

---

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Duane. This is Mario. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the RZERC Teleconference Call on 16 of October 2017, 17:00 UTC. On the participant list, we have Duane, Kim, Peter, Jim, and Kaved. And we have apologies from Brad Verd, and on the staff side, we have Steve, Trang, and myself, Mario, doing the call management. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for the records, and we're ready to begin the call.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. So, let's start with item 2 on our agenda, which is to review the action items from our last meeting. Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Duane. Yes. The action items from the previous meeting. No. 1, staff to publish the minutes, transcripts, and audio recording from the 21st of August 2017 Teleconference; and No. 2, Duane to add a question to the list of topics related to Outsourcing. No. 3, Duane to add wording "satisfactory" in relation to the outputs reported in topic No. 20. No. 4, Mario and Duane to make edits to the survey questions adding the option of "not sure" and the field of "comments."

No. 5, staff to send an updated survey for the RZERC member list via the mailing list. No. 6, staff to confirm with RZERC members whether or not they will be attending the in-person to both sessions during ICANN60.

---

*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.*

---

With this, all of these actions items have been sold, and let us know if you have any questions. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Just one little clarification I want to make. I don't know if it's in the minutes or not, but the action item here says to send the survey to the RZERC members via the mailing list. And I did ask Steve and Mario to send that out to members directly, rather than on the list just because I sense there's a little bit of sensitivity of this topic at this time, and we haven't really decided how we want to sort of present this to the public.

So they did send that out directly, although I do believe later that Mario did also put the URL on the RZERC list. But you have the link to the results in your emails, directly, and that has been kept off the list at this point.

MARIO ALEMAN:

Thank you, Duane. I'll make that edit on the action items for the minutes.

DUANE WESSELS:

All right. Thank you. And then, our next task is to approve the minutes from that meeting, and already in the chat, Peter has noticed one little typo, which will be easy to correct. Are there any other comments about the minutes, and if not, perhaps someone would make a motion to approve, pending the edits that we've discussed.

---

PETER KOCH: This is Peter. I move.

KAVED RANJBAR: This is Kaved. I second.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Kaved. So, we'll take those as approved. Mario will make the two edits that we've discussed, and then those will be published shortly.

KAVED RANJBAR: Duane, question?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, please.

KAVED RANJBAR: I don't remember the procedures, and I don't think it's that important for minutes, but do we have the quorum?

DUANE WESSELS: That's a good question. We have -- well, I don't -- yeah, I don't think we generally -- I mean, our procedures don't say anything about quorum, right, so --

---

KAVED RANJBAR: Okay. Sorry, I think we kept that from the RZERC. If we don't have it in the procedures, then we are good to go. Just in case -- thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Kaved. So let's move on to the meat of today's topic, which is the discussion of the server results. Has everyone had a chance to check your emails and load up the survey results' URL? Is there anybody that needs that still? Okay, so I'm going to assume that you'll sort of be following along as we go through the survey results. There's obviously 41 questions -- a lot to discuss. I don't know if we'll have time to go through all of these.

We had responses from six RZERC members, and you can see their names there at the top of the results. I have closed the survey to additional results, however, if, you know, by chance someone still wants to go through and enter their results, I would be happy to open it up again, I guess. Kaved, question?

KAVED RANJBAR: Yes, Duane. If you can open it up for like one hour or something because I did -- my stupidity -- I fill in the test one, and yeah, I was planning to fill in this one last week, but I was down with the flu, so if you can open up -- I already know the answer to most of them, so I would quickly fill it in.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I've just done that, so you should be able to do that, fill it in now. Obviously, we're not going to wait for you to do that; we're going to

---

discuss the results that have been recorded so far. So, the first comment I'll make, obviously, is there's a lot of, you know, variation in how people answered. There was only one question, one topic, that universal agreement, and that was the question of location of root servers.

