
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thanks everybody for joining. This is the RZERC Teleconference held on Tuesday the 16th of February, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. I'm going to kick things off with a roll call. From the ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: PTI, Kim Davies?

KIM DAVIES: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: SSAC, Geoff Huston?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yup.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RSSAC, Daniel Migault?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Present.

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: ASO, Carlos Martinez?

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Tim April?

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RySG, Howard Eland.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't see Howard on the list. Did he drop off?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard just sent his regrets, and my apologies, I thought I saw him on the list.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ccNSO, Peter Koch?

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And Verisign as the RZN, Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, this is Duane. Thanks, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right, and I'll pass it over to you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Thanks, everyone for making it today. This is probably going to be a short meeting since a lot of our work is behind us. We'll talk about the election, we'll just briefly cover the state of the documents that we've been working on and maybe a little bit about a topic scoping exercise, and if anyone has other business, feel free to bring it up at the end.

The first order of business will be to approve the minutes from our January meeting. You have the link there. Thanks, Danielle, for the minutes. Does anyone have comments or concerns about our January minutes? All right, it doesn't seem like it so we'll take those as approved by the committee and they can be published on our website.

Next up is the upcoming chair election. The nominations open today and will go until March 9th. Then we [inaudible] have everyone [inaudible] and if there's more than one, then those can speak to their candidacy and so on, and we'll have the vote following that. I would encourage anyone to of course consider running for the chair and if you have questions about what it's like to be the chair or what the responsibilities are, what the workload is, you can ask me either here or in private. I'd be happy to answer those questions. Something just popped up from the chat. Oh, is my audio breaking up?

PETER KOCH: Sometimes it is, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I was just going through, just reading what's on the screen about the election. Nominations open today, run for a few weeks, we'll have the election in March. My last time chairing a meeting will be at the March meeting and I'd encourage anyone to ask questions about what the chair position is like. I see in the chat Danielle says she will kick off the nomination process with an e-mail to the committee after this meeting. Are there any questions at this point about the election process? Okay, and again, feel free to contact myself or Danielle privately. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Apologies, I didn't find the hand. I'll lower it again. I think I remember that in one of the previous elections, we had a discussion

about people being—while not term-limited—the overlapping terms or something because our individual terms are not aligned with each other so they're not aligned with the chair's term. Did we come to a conclusion what that means for our potential candidates?

DUANE WESSELS:

So we didn't really resolve that. One of the options that was presented was that we could ask all of the appointing bodies to align their appointments in such a way that made a lot of this easier. I don't even think we were proposing to align the appointments with the chair election, but more just to align the appointments with each other with all of them so that they all started at the same time, basically. The other complication which you referred to is that some of the appointments are open-ended, some of them are one year, two years, or more, and none of them really aligned with the chair election schedule. So I think the way we left it if I remember correctly, Peter, was that for community members who this may be a particular problem, I think what we agreed was we can just ask the appointing organizations or give them a heads up, "Hey, your appointee would like to run for the chair position. Is there any reason that that would be a problem? Do you see that being a problem?"

That's my recollection of where we left it, but maybe somebody else has other ideas. Anyone? Danielle has shared some text from the procedures document about the chair term. I mean, one way we can deal with it is if somebody has to leave the committee and they're the chair, then that essentially kicks off a new election.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, Duane. Yeah, thanks for refreshing the memory. I didn't prepare this well, it just came across my mind. So it appears to me that from history and from what you explained, shouldn't be too much of a consideration. We just proceed as we want and then if problems occur, we'll deal with them as we go. That's my summary or would be my takeaway from this and from previous action. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I agree. Tim?

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I was reviewing my notes just a second ago from what Jim Reid had sent me before he departed as the IETF liaison and that correlated with the operational procedures which Danielle pasted to make it sound like it's not too much of a concern, it's just that we may have to have another election before two years from now.

DUANE WESSELS: Right, right. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, I just wanted to add I think it's definitely manageable as you mentioned, and I recall what you said. But I think it might not be bad to start trying to fix it. I know it might take long time because for this, some of the other committees they also have it in bylaws or charter that

[need to change,] so it might not be as easy as it looks. But even if it takes two, three years, thinking about long run, it won't hurt to make sure RZERC is properly aligned within the ICANN ecosystem. I think starting an effort to align these might also help.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, okay. Thank you, Kaveh. All right. Any other discussion about the election or terms? I suppose if it's helpful also one thing that we can ask Danielle to do would be to, if necessary, update the spreadsheet that has everyone's terms and she can share that during the nomination process if anyone would like to have that information. It's probably already up to date, right Danielle?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: It should be. I'm finding the public page now that I think has everybody's term limit.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. All right, so let's move on then to the work items. Oh, and in the chat, Danielle is pasting some links with the membership and there's also a Google Doc spreadsheet. I don't know how public that is but there's a Google Doc spreadsheet that has everyone's appointment information also.

