DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello and welcome to the RZERC Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 18th of August, 2020 at 19:00 UTC. Duane, would you like me to do the roll call?
DUANE WESSELS:	Yes, please. Thank you.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	From PTI, we have Kim Davies.
KIM DAVIES:	Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	The SSAC, Geoff Huston.
GEOFF HUSTON:	Searching for the mute button. Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	From the ASO, Carlos Martinez.
CARLOS MARTINEZ:	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: From the IETF, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From the Registries Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland.

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From the ccNSO, Peter Koch.

PETER KOCH: Yes. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Root zone maintainer, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From the RSSAC, Brad Verd.

BRAD VERD: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. And then, I'll note that Kaveh Ranjbar from the ICANN Board is not on the call at this time. Duane, over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you very much. So, on your screen is the agenda. Howard already said he would like one AOB item, which is great. Does anyone else have anything to add to the agenda today?

All right. So, I think the first order of business is to give a warm welcome to Tim April, who's the new appointee from the IETF. As you know from our previous call, Jim termed out. His time on RZERC was up after four years. And so, the IAB reappointed Tim. Tim, would you like to tell us a little bit about yourself for anyone who doesn't know you? I don't know if everyone knows Tim yet or not. But maybe you want to give a brief introduction.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I'm Tim April. I'm an architect in the information security group at Akamai and I spend most of my time dealing with DNS and security-related matters. I'm also a member of the SSAC. And I can't think of anything else that … If you have other questions for me, let me know. I'm happy to talk to everyone.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Great. So, Tim's appointment only came through mid-last week and he's … We sent him all the materials that we've had—we've been working on recently and getting him up-to-date. So, hopefully, Tim, you're up-to-speed on where we are. If not, please don't be afraid to ask questions about something that we may all be taking for granted, given our longer time on the committee here.

All right. So, moving on. The minutes from the July meeting are in the linked Google Doc and on your screen now. Would anyone like to comment on, adjust, or change the minutes before we take them for approval? Okay. Given that, unless anyone has an objection at this time, I think we should take the minutes as approved. And Danielle or Steve will post them to the website after this meeting. All right. Thank you.

So, a couple of work items to go through today—the same things that we've been talking about recently, the root zone protections and signing the root-servers.net zone. So, let's go through the root zone data protections first. This has been reformatted into a document that's probably familiar to anyone who's worked in RSSAC, or SSAC, or in those sorts of things. So, it's got that familiar structure. It's been in the Google Doc, in this form, for a while. And we have some comments and a few things to go through today, to discuss.

Before we go through the items, are there any general concerns about the format or the structure of the document at this point? The idea is that once we're finished with this, this will be published as a numbered RZERC document with recommendations, primarily to the ICANN Board.

So, any general comments about this format? Okay. Not seeing any. So, let's scroll down through the document and go through some of these comments. I believe this is you, Peter, correct, the anonymous here?

PETER KOCH: Yes. Thanks, Duane, and hello, committee. Yeah, indeed. I don't have a Google account so I'm anonymous. But I sent a note to the RZERC list an hour or so ago, lifting my anonymity. Do you want me to expand on this?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I guess so. I think I understand what you're saying about, "Need more text here." I guess I would like you to say a little bit more about … You said "competence versus scope." Or are those just the same thing, essentially?

PETER KOCH: Oh, I meant "competent" as in court, not as in engineer. So, yeah. Given the limited—and then, yes, I could use the word "scope—" of RZERC, I thought it might be useful to add a section, not that the committee decided to but why we think it's important to give advice here. Rather than the other advisory committees who often get asked, say, by the Board or by others, we do this when we find things. And given the special nature of RZERC and the charter, I thought it might be helpful here.

And I need to apologize. I missed the previous round of discussions. So, that gave me a bit of an opportunity to have a fresh read. But of course, I am agnostic to any previous discussion of this.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Peter. So, one of the reasons, of course, that we're discussing this is because … Well, I guess there's two reasons. One is because me, or your RZM representative, brought it to the committee. That's pretty clearly stated. But the other being that the expectation is that deploying this feature will require adding something to the root zone that hasn't been there before. So, I guess that's more what you're looking for?