Everyone agreed that that was entirely out-of-scope. For the others, you know, it's a mixture of, mostly in-scope, or mostly out-of scope -- a lot of not-sure responses, which is fine. And then, on the survey results page, you can see where people entered specific comments to their answers. So, I suggest we sort of go through these and see how far we get, and see where the discussion takes us. Is that okay with everyone? Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Thank, Duane. This is Peter. For the preparation of the public meeting, I was wondering whether we go through these one-by-one, or when our primary goal is to identify the clear cuts where we can present to the community things that we mostly agree would be in-scope, pending clarification of some details -- mostly agree, or unanimously agree that it is out-of-scope, which may have us end up with only 10 examples instead of 41 since we are not supposed to like preempt any of the inquiries,

I think the examples is what the community is looking for, but we can also walk through one-by-one. I guess, we have another private meeting before the public meeting anyway.

---

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah. To be honest, I haven't, you know, given that, I guess, a lot of thought or haven't made any decisions on how we would present this to the public.

You know, we could, for example, cover this sort of broadly, and maybe group these survey questions in sort of categories, and say, you know, in this category, we found things mostly-in-scope, out-of-scope. Or we could, sort of go through them one-by-one, and say, "Yeah, this is a topic that we would like to share with the public, our thoughts on." So, I guess I'm open to suggestions at this point. Jim, please.

JIM REID:

Thanks, Duane. My feeling is we should not go into a great deal of detail about this stuff, in Abu Dhabi -- certainly, in terms of the public meeting. I think it's fine to give some illustrations of the sort of things that we are thinking could be in-scope for RZERC, and things that could probably be out-of-scope for RZERC. But getting into the specifics of things and going through an itemized list, I think is perhaps excessive. I think all we need to do is inform the community what we're thinking about, and where our thinking is at that time.

We don't need to get into a great deal of detail about this because, again, that then opens up the potential for people saying they're saying that's out-of scope; we think you're doing the wrong thing. And we could then get into a horrible mess just by having people try to micromanage things, or feel that they have to decide for us what we think we should be doing. And I would prefer not to have those kinds of conversations.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Yeah. Thanks, Jim. So, maybe we should spend this time here going through our results just for ourselves, and then, afterwards, we can talk about, you know, what goes into the public meeting, and of course, we'll talk more about that in our preparation meeting in Abu Dhabi. Okay. So, I'll go through these. The first question was about new RR types and here, there was a leaning towards being in-scope. Obviously, a lot of the comments say, you know, it depends on the particulars of the R type, and you know, the RFC in question, which I think is appropriate.

I think this question is, you know, not answerable without knowing more details about particular RR types, or particular features being supported. So, for me, these answers don't surprise me too much. Second one is about TTLs in the root zone, which as the question mentions, something that RZERC has previously considered. And here, there's a nice even split, you know, three in-scope, two out-of-scope; and two, not-sure. Yes?

KAVED RANJBAR: Sorry. I think if you refresh because I just submitted my answers, so if it's immediate, then if you refresh, mine is also included.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense. I see some of these numbers changing in front of me. The totals are changing now. So now we have seven responses, and the results may reflect that. So again, to No. 2, this

---

sounds like something that would require further discussion from us about TTLs because there's a lot of variation in our answers here. Also, I should say that, as you look through these survey results, you may notice that sometimes the total number -- if you add up the totals for for in-scope, not-sure, and out-of-scope, usually you'll get seven, but sometimes, you'll get six, and that's cause the way this survey was designed with the ability to, you know, the text input, we couldn't enforce that one of the first three was always chosen, so I think some respondents maybe forgot to check the in-scope, not-sure, or out-of-scope, and that's why they don't always add up to the seven. Anyway.

On the question of new TLDs, we're also split here; about half saying in-scope, half saying out-of-scope. So, that seems like another one that we will want to discuss further in the future.

On No. 4, which is about key sites for the KSK, I would say it's pretty strongly leaning to out-of-scope, there was one vote for in-scope; and one not-sure, with comments. And for the same question relating to the ZSK, it's also pretty strongly out-of-scope.

