
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you all for joining. This is the RZERC monthly teleconference held on Tuesday the 16th of March 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Duane, would you like me to get started with the roll call?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Representing the ASO, we have Carlos Martinez.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ccNSO, Peter Koch.

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar.

KAVEH RANJBAR: 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: IANA, Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RySG, Howard Eland.

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am, I'm here despite my suggestion otherwise with the previous regrets.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Wonderful. RSSAC, Daniel Migault.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RZM, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And from the SSAC, Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. Hi.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right, and from staff, we have myself, Danielle Rutherford, and Steve Sheng.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you very much, Danielle. Welcome, everybody, to the March meeting. We don't have a lot to go through today. Mostly, it's going to be about the chair election. Unless anyone has—if you have Any Other Business, feel free to message Danielle in the chat or something or bring it up at the end.

But first, we have the minutes from our February meeting to approve. Did anyone have any comments or corrections for the minutes? Okay, I don't think so, so we'll take those as accepted and Danielle can publish those on the website.

And then next on our agenda is to discuss the chair election, and Danielle has prepared a bunch of slides. Did you want to go through these, Danielle? Or you'd probably want me to, right?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can go through them.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, go ahead.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right, so today we'll be talking about the RZERC chair election according to the RZERC operating procedures. So today, the candidates will each have their opportunity to accept or reject their nomination, and then once they've all accepted or rejected their nominations, each candidate will have an opportunity to address the committee regarding their candidacy. Once we've heard from each candidate and RZERC members will have opportunities to ask questions, I would give an overview of the voting procedures, and this will include online vote instructions for the [Big Polls poll,] rules for declaring a winner, and what the operational procedures provide for in the event of a tie breaker. And at the end, we'll have an opportunity to thank Duane Wessels for his four years of service as the RZERC chair. Does anyone have any questions? All right.

Listed alphabetically by last name, I will ask each of the candidates to either accept or reject their nomination. First up, we have Tim April. Do you accept your nomination as RZERC chair?

TIM APRIL: I do.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. Geoff Huston, do you accept your nomination for the RZERC chair?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, I do.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. And Daniel Migault, do you accept your nomination for the RZERC chair?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I do.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. I'll note that we have all three candidates accepting their nomination. So first up, ordered alphabetically by last name, Tim April, you have the opportunity to address the committee regarding your candidacy.

TIM APRIL: I think basically everyone here knows me. I'm happy to accept the opportunity to be the chair. I'm willing to work with everyone here on

any of the new work items that come in. The only things I can think of that were slated to be done in the next couple of years—aside from anything that comes in from any of the stakeholders—is the review of scope of the committee, like Duane was proposing last time, and then I think from my reading of the operating procedures is we’re going to have to do a charter review in the next two years. Happy to help drive those things as we get closer to them. Can't think of much else to say, so happy to take any questions that anyone has later on.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Tim. Does anyone have any questions for Tim? All right, seeing none, Geoff Huston, this is now your opportunity to address the committee.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Thanks for that. Look, I'm aware of the scope of the role of this particular committee in terms of considering issues raised by any of its members, by PTI stuff or the Customer Standing Committee on evolutionary changes and improvements to the security, stability and resiliency of the root system inside the context of the various stakeholders in the ICANN ecosystem and with particular attention to the resiliency and utility of the root servers.

So in that respect, I'm quite happy to continue the amazing track record that Duane has had in careful and deliberate consideration of such matters trying to both keep consensus within this committee but also make sure that the various stakeholders which we represent in some ways are also adequately informed and have the ability to provide input

and consideration so that changes, as and when they might be proposed, have, if you will, due care and attention and responsibility being exercised to make sure that we're not going into wayward directions. So I'm happy to facilitate the workings of this group as a chair, and certainly try hard to attend all the meetings and do the chairing things. Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Geoff. Are there any questions for Geoff Huston? Yes, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't have a question specifically for Geoff, but I think I would like to ask questions of all the candidates after they've done their statements.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Great. I will make sure there's an opportunity for that. All right. Seeing no other questions specifically for Geoff at this moment, Daniel Migault, this is now your opportunity to address the committee.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. I think RZERC might be called by some multi-stakeholder to address some of the questions, but I also do think that RZERC should also be focused on some aspects and specific work items. So I would like that the RZERC decide on which topic it's willing to advance. And the one I particularly see is the evolution and the agility that might be required regarding cryptography, the impact, for example, on the post-quantum algorithms, how it's going to impact the root zone, especially with the

third round of [NIST] that is coming up later this month. I'd like to work maybe on algorithm rollovers as well as cryptography agility, first for enabling a transition maybe if we're doing a rollover, or to handling some maybe harder discussions on should we serve simultaneously different algorithm, for example, to avoid fragmentation of the naming space, so these kinds of questions.