PETER KOCH: Yes. Absolutely.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And in your opinion, it's fine to put that in the preface section, rather than later on? Or do you care?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I wasn't religious about where to put it. I thought given that the preface said who brought it in—and I'm not even sure that that has to go on record but I'm fine with having it there—it might be quite natural to actually, then, add that RZERC decided to take this up exactly because there's a new record type to be added to the root zone and here we go.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. I was going to call on Howard but you took your hand down, Howard. I guess your concern has been addressed?

HOWARD ELAND: That's correct.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. All right. So, thanks for that, Peter. I will take the action to add some text here and let everyone know when that's ready for review. Okay, Danielle, can we scroll down, then?

Right. So, this is the start of the background. And it opens with this sentence, which I guess … I don't know if it's necessarily controversial but I think, Peter, again, you're asking for more background here. The sentence is that, "Recent years have seen an increase in recognition of the root zone as a critical resource." So, is this more like a citation needed kind of a comment? Or what do you think here.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. It's a very generic opener. So, there's nothing particularly bad on that. But trying to take the perspective of someone who is not familiar with these discussions … Yeah. I stumbled across this and was wondering, "Okay. So, every talk about the root zone or the root server system is over-emphasizing the root servers, and so on and so forth. So, why only 'in recent years?'"

I don't think we can or should do the wordsmithing right now. But giving it an editorial pass with the, say, non-technical reader in mind, or maybe even with the paranoid politician reader in mind, could be helpful, maybe as a final edit or something. So, it's nothing very particular about this sentence. It's just that the opener didn't open the document very well to me. But that might be me. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Peter. Any other comments or thoughts on this opening of the background here? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I must admit, I look at these opening paragraphs and kind of go [vocalizing unenthusiastically]. None of it strikes me as being terribly contentious one way or another. This kind of document is not one that tries to make every sentence hit a target. If we were, it would be much shorter and much, much, much more focused. But it's not. It's just a background preamble.

I wonder, though, in what's being stated here, whether you're hitting the target. The issue with ZONEMD is not the scale of queries or the scale of the root zone. It's really the case that the existing protection mechanism is protection of the parts. And what's being proposed here is protection of the whole. And the reason why is AXFR and the desire to support that.

The first paragraph tries to motivate AXFR and does so rather poorly. But like I said, I'm rather agnostic to the wording here. It just doesn't

bother me. I've already leapt to paragraph three and looking at the justification there. So, I don't care one way or the other.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And Howard, I see your comment that this sentence could be deleted. I considered that as well. I think maybe if we do that, then what remains in that first paragraph could use a little bit of massaging. But that would be fine with me to just delete that first sentence, if that makes it easier. Any other comments about this? Okay. Well, let's scroll down some more, then.

Right. So, this next highlighted section references hyperlocal root and also RFC 8806, which is serving root on loopback or whatever the new title is. And I think Steve had some thoughts on this as well. My struggle with talking about hyperlocal root is I feel like it's something that's been discussed in ICANN for a while—a few years, maybe even longer. But there's not very much written about it, which we could point to as a citation or as a background.

So, Peter, I'm also interested in whether or not you think hyperlocal should be mentioned or should be just not mentioned in this document at all.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Duane. My understanding of the ZONEMD proposal being brought to the attention of RZERC was actually that this is mostly because of hyperlocal. If that isn't the case, then maybe I should reread the motivation. Or we might want to emphasize the motivation.

My concern that I didn't put in the document but I think I shared on the list is that by using hyperlocal and/or 8806 as a motivation, RZERC would almost endorse that approach. And I think that would be a bit premature. Interestingly, the RFC 8806, the update to 7706, says that, "Oh yeah. We didn't publish this because we weren't sure whether this is now considered useful. But yes. The DNS operational community has now decided it is operationally useful." And then, there is no reference or nothing, which is okay for a description from the IETF.