Question no. 6 about DNSSEC algorithm is very strongly in-scope, with only one respondent saying out-of-scope. And that sort of matches my expectation, I guess. A comment here is, "Depends if this is a major architectural change or not" -- reasonable comment.

Question 7 was about change in other DNSSEC parameters, such as signature validity and use of nTech, and here, the most popular choice was not-sure, with also a couple saying in-scope and a couple saying



---

out-of-scope. This is also something that RZERC has previously touched on RZERC 003.

No. 8 is about changes to DS types, DS algorithms and digest types with four respondents saying out-of-scope, two saying in-scope, and one unsure. My personal comment on this would be that for things that are sort of you know standardized to the IETF and approved algorithms, and not deprecated and things like that, it's probably out-of-scope. And I would note that this is something that -- this change is happening to the root, sort of as we speak. Verisign and ICANN are working on new algorithm types, and I expect there will be an announcement soon.

No. 9 is about a scheduled KSK rollover with no change in algorithm, and here the respondents are pretty strongly saying out-of-scope, with one unsure, and one in-scope. And interestingly, the next question is, an emergency KSK rollover is even more strongly out-of-scope, I would say, which I certainly agree with because, to be honest, I think an emergency KSK rollover doesn't sort of have time for RZERC to weigh-in on it. It's probably urgent and it needs to happen very quickly.

No. 11 is the geographical location of key management facilities. This is leaning towards mostly-out-of-scope; there was no votes for in-scope on this one. Label generation rules and use of non-ASCII characters, which is an activity that's been going on with ICANN for a few years, I believe, and this is leaning towards out-of-scope.

No. 13 is removal of an existing root-server operator, and again, this is leaning pretty strongly towards out-of-scope, with five votes there. And

---

similarly, No. 14 is about the addition of a new operator; again, mostly out-of-scope.

No. 15 is a change of ownership of a root-server operator, and as with the other two, this is mostly out-of-scope, with you know, one unsure. Next question is, "How many root-server identities (i.e., letters) should there be?" and here, we're seeing pretty strongly in-scope with four, although two saying out-of-scope.

STEVE SHENG: Hi, Duane. This is Steve.

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: It might be good for those who, you know, who says, you know, it's out-of-scope or in-scope -- like the minority to give an opinion, you know, why they think it's in-scope or out-of-scope cause sometimes I think that informs the discussion on some of these points. Just a suggestion.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. That's a good idea. I don't have the names associated with each one handy, so if someone is willing to speak up on any of these, would be perfectly fine with me. Would anyone like to you know speak up, in reference to the last question about how many root-server identities

---

there should be -- we had two saying out-of-scope -- sort of in the minority there? Jim?

JIM REID:

I wasn't wanting to speak on that specific point, but it's actually about the actual questions and the survey responses. [CROSSTALK] I think -- sorry; what I think we should try to do is look at the questions where the committee's split, or we have very divergent views, for example, question 3 is a good case in point, those are split 50/50 between in-scope and out-of-scope.

So, I think what we want to try to look at is all of those questions. They're the ones that should account for a discussion or for a discussion at a future meeting should be the ones which are the most contentious between the committee members to try to see if we can find out why we have this divergence of views.

And then, once we get those ones out of the way, we can then follow-up on Steve's suggestion and look at the other ones where people have said, I think such and such an item is out-of-scope, or there's one minority opinion, which says something is in-scope or out-of-scope, but I think the focus should be on the ones where we're split at equally, or that's a radical or a rapid divergence of views, and some members of the committee have got a completely contrasting opinion from others. I think those are the ones we need to look at first of all, and why we have those particular differences of opinion.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay. Thanks, Jim. I agree. I think that's a good suggestion. I'm still happy to take anyone's, you know, comments as we go through these one-by-one, as well. Peter?

PETER KOCH:                    Yeah. Thank you. So, I probably agree with Jim, although I -- and with your suggestion, Duane, but I'm not sure that we should try to convince each other of one way or another during this or the next meeting.