Okay, so RZERC002 was approved and published, that's the document that talks about having signed root name server information and that has been seen by the board and by OCTO and so that is now behind us. Thank you everyone for your work on that. The other document about

adding Root Zone data protections, is RZERC003. I think just today or yesterday maybe Kaveh has forwarded this to the ICANN board and they have a 48-hour courtesy period to have that document and then it will be published on the RZERC website on Thursday the 18th. Also, of course, the RFC that that document referenced has been published so I think that work is complete as well. Geoff, you have your hand up.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, I do. Thanks, Duane. RZERC002 recommended that ICANN Org, I believe, carried out further studies. The issue of signing rootservers.net zone. In your opinion, who has the responsibility of overseeing the fact that the work gets done? The SSAC experience over the years has certainly indicated that sometimes recommendations flowed upwards to the board and then just do nothing. They languish and ultimately die of old age. And I was wondering, is this one of those cases where there is no follow-up from RZERC? Does RZERC maintain a watching brief on ICANN's response to this? Who has the ball at this point once that recommendation via the publication has been made? Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

I think Kaveh may want to answer that. Is that right, Kaveh? Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes, that's why my hand is raised. So, correct, Geoff. Since a few years ago, I think there is the board action with history tracker thing which these publication are registered there, and they get a constant report via the basically all the staff on the status of them. This is normally an

update for the call but, for example, RZERC002 as was your question, was sent to the board and the board actually made resolutions, instructed Göran to execute those, and then OCTO actually also stated that they have taken over the work, they have done part of it, and are going to do the rest. So it is now officially with OCTO and the board internally will track with the organization on the status, and the status is visible to the chairs. So hopefully it won't need the constant checking from the RZERC side because it is an open item on the tracker until there's a change. But, of course, it might be good to also keep an eye on it at least in the long run. If you don't hear in three months or six months, then maybe ask.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks Kaveh. I think that's good information. Okay, and I have to think that for the 003 document it's going to be similar. It will also be added to their tracking site and so that'll be good. Item C under work items is topic scoping exercise.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, Duane, before—sorry. May I quickly?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, please. Please.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I just want to check maybe there is a follow-up item for me and the staff, maybe Danielle, just to make sure that RZERC is properly in the ARR, and also there is clear communication from that system with the support staff and the chair. I think if Danielle, I would follow up with her to make sure that this is done and already in place.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can speak to that now. There were some internal discussions at ICANN org whether or not RZERC advice would go through the ARR officially and that has been determined that, yes, it will go through that process. I'm very well acquainted with that process as I used to be on that team, so I will be shepherding the confirmation of understanding statements, any clarifying questions from ICANN Org, and facilitating the updates to RZERC as it goes through that process.

KEVAH RANJBAR: Yeah, superb. So Danielle, thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. That's great. Thanks. Okay, so the topic scoping exercise is something that the committee did shortly after it was first formed, so three-plus years ago. And so on the screen now, there's the results of that. This was a set of 40 or so topics that could be brought to the committee and we asked everyone to rate them, whether or not they were in scope or out of scope, and so on. And so there was a whole range of different responses. Some of them were felt to be clearly out of

scope and some were felt to be largely in scope. My thought was that maybe it's something we want to repeat this after having done it such a long time ago. Maybe the topics have changed, maybe not. But I think it could be helpful just in setting everyone's expectations about things that RZERC should consider as in scope or not. I guess given that there's an election coming, this would probably fall largely to the new chair, so I think at this point we probably don't want to decide right now but maybe this is something for a new chair to consider if they would like to take this on.

I will also note that when we went through this exercise, we felt that this was a slightly sensitive discussion and although we did reference some of these things in the minutes, the results like you see on the screen here were not made publicly available. So to Daniel's question about could you have the link, I think we can get you that link for the historical results, Daniel, but just note that we did take a couple steps to keep it out of the mailing list and keep some of the details out of the minutes because I always felt that there was some sensitivity around that. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm curious now in relation to RZERC002, which is a change of DNSSEC of root-servers.net which is item 20 in that list, which at the time was neutrally rated, some were in favor, some sorted in, some sorted out. Yet the work was done and other things with, if you will, a higher score—whatever that might mean—were not. In your view, Duane, what was the relationship of this list to the work that transpired over the last couple of years? How did this list guide us because like many—I

haven't been here forever, I've only been here 12 months—but it just seems I can't quite understand how that item was picked up and other items that had a higher score were not picked up so far. What was the relationship of this list to the actual documents that were undertaken?