But if RZERC would go and say, "We would recommend to have an additional or an amended root zone distribution mechanism," that might raise concerns. So, my main point here was don't endorse hyperlocal in passing. And if we can avoid it at all, it might be good. And we might want to look at hyperlocal, at some point in time, as a separate issue and then maybe come up with a statement.

I'm pretty sure there are open questions. I think I mentioned one, the distribution structure of the zone. If we don't mention hyperlocal here, then what exactly is the operational need? Geoff quite nicely phrased it. We are now going from protecting the hop-by-hop part to protecting the root zone as a whole, including the non-authoritative records.

Again, with the paranoid politician in mind, why is that an issue today? Or it isn't an issue but we would like it for, say, engineering perfection, then that is okay. But we need to say something about what the motivation is to avoid speculation that there is any insecurity in the current process or you name it.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks. Geoff, I see your hand but I want to respond, just quickly, or ask a follow-up question, to Peter, I guess. Do you think this would be more palatable, maybe, if we, instead of referencing hyperlocal root and the RFC, if we referenced the fact that there are implementations—if you look at BIND, and Unbound, and, I assume, Knot as well, there are now configuration knobs that let you do this—and use that as a motivation?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I think that would be … It would be a bit like the same thing without that taboo word. The reference to the RFC and the reference to the—the dangling reference to the ICANN activities on hyperlocal, that's what we might want to avoid here, indeed. Giving the rationale that protecting the zone, rather than the zone's transport, is technically okay. I think we would be better off if we found a reason why—

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks. Geoff?

PETER KOCH: - as in not suggesting that there's an insecurity right now. It's just an improvement, and so on and so forth.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: So, the answer to your question is yes. We might want to avoid mentioning it at all. And the way you suggested would—

DUANE WESSELS: All right. You broke up a little bit at the end but I think we got the gist of it there, Peter. Thanks. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: With respect to Peter, I'm not so sensitive about hyperlocal, endorsing it or otherwise. I do notice that I can justify that sentence or that assertion on current activity within ICANN and the IETF by looking at Wes Hardaker's local root initiative, which I put a URL in the chat window, which actually has sponsorship from ICANN to actually make the root zone available.

                      If you're going to avoid mentioning it … And quite frankly, I'm not sure why we should do that. I'm quite happy with the sentence as it sounds. The alternative way of phrasing this is that there's always been two ways that the root zone contents have been promulgated beyond the scope of the root zone servers. And one is, of course, query-by-query, where recursive resolvers hold a local copy of the answer and use that local copy for subsequent queries until expiration time. And there's always been the ability to perform AXFR. And both of these mechanisms have been available since inception and continue to be available.

                      The issue with AXFR, since the root zone has been signed, is that it is inefficient of AXFR clients to ensure that the zone that they have copied is indeed the integral and correct zone. ZONEMD provides what is a

reasonable and perhaps necessary assurance that the local copy they have is indeed authentic and complete.

Now, if you do it that way, you avoid any mention of this. And it's possible to say that. To my mind, I'm not sure it makes the document any better. But if you really are sensitive about this, there are other ways of phrasing that paragraph that avoid some implicit endorsement.

Your deeper issue, "Does this make sense?" Personally, I think the entire thing is just basically a farce and negative aggressive NSEC caching does a much better job. But local zone was always a political answer to a political question. And quite frankly, as soon as you start saying that, you're way beyond my level of operation, and up into, "Country X wants a root server. What are we going to do about it?" kind of conversation. And I don't really want to go there. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Geoff. Tim, your hand's up.

TIM APRIL: So, when I was reading it the other day, I went and looked at the root zone from the IANA website and got to the internet click, and it's HTTP, and then realized that there is no way for me to get—to acquire an authentic root zone that I can verify, at this point, without the presence of either ZONEMD or some sort of pictographic hash across the file that's published in a site that has HTTPS running on it, which may be one motivation that we could include in the document in place of