My goal would still be to identify the clear cuts, which should be easy, even if we end up with only two of them, and then work on this internally, but many of the questions that we've faced so far are -- I think all of them are very good and are covering much of what we might expect, but a concrete proposal on the table will have to submit additional detail, absent which we will only have a certain amount of data to agree on things or not. So we can't really make conclusions if we have just a headline there. We should actually wait for something to happen.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay. Thank you. Jim?

JIM REID:                        I'm in agreement with what Peter said and [inaudible]. I wasn't suggesting that we were about to try and resolve any differences between members of the committee. But I think, my intention would be to have a discussion about these contentious topics, if we can use

---

that term fairly loosely, and try to see why people have taken the opinions they have.

I'm not looking to try to see that we try to persuade somebody that they're wrong, and we're right, but just try to get an understanding of what made people give the decisions that they did when they filled in the survey. Maybe there's been a misunderstanding, or maybe there's been a miscommunication, but try to understand that is fine, and I'm quite happy with the committee having divergent views about things.

I mean that's to be encouraged, and diversity is a good thing, and it would be very, very surprising if we had absolutely unanimity on everything that we ever discuss. There's bound to be some disagreements from time to time, and we just have embrace that, but I think it would be good to get an understanding of why people voted the way they did, if I can use that term fairly loosely.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. I agree. I'm going to keep going through the list here.

JIM REID: We don't need to do that right now.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep. Okay. So, I think we were on No. 17, which is the one question where we still all agree, location of root-server instances is out-of-scope.

---

No. 18 is the prolonged inability of an operator to meet any service-level expectation; here is mostly-out-of-scope, no in-scope votes.

No. 19 is a change to the naming scheme of root servers, as has been discussed within RSSAC; this is, I would say, strongly in-scope.

No. 20, change in DNSSEC status or parameters of the zone that names root servers, and also something that RSSAC has considered a little bit. And here, this looks like a prime candidate for further discussion with lots of variation, almost evenly split among the three choices, even.

No. 21 is a change in frequency of publishing the root zone. This is mostly in-scope according to the survey.

No. 22 is latency in root-zone distribution; are the values being reported in the RZERC 002 metrics, are they satisfactory, and here is pretty strongly out-of-scope, according to the survey.

No. 23 is changes to the set of metrics defined by RZERC 002, and the sentiment is out-of-scope for the most part.

No. 24, however, is the transport protocol supported by root servers, and here, we have an even split between in-scope and out-of-scope, understanding that here the question is, you know a little bit vague, of course, but this looks like another one for further discussion.

No. 25 is AXFR servers provided by root servers, which is done voluntarily today, and the question is what if there's increased demand, or pressure for more operators to provide this, and this is split between not-sure, and out-of-scope. So, leaning towards out-of-scope.

---

No. 26 is configuration of servers with respect with MTU and MSF, and so on. This also is leaning towards out-of-scope.

No. 27 is significant changes to the KSK DNSSEC practice statement, and leaning towards in-scope, and similarly, significant changes to the ZSK DNSSEC practice statement, also leaning towards in-scope, although it's just slightly less, and I think it's good that those two are, you know, matching because really these practice statements are very tightly tied together, and any significant change in one really requires a significant change in the other, I would say.

No. 29 is revisions to PTis authentication mechanisms for TLD managers, and this leaning towards out-of-scope. Next is changes to technical checks performed by PTI, and here is, I'd say, slightly leaning towards out-of-scope, a lot of not-sure here, which is fine because, you know the -- this is a little bit vague.

No. 31 is changes in technical checks performed by the root-zone maintainer, and the results are pretty similar; slightly leaning towards out-of-scope, but quite a bit of variation, so maybe worth future discussion.

No. 32 is upgrades to the software used to manage the root zone, and to root-zone workflow. The most popular choice here was not-sure; this is, I guess, something that could be much better specified, you know, a lot of details not present in this question.

