever that thing is, in some ways, languishes a little bit because we concentrate on on-demand query answering.

And there is an architectural question about how to provision this information, in the light of our understanding of today's networks' capacity abundance, oddly enough, that makes the whole idea of query-based responses, from a small number of servers in the scheme of things, to be architecturally overtaken by events. And this shift is prompted by that comment, AXFR service by RSOs. But the broader issue is if we move from just-in-time to well-in-time, pre-provisioning, just in case, how do we think about the root servers then. I think it parallels the whole root zone signing work from last year.

So that's why I think that element that's in discussion is an architectural thing if you take it more than just AXFR. But this whole issue of just-in-

---

case pre-provisioning of root zone contents, beyond the RSO structure, has been an interesting and valuable architectural issue because once we go to that, while we signal the changes in the zone to the root service operators, if I am a slave doing an AXFR, apart from banging, how do I know when? How do I change on-demand pull into pull what's required in a scalable way?

So I'm taking too long to say I think there's some substance in AXFR. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I took a pretty strict interpretation of the charter for this, focusing again on the word "content." I think since this is not a content change, it's out of scope for the current charter. I would say "maybe" for a revised charter.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Tim. I voted for in scope, even with the current charter, because I think the topic of distribution is covered there. And while the individual decision of an RSO to open AXFR is not in scope for RZERC, for the reasons that Geoff elaborated on and maybe a couple of others, the

---

shift in distribution of the root zone is something that needs discussion, and should be discussed, and if not elsewhere, then of course in RZERC.

So it's not micromanagement here. It's about the underlying intent of and the expectation of the community of the resolver operators or anybody else to what the root server operator should provide here and maybe even change their job description a bit.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Pete. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Thank you. I think it's no in the current charter. And I'm with Duane. I strictly read the charter and this is not about content. In a future charter, maybe, and for the reasons that Geoff and Peter stated. But then, not the current wording because it should be AXFR service by RSOs. I think RSOs, they run DNS and whatever comes with it. Some of them have AXFR enabled.

But I think yes. The alternate distribution of a root zone or something like that. So that possibly can be in the scope, depending on if that relates to the content or we want to widen the scope. But with the current text, I think, even in a revised charter, because it shouldn't refer to RSOs or what they do. If we want to decide or have a different means of distributing the root zone, then yes.

---

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Kaveh. And then if we're quick, we could probably finish the discussion on the actual RZM transition, if there are any comments there. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: For me, this is a matter of how we interpret the topic. But I think that RZERC has a role in terms of defining the parameters for a transition. But as to the actual specifics of an actual transition, the day-to-day stuff, I would expect it's not designed for that kind of engagement.

So apologies. I don't have the definition ready with me. But if this is about defining the parameters, then yes. If it's about being actively involved in the specific transition from entity A to entity B, I think ICANN Org and its staff is more appropriately situated to organize and oversee that transition with the different parties. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm riffing more on the word "evolution" here and say that even the parameters of such a transition do not lie within RZERC, as I understand the charter. And while it would be useful, I supposed, for the mechanism to have some oversight and review, I wouldn't necessarily say that's an RZERC responsibility. It may well be with RSSAC or some other body. So I would tend to be out of scope, even in a revised charter. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I might have been tricked by remembering an earlier version of the current charter—one of the draft versions. I think the RZM transition was explicitly mentioned in there. So my contribution might need a bit of a grain of salt. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Okay. So we have about two minutes left so I think we should pause there and pick this up and the next monthly call. If any of the discussions of the first three have changed anyone's minds, if you want to go ahead and modify the results in the survey, you can take a look at it and see if that changes things dramatically before the next call.

And then I guess we'll all talk to each other at the public meeting on the 28th. Thank you all for your time.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**