hyperlocal. I'm perfectly fine with leaving hyperlocal in there. But if we're looking for another reason, that could be it.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. Steve, since you and I talked about this in one of our editing sessions, is there anything you want to add about referring to hyperlocal root?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, Duane. I think the points I brought out, one thing is I couldn't find a stable reference hyperlocal root in the ICANN initiative. Maybe what Geoff provided could be used as one. The other thing is, as what Peter described, we don't want this document to be endorsing the hyperlocal root approach but just stating it factually. So, that's my point. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right. Well, thanks, everyone, for that input. Again, I will take an action item to propose some different wording here in this paragraph for review. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'll just add one more comment here because I don't think it's been said, that if you reword it, you need to think about. Prior to the zone being signed, it mattered a lot where you got data from because in some ways, where you go to was almost the only assurance of integrity. With, basically, the augmentation of this with digital signatures, then the issue comes … It really doesn't matter where I get it from.

And so, it doesn't matter that I go to the InterNIC, or I go to this, or I go to that. It doesn't matter where I get a copy of the root zone, through AXFR or any other means. With ZONEMD, I can assure myself that it is indeed the current authentic zone. And that's almost the point of this, that you're trying to self-protect the data rather than rely on where you got it from.

And that's, I suppose, right at the heart of this, what we're trying to do. We're trying to increase the authenticity and robustness of the data set as a self-contained entity and eliminate the issue of where I got it from as part of the reason why a client or a relying party is willing to accept it as the truth. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. That's well said, for sure. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. And just to piggyback on just a couple of previous comments, too, is there's two distinct things here. One is safeguarding. One is what happens when it's from transmission point forward, right? And that's some of the things we start discussing with AXFR. But the ultimate rationale for why does RZERC care, I think, is not so much the integrity of the zone one transmitted. I don't think that's necessarily our scope.

But I do think that the fact that—the two points that there is a new RR to examine and the implications thereof, added with the fact that the person that was the root zone operator that happened to bring this up is saying, "This is something that we potentially are looking at,

specifically for the root zone …" Those two statements combined provide the rationale for why this is particularly interesting to RZERC, I think.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Howard. That's an interesting take. And I guess what I hear you saying there is that some of this background maybe doesn't matter as much, as long as you focus on those two points—that the root zone maintainer is proposing to add this and it falls within RZERC's scope to comment on it. That should be sufficient. Okay.

Danielle, let's scroll down. I'm not sure if there's any other … Oh. There's some other things here. Yeah. Okay. So, this is the recommendation section. There originally were five recommendations. And again, Steve and I had a little editing session. And we discussed that recommendation two isn't really a recommendation. And so, we moved that up to the opening paragraph and would suggest deleting it as an actual recommendation. That's essentially this change here. I don't think there's anything more substantial than that, right, Steve? It's just moving that one up.

STEVE SHENG: Yep. Nope.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So, Steve's point, which was really good, was that if you took number two as written, it sounded like the RZERC was expecting the IETF to almost—I don't want to say "forcing" but strongly encouraging

the IETF to move this forward, when that's fully within the IETF's remit. So, the wording of that opening sentence was changed a little bit. Rather than, "We expect IETF" to do something, it now says … Up in the green, it says, "It is the assumption of the RZERC that the IETF will progress the document." Is everyone okay with this change? Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Thanks, Duane. I guess the question … And my apologies if it was discussed on a previous call. But is there a reason why we wouldn't just withhold issuing this document until it is issued as an RFC? Then, we could have, obviously, the final reference to the RFC number and so forth. Is there a timing issue, where delaying this document is of benefit?

DUANE WESSELS: No. Well, yes and no, I guess. My reasoning for bringing this to RZERC now is to get ahead of this a little bit and get all the pieces in place so that we can deploy it quickly when all the approvals are in place—when it's an RFC and when all the other recommendations have been met. Other than that, RZERC could delay or wait until it becomes an RFC. Everything would still … Doing it in that order would still work just fine. It's just a matter of me, I guess, being a little bit impatient and wanting to get things in place. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Along the same lines—and I think I mentioned that I my email, as well—my understanding is that the final draft has passed IETF last call

and is in AD evaluation or is it in … No. Sorry. It was submitted to the AD for evaluation, I guess. So, there's going to be a last call and may or may not be changes to the document. But I'd also strongly prefer to have a stable reference, rather than pointing to the document, which also means that we could soften the text a bit by not talking about assumptions what the IETF will or will not do.