Yeah, so that's one aspect of the thing I'd like us to work on a little bit, as well as we also have to look at the evolution of the ROOT SERVER SYSTEM with authoritative servers being encrypted, as well as hyperlocal where there is a balance to find between a completely decentralized architecture and a completely centralized, and maybe that has some impact on how—maybe some additional data are needed for the root or considerations at least. So that's basically what I'm currently thinking.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Daniel. Do we have any questions for Daniel at this moment? Okay. As Duane suggested a little bit ago, I'm going to open up the floor for questions for all three candidates. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I guess I'll go first. So one of the things that, to be honest, the committee struggled with for, I would say, a couple years on and off, was striking the right balance between meeting regularly to keep people in the cadence of having meetings and exercising our processes versus kind of having nothing to do. There were long periods of time where there was really no work presented to the committee, and so I'm curious what the candidates think about striking that balance. Do you see, going

forward, the committee needing to meet regularly just for the sake of it, or maybe going into some hibernation as we've done in the past?
Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Would any of the candidates like to respond?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, I'll certainly fill the gap. Look, I actually don't think there's any danger of a lack of topics around there, particularly as we consider the architectural implications of this hyperlocal approach, and the signing of the root zone was, I think, one part of the possible changes, but I notice that the broader charter is actually about not just the mechanisms but the architecture of root servers' distribution.

So I suppose I'd firstly say, Duane, there is no shortage of material to consider. But on the other hand, it's also the case that this is meant to be a body that reviews proposals brought by the various stakeholders and the composition of the group as representatives from particular organizations and sectors as distinct from the bunch of people who do the work, and trying to strike a balance there between careful and considered review of various proposals versus actually initiating it, I think, is the boundary point.

And so in some ways, it is up to the broader environment of folk to propose changes, and it is up to this group to provide considered and careful review to feed into the Board of ICANN in terms of its subsequent adoption or not, and this coordination effort is certainly one

that is reactive rather than being directive. So to that extent, Duane, if there truly is nothing to do, it is a case of meeting enough to exercise the processes and make sure we're all familiar with the work, but not simply spending an hour pedaling a bicycle that has nowhere to go.

But that said, I certainly think over the next 12 to 24 months, which I serve [for a further] 12 months in my current appointment from SSAC, I don't think there's any shortage, it's more a case of prompting our various organizations to come up with areas that they would like us to consider and us to provide a considered response to.

So there is a delicate boundary here, Duane, between do we initiate such studies? I don't think so. Do we respond to such proposals, yes, we should, and definitely so in terms of being able to provide considered and appropriate advice to the Board of ICANN as to whether to proceed or not with such changes.

So a balance needs to be struck, Duane, is about the best I can say. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Geoff.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay, Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I think I agree with Geoff that it's not a lack of topics that we may discuss, address or conveys our respective community to think about. And it's really a hard goal to remain hibernating, and I think the best way not to fall asleep is just to be kept awake. So yeah, how I view things is that it's unlikely we have actually nothing to do, and that's how we're going to be kept awake.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Thank you. Tim, did you want to add any thoughts here?

TIM APRIL: Yeah, I agree with both Daniel and Geoff. I don't expect that it's going to end up going to—we may end up not needing to have some meetings over the next two or so years just because there may not be active work that's going on, but I would expect if we were to prompt our respective constituencies, they may have some things for us to consider, whether it turns into a document or not.