No. 33 is the process that PTI uses when changing the registrant for a TLD, and this is leaning towards strongly out-of-scope, as is the next

---

one, which is an actual change in the registrant or owner of a particular TLD, out-of-scope for RZERC.

No. 35 is applications for special-use TLDs. I think here, a lot of not-sure choices, probably because it depends, you know, the particular usage and the particular TLD being discussed, I would say. Some comments provided here, you know, talk about whether or not it requires any -- or results in any significant architectural changes to the root zone.

No. 36 is a proposal that the root zone could be served from many CPE devices. This is mostly-out-of-scope, according to the survey.

No. 37 is a review of the root-zone maintainer transition plan, and this is mostly in-scope.

No. 38 is an actual transition of a root-zone maintainer functions from one organization to another, and I would say -- survey, this is mostly out-of-scope, but a couple of votes for in-scope, as well.

No. 39 is zones other than root being served by the root servers, and today that includes Arpa and root-servers.net. This is leaning towards out-of-scope.

No. 40 is the design of the distribution system between the root-zone maintainer and the root-zone operators. This is evenly split between in-scope and out-of-scope. And the last question is a change in the root-zone SOA serial format; leaning towards mostly in-scope.

So, we made it to the end. Would anyone like to bring up anything in particular about those survey questions before we move on? Okay. So, I guess, what I propose for, you know, continuing on this discussion,



---

would be to identify, as we've said, identify those topics where there was, you know, even splits, or disagreements; and bring those for further discussion in a future meeting, and yeah, continue this there. We may want to wait, I guess, and encourage a couple of more respondents to the survey, but if not, we'll go with what we have.

All right. So, I think, unless there's comments, I'll close out that topic on the agenda, and we should talk a little bit, though, about what we want to say during Abu Dhabi at our public meeting. I think that we should, obviously, say that you know, this exercise has been done, give some sense of the topics that were discussed, maybe include one or two specific sort of noncontroversial examples, and just say that, you know, RZERC is currently working through some of the ones that did happen to be controversial, and can report on those later. Any other input on preparations for Abu Dhabi? Jim?

JIM REID:

Thanks, Duane. I would just ask that when we do present this stuff in Abu Dhabi, that we try to be a bit more careful with the language. You know, controversial might be an overstatement here. But if we use those kind of words that could be misinterpreted, especially at an ICANN meeting.

So, we may want to try and soften the language a little bit there to say things that there are areas where there's a strong sense of consensus within the committee, and then in other, the committee is divided, and we're working those issues, but we don't necessarily call it controversy - - just say there's a diversity of views or something like that.

---

And if we end up having the ICANN people going away thinking that RZERC is complete and utterly broken, or that the members of the committee don't know what they're doing they're continually arguing and disagreeing with each other; that might well give the wrong impression, and I don't think we want to do that.

DUANE WESSELS: No, that's right. That would be the wrong impression because that's certainly not what's happening here. This is all, you know, this is our first time, and we're sort of learning here and figuring it out, so I agree that the words [CROSSTALK] --

JIM REID: Yeah. I mean, I'm guilty because I'm the one who started using the word controversy in this particular call, but I hope we're not going to start a [inaudible] that just grows and grows and grows.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

JIM REID: [Inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Yep. So, I believe that I heard from Mario that Jim, you are confirmed to be in Abu Dhabi and in attendance; and I will be there. Will anyone else be at the meeting?

---

KIM DAVIES: I will. Kim here.

DUANE WESSELS: Kim will. Okay. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

PETER KOCH: I mean, yes, I'll be there. Sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Mario, is this discussion sufficient for your purposes in knowing who's going to be there, or would you like these folks to send you an email as well?

MARIO ALEMAN: This will be okay. This is Mario for the records. I also received a confirmation from Kaved that he will be attending ICANN60, and so, I guess, I have a good estimation for now, and later, what I would like to share are some of the logistics, but I don't know if we can move to the next point, or we should wait.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yeah. I think we can move, shortly.