And I believe that the blocking factor will not be further progressing in the IETF. But the time that is to be taken is what is currently recommendation three, and which is really, really to the point of what RZERC is for. Make sure that all the parties involved get involved and have an opportunity to address their concerns or their support, which means that they can only work on this after it has been implemented, after it has been standardized, and so on and so forth. And only after that, maybe, the record is then deployed within the root zone.

The draft currently mentions more use cases than the root zone, if I remember correctly.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Which is good. But in analogy to, say, DNSSEC, we didn't start that in the root. We started it somewhere else. And yeah. Maybe there are not so many other use cases, even though that document suggests there are. I'm not sure that a lot of zones will jump start.

But anyway, the feedback from operators and from vendors or software developers would be helpful for maybe, then, a second statement of RZERC that, yes, all the conditions have been met and we are now ready to support this change, which would touch upon what is our strategy with this change. We are now giving a recommendation what should be done. And are we then going to review whether the criteria have been met? Or is that just something that we give to the Board and say, "Well, you, Board, decide whether the criteria have been met?" Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you, Peter. So, I guess I'd be interested to hear from other committee members also, on timing questions. Should we proceed with this as is? Or would it be better to wait until we have an RFC? I'd like to have more input on that. Carlos?

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Hi. I think unless there is a pressing need by any member of the ICANN or technical community in general, and given that ZONEMD is on last call, it really would make sense until we have an RFC.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Carlos. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't think the IETF is the arbiter of the records in the root zone, solely. I think there are, and should be, more folk who collectively need

to make that decision. And the order in which those folk cast a position or create an input is, in some ways, irrelevant.

I actually don't think that this document would substantively change its wording whenever it gets published. It's the same document. And I don't think that it necessarily helps us to actually wait for an RFC. I think the document is adequately conditional and it's actually saying the ultimate directive to the PTI, to make that change in the root zone as published, is conditional on a number of folk. This document is certainly part of that conditional. The IETF's RFC is part of that conditional.

But in the same way that RZERC is not the ultimate arbiter, neither is the IETF. And I actually am persuaded by the extraordinary stasis in the root, that making changes takes forever, that preloading some of these, in terms of logistics, is more convincing to me than serializing an already tediously, geologically-slow process to make sure it will never happen until the next century.

So, my view is because the wording won't change—because it's the same recommendation, irrespective, and it's always conditional on all the parties agreeing, including, of course, the IETF—that we should publish it with that assumption explicitly built in, to effectively make the gating condition or have every box being ticked that the PTI would necessarily go through—one that the PTI can go through much faster than waiting for A, then B, then C, then D. So, I certainly would argue strongly that we should do our work, say it's conditional, sign it off, and push it out. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you, Geoff. Brad, you're next.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I just want to echo what Geoff said. To me, I think this goes to the Board and it's going to have to be evaluated by the Board. And action is going to have to be taken. That's all going to take time, also. So, I feel like it's better to get the ball rolling here than it is to do things in a very serial fashion.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Brad. You kind of cut off at the end but I think we got it. Carlos, I don't know if your hand is an old hand or a new hand.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Old hand. Sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. Just quickly, I'm fine with the publication. Just per just comments, I think everything that was said was … I'm in complete agreement, with the only slight exception about that it's completely serial for us and we hand off, just because of the very last sentence of the last recommendation, which is that nice little feedback loop, which means we will have more work on this. So, we're going to get to do this again

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Thanks. Just a few observations. One is that I think, practically speaking, if RZERC is of the opinion that this kind of language is going to proceed, I think there's nothing stopping ICANN staff, Verisign, as the root zone maintainer, starting to make parallel preparations on the notion that this will be issued at some point. So, I don't see that issuance of this text specifically is a blocker on progress on other parts. But that being said, I'm not against the text as it is. It just seemed cleaner to me to cite it to the RFC, given the RFC seems to be very close to being finalized.