DUANE WESSELS:

Sure. I see a lot of hands but I'll try to answer quickly. There's really, to me, two aspects to this. One is, when the committee started, it didn't have any work before. No one was bringing in any requests. And so we did discuss the fact that the charter was a little bit vague and there wasn't always agreement within the committee about things that were in scope or out of scope. And so by doing this exercise with some specific items, that helped us find our feet a little bit. The other point is that, of course, none of these other items came to the committee because no one brought them to the committee. In order for the committee to do some of this work someone has to say, "Hey, I think this is something that should happen or should be worked on." The change of—in particular the item 20, the change of DNSSEC to rootservers.net, that was brought by myself to the committee because a couple years ago there was a lot of talk about this and I felt like it was something that maybe should happen. I hope that answers those questions. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

So I just wanted to clarify the reason I was asking the link, it was mostly because I had a frame that prevent me from seeing some of the green items. It was basically just to have a look at those items. Now I would

have a question on maybe—and I would be happy to know what the other people think. Should the use of TLS for the root servers be a part of RZERC or do you think it's not part of it?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, that sounds like a topic that it would go into the next exercise. I'm not sure we want to have that discussion right now about whether it's in scope, but I think that's a great example of something that probably wasn't there before that's a newer development and so that's the kind of thing that I think would be perfect for the next iteration of this if the committee wants to do that. Are you able to see the full document now or not?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, yeah. Sometimes the frame is going down so I can see this.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, that's fine.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter? Okay, thanks, Daniel. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, Duane. It's been quite a while when we did that exercise and if we look at the hot topics, hot as in red, obviously it is also a child of its time. There's lots of work that is strongly in the red has been done by RSSAC. In the meantime, other things have evolved and newer issues like TLS, like Daniel mentioned, also the alternative distribution of the root zone hadn't popped up then. Also we should probably remind ourselves that this was just a temperature of the room, of the then members of the committee to try to understand how we collectively interpret the charter. If I'm not completely mistaken, we have a charter review in front of us, more or less, five years after the setting up of the committee. So that might be another reason to either repeat or refine the exercise that some of us did back then.

It's not cast in stone and obviously, we've taken up work that didn't have a clear green back then. Maybe because the case was made and some of the proposals were—when we did this exercise—clear strawman approaches or strawman proposals to end up in the more red part of the spectrum. But, yeah, maybe the charter review is something we should think about and contextualize that with this previous result and repeat it. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Not so much to that hard [inaudible] is saying would people [inaudible] hand up?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, I think your audio is breaking up a little bit.

DUANE WESSELS: [inaudible]. Also, I wanted to note that since this topic survey has been done, there has been a lot of work on root server system governance that overlaps with this and we have the RSSEC037 document and we now have the RSS GWG making progress. Both myself and Geoff are on that committee and Kaveh as well, I guess. Kim, sorry. The GWG committee is just getting to the point where thinking about the ways that its work might overlap with RZERC's work. Again, I think given these developments, it may be useful to do some of this scoping work again. Hopefully, you could understand that. And any comments? Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, just in clarification of that since I with you am, and others are a member of that GWG. It's, I suppose, useful to point out that any subsequent changes in the chartering of RZERC is beyond the scope of the GWG. There may be some overlap from this kind of open-ended list that was done some years ago that we have before us on the screen. Some overlap between that and the matters being considered by the GWG. But the concept of RZERC reporting into the ICANN board with advice going to the board is effectively outside the scope of, I believe, what the GWG is chartered to look at and will be making recommendations on. And so in that respect, nothing changes for this particular review committee and its mission, per se. My expectation would be it can choose to do pretty much whatever it likes within its charter and if the ICANN board in a post report world with some new organization associated with the root service operation chooses to refer

matters to it, that is actually up to the ICANN Board, not necessarily this committee.

So the bottom line is at this point I think they're not quite ships in the night but there's certainly activities that don't have a strong intersection, the GWG work, and this committee's work per se. This committee is envisaged to continue as is, that the way in which their recommendations might be implemented might be impacted depending on the nature of the recommendation. But I think that's about it, Duane, so it's by no means a big shake-up as far as I can see. It's more concentrated on the RSOs and their operation, etc., than it is on this particular work here. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I wasn't thinking that it's a shake-up and I agree with your descriptions of the various groups and their charters and how they interact or don't interact. I guess I was thinking that some of these topics, in fact probably most of the ones that are already in red and out of scope would fall much more into the purview of the GWG or its new governance model than RZERC. But just to make the point that the existence of a new governance model may change the way that the committee rates some of these topics, I might think. Any last comments about the scoping exercise? All right. Over to the AOB part of the agenda then. Anyone have something they'd like to bring up for the committee at this time? All right, doesn't seem like it. Thanks, everyone, for making it today, and sorry for the poor audio quality on my part. We can adjourn the meeting and look forward to the election and see you next month.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you, Duane.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]