STEVE SHENG:                    This is Steve, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yeah.

STEVE SHENG:                    For the public presentation at ICANN60, perhaps the group can also talk a little bit about how the group, you know, is going to consider issues and proposals; some of these are documented in the operations and procedures: how you receive the proposal, how you consider, consult, your deliberation and decision-making, so that the community knows, you know, kind of the process, how you work. So that's another suggestion for like a five-minute discussion on that topic.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yeah. I think in our public meeting, we really have sort of two things to cover. One is, as you said, we can mention that the procedures document is finalized and include some of those details in some slides. And then to discuss this exercise that we're going through with topics. Does anyone else have other sort of you know, topics for the public presentation in ICANN60? Okay. So, Steve, one of us should probably start looking up some slides [CROSSTALK] --

PETER KOCH:                   Sorry. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:               Yeah. Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH:                   Sorry for that last second; so I was wondering would you want to like close the agenda for the public meeting, or will we have an open-mic session anyway, so that we could go back to our communities and, not necessarily, solicit input, but point people to the public meeting, and if they have any questions, to present them there?

DUANE WESSELS:               Yeah. I think that's fine. I'm certainly open to like a Q-and-A session, or whatever you want to call it. Yeah.

PETER KOCH:                   Thanks.

STEVE SHENG:                 Sounds good. And [inaudible] staff can help pull some slides together, and then, you know, the group will probably need to iterate on it.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, for sure. Maybe if you can start a template or something, and then, you know, you and I can work on it together -- you and I and Mario can work on it together, and then, we can present it to the committee during our preparation session in Abu Dhabi.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Jim, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Jim, you are on mute.

DUANE WESSELS: He's been cut off by Adobe Connect, apparently. We can hear you, Jim.

JIM REID: Sorry. Thanks. You may have heard that the Interisle Group has got the contract from ICANN to conduct a review of RSSAC, and I'm a member of the review team. So, some of you are like to be hearing from Interisle, very soon, about interviews and other stuff as part of this review process. And I'm just passing this information on for everybody's benefit so that you know that's what's going on. That's all. Thank you.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yeah. So Jim, that's specific to RSSAC, is that right?

JIM REID:                            The people would like to talk to also members of RZERC.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay. All right. Thank you. Okay. So let's close out item 4 on our agenda and move on to any other business, and Mario, you wanted to tell us about logistics.

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Yes. Thank you, Duane. This is Mario. Just to confirm that the meeting schedule is now being public, and you can visit it, actually, on the website, and our first meeting will be the private meeting that we have on Sunday, at 9:00 local time, in the morning. And our public meeting will be on Wednesday, 14 hours, local time, again. And so, the other question that I had was about the attendance, but it is very clear now, and with these, actually, I have nothing else to add.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Thank you, Mario. Is our public meeting announced on our webpage, yet?

MARIO ALEMAN:                    Yes. It's announced.

---

STEVE SHENG:                         Sorry, this is Steve. You mean, on the RZERC webpage, right?

DUANE WESSELS:                     Yes, on the RZERC webpage.

STEVE SHENG:                         My apologies. I meant to do that, and I haven't done that. Let me do that.

DUANE WESSELS:                     Okay. Okay. So once we have that announcement, then, as Peter said, maybe we would want to share that around with our other committees that we're representing here, right?

MARIO ALEMAN:                       Right. This is Mario. Yes, I'd actually thought it was on the ICANN60 website, but yeah, we will work on that and have it ready as soon as possible.

DUANE WESSELS:                     Okay. Great. Thanks. Any other business to discuss? All right. Then, I think we can adjourn until next time, and I look forward to seeing most of you in Abu Dhabi.

STEVE SHENG:                         Sounds good.



MARIO ALEMAN: Thanks, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Good day, everyone.

[CROSSTALK OF GOOD-BYES]

MARIO ALEMAN: Bye-bye. This meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect any remaining lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]