But perhaps, also, this is a segue because I think some of the other comments touched on this issue as well, which is … Another piece of feedback I had for these recommendations in general is I think, particularly because this is the first recommendation issued by RZERC of this nature, that we probably want to be more explicit about what RZERC's role is here, which is to provide advice to the ICANN Board of Directors. I think a consequence of this advice would be that the Board would task PTI to do certain things, communities to do certain things, and in the context of ICANN being the contractor of Verisign to perform the root zone maintainer function, would be tasking Verisign to do its roles.

And I wanted to propose that we come up with some language that is a bit more explicit, that RZERC's role here is to review this proposal that's been submitted by one of its members, which it has. And indeed, it supports deploying it in the root zone, which is stated there. But I think what's missing is that it's not actually clear that the consequence of this RZERC document is not that all these parties go forth and do this. This is a recommendation that the ICANN Board of Directors organize this work and these are the conditions under which the work should be done—that these need to be satisfied as part of the process.

DUANE WESSELS:

All right. That's very good input. So, I feel like, with respect to the question of—the timing question of when to wait and when not to wait—I think we don't exactly have consensus on that. It may become a moot point, if the IETF processes happen sooner rather than later. I will try to find out. I'll ping the area directors and see if I can get some information on their thoughts in regards to timing. And maybe that will impact what we do here. My personal opinion is in line with Geoff and Brad, that I don't want to … I don't see the need to wait too long. I would rather get some of these pieces in place.

And then, with respect to Kim's point about being more explicit about recommendations to the Board, is everyone okay with that? I can certainly reword some of the text in the section, if everyone's in agreement that that's what we should do. All right. I see a couple of yeses on the participant list so we'll go ahead and do that.

All right. So, I'm going to use the remaining … Well, let's see. Last chance for any discussions about this document, I guess. We've got just about 15 minutes left in our meeting to talk about the other topic and the AOB item. So, I kind of want to move on unless there's anything else.

All right. So, we have another document, which is about signing root zone name server data. At our last meeting, we had a good discussion about this and how, essentially, the plan was that RZERC would suggest—would make a recommendation to the Board that this be further studied and that it might very likely fall to ICANN's OCTO group to do some of this work.

I had a telephone conversation with Matt Larson about this. And it was interesting because they were already looking at some of these things because the RSSAC document left some future work to be done and that was still on their to-do list. So, Matt seemed very welcoming about receiving this sort of work from RZERC, via the Board. I'd sent him a copy of this document about a week or two ago but it was right before he was leaving on some vacation. So, he didn't have a chance to give feedback on it.

Essentially, I'm at the point where I want to make sure that ICANN OCTO is—that this is essentially what they expect and would be useful for them. And so, at this point, I think RZERC's in a holding pattern on this. And I don't think we have any comments in the Google Doc. Is that correct, Danielle? Can you scroll down? Yeah. I guess there's one from me.

One thing that did come up in my conversation with Matt was that, again, their to-do list item came from the older RSSAC recommendations, which I'm forgetting the exact number. But in that RSSAC document, it talked not specifically about signing root-servers.net but more generally about renaming the root servers and renaming them in a way that they become protected by DNSSEC—so, for example, giving them names directly in the root zone. And so, this document here has been tweaked a little bit to better reflect that—to not limit it just root-servers.net but to more generally talk about having signed root zone name server data.

So, given all that status update, does anyone have any comments or suggestions about this at this time? Or do we just want to wait until we get our feedback from the OCTO team and then go from there? Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Since I was woefully inadequate in answering your comment in a timely manner, I probably should do it now. So, the place I was coming from, for those that weren't on the call, is that through RRAs, ICANN, at least on the new TLD round, required that, from the TLD perspective, that this data be signed. So, the part of the stance … And I realize that is absolutely out-of-scope for RZERC because of the R.

But the idea is … There seems to be a, as it stands—I won't call it hypocrisy but certainly a disconnect between why was it absolutely, 100% mandated from the TLD perspective but completely verboten at

the root zone. Understanding the differences in architecture and what have you aside, it seems like that's a really wide gap.

And I'm hoping that if we don't come into congruence one way or the other, that we at least have—either us, or OCTO, or someone has at least addressed the issue so that it can be—the question doesn't reside forever or people would be like, "I still don't understand what that R data is somehow exempted from this," when, in theory, some would argue that if you're signing that data, the root zone R data might be the most important.

So, I see what you're saying. I'm following the devil's advocacy down the rabbit hole there a bit. But that's kind of where I was coming from with my comment from the previous call. I don't know if that helps you craft that recommendation or not. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Howard. Do you think that we could have a …? Do we need a recommendation along the lines of if the first set of recommendations, or if the work—the first study continues—with the status quo, then that should be very well-justified in why … I'm reluctant to say something like why the root zone is different than the TLDs. But that's essentially the question, right, is if the recommendation is to not have signed root name server data, why is that okay for the root?

HOWARD ELAND: I think maybe the right word there is "effect." It should at least be evaluated and addressed. If the ultimate response is that we will keep

both sides as they are, I just think they need to address the issue on one side or the other.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Does anyone else have thoughts on this recommendation two? Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I think just to respond, I think why all the TLDs were signed, I think that's out of our scope to answer, though I'm sure we could speculate on why that happened. But regarding why this isn't signed, one, legacy. It predated all of that. And two, there are implications to signing this with the priming queries.

And I think what RSSAC alluded to, and what I think the conversation here was trying to allude to, is that somebody needs to look at that and give—and finally answer that. What are the implications of signing this and can we go forward and do it? Because I think you're right. I think everybody thinks it should be signed. But there's also … We don't want to do it blindly. We need to understand what the implications are of signing it. And once we have that data, we could answer that question and finally have a decision either way and have it justified. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Thanks, Brad. Peter?

PETER KOCH:	Yeah. I think that the second recommendation is probably going beyond the scope of RZERC. And on the substance of the matter, I think it's not even justified, if for nothing else than that it's sending the signal that DNSSEC isn't yet ready. And this is the trap that DNSSEC has been caught in for a while now, even more so in the IETF, because we see there is little deployment so let's make the protocol even more complicated.
	Now, you could argue that signing the delegation doesn't make it more complicated. But it adds things that aren't there and it would be a bigger effort to get that deployed, and so on and so forth. I think we might be pouring the baby out with the bathwater here. [inaudible] that recommendation.
DUANE WESSELS:	Peter, can you repeat that last sentence because for me, you broke up a little bit. Did you say recommend deleting it?
PETER KOCH:	I said I would recommend against that recommendation—not adding it into the document.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. Thanks. Okay. Any last comments about this document before we close it out? All right. Very good. So, let's go to our AOB items. Howard has a logistical item, request, update. I'm not sure. Howard, go ahead.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. Just when looking at the calendar invite that contained both the URL with the meeting ID and the password in clear text, I'm wondering if we should … This came in through unencrypted email. I'm wondering, in the days of sophisticated Zoom bombers, if we shouldn't try and do something at least a little more clandestine to hide some of that.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. That's a good question. Also, these emails go to the public archive. So, they're pretty open. Steve or Danielle, do you have? How do you deal with this with other meetings? I know it's a hassle to send out the password separately. But is that something that we should do, maybe?

STEVE SHENG: Hi, Duane. Yeah. I think Howard raised a good point. We will take it into consideration. I agree because the RZERC list is a public list. So, we might want to have a separate channel to send out the meeting passwords. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Howard. Brad, with an update.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. I just want to thank you all for letting me be here, be part of this. But I have termed out and I will not be attending the next meeting. I believe it's Daniel Migault, caucus member from RSSAC, is the new

appointee and should be here to join and create output with you. So, thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks, Brad. I'm glad you remembered because I didn't remember the exact date, again, when the switchover was happening. But yeah. The RSSAC has appointed Daniel. So, thank you very much, Brad. I'm sure we're all going to miss you. And hopefully we get to see each other in person one of these days and commiserate.

BRAD VERD: I look forward to it.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep. Okay. Last chance for topics before we adjourn the meeting. Anyone, anyone? Okay. Thanks, everyone, for participating today. And look for some updates on the list about the topics we discussed today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Duane.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]