But the other—jumping back to what I said earlier, having an updated view of what we believe the scope of RZERC to be, and if that's either casually or—if it's published as a document or if it's just communicated to the different constituencies, of, these are the things that we consider to be in scope, that may trigger some different work or request to come our way, but I don't know if that's in line with what everyone else is thinking.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you, Tim. Duane, did you have any more comments or questions for the candidates, or does anybody on the committee have any questions they'd like to ask all three?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't have any more at this time.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Not seeing anything else, I'm going to move on to talking about the online voting procedures. So according to the RZERC operating procedures, when we have more than one candidate, that will trigger an online anonymous poll open for seven days. I will be distributing the voting credentials later today via the Big Polls online voting system. This is a common system used for anonymous, secure voting within the ICANN community.

I know that in the past, some community members have had issues with Big Polls credentials going to spam inboxes, so I will send a note to the whole RZERC mailing list once everyone should have received their credentials. Each member will receive an individual e-mail with the unique link with their voting credentials, and they may vote only once. You may not change your vote once it's submitted.

Because it's an anonymous poll, results are not going to be available to staff until after the poll closes to preserve anonymity. So while I will be able to see if people have voted, I will not be able to access any tallies or how anyone votes during or after the election. The poll will be launched

today, 16th March 2021 at 23:59 UTC, it'll run for seven days and close 15 March 2021 at 23:59 UTC.

An overview of what you'll get in your inboxes today is an e-mail that'll look something like this. Obviously, it'll be addressed to individual members. it'll give you the title of the election, poll open and close date, and then a link to a Big Polls that is unique to your individual persons.

Once you click the link, you'll see the poll question for the election. I've put an example here to show how voting occurs. Here, in order to select the best fruit, please select one of the two candidates, apples or oranges. I've selected my vote for apples. You proceed to the vote confirm page, then we'll show you that your vote is not yet submitted, it'll give you the tally of what you're voting for, and then you can select your preferences for how your ballot will be received.

Here, I've indicated to include my vote selection in the vote receipt and include the vote receipt code in the vote receipt. So once you've selected your preferences, you can either click back to make a correction, for instance if I really wanted to vote for oranges, or submit the vote for apples. So if I hit submit my vote, it will say thank you for voting, your vote has been successfully submitted, and then I would get a receipt that looks something like this in my inbox.

Because I elected to have the identifying information of the receipt code and vote, both those pieces of information came back in this receipt. Do we have any questions about the Big Polls voting procedures? Yes, Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Possibly a comment and also a question. Just as to Board procedure, liaison procedures, basically, the Board representative in any of the groups generally abstains from voting or any other type of decision making, except if it is mandated by bylaws or basically it's part of the charter of the activity that is happening.

So in this case, as the Board's usual practice, which is actually [now being] documented as well, I will have to abstain. So I think that's good to have on the record.

The question is, do I have to just ignore the mail, or should I go through the process but not select anything and submit?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I believe that you should just ignore the mail because I have not included an abstain option in the poll.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. That works for me. As long as it is noted, I'm fine.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. Thank you for letting me know. Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Danielle. And apologies in advance. I might have missed that—I just saw the slide go by. Did you say that we'll have a simple majority so we get to pick one of three and no ranking at all?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That's correct. On the next slide, declaring a winner according to the operating procedures, a simple majority will confirm the winner, so five votes in this case. Even if Kaveh abstains, it would be five votes. If a majority is not reached, among the three, the nominee with the least number of votes is eliminated and the voting is repeated with a reduced slate of names and the process is repeated until one nominee achieves a simple majority.

In the event of a tie, candidates will get time on the next call to address the group. Another vote occurs, and then a subsequent tie would initiate an immediate coin toss. So in this case, we won't have the opportunity for a three-way tie, so if each candidate received three votes, as Kaveh has noted he's abstaining. But if we narrow it down to two people and that we have two ties, I think it would trigger an immediate coin toss. Does that answer your question, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yes, absolutely. Thanks. Well, maybe—so Big Polls would allow for doing this all at once, but in the event that we get a tie in the first round, you'll send out new e-mails for new votes?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. In the event of a tie or if we have to repeat a process, I'll actually set up a brand new poll in Big Poll, so I'll do it under a separate filing so you will get new credentials.

PETER KOCH:

Okay. Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:

Do we have any further questions? Howard asks, is it possible for a three-way tie in round one? It would have been if all nine members were voting, each candidate could have received three votes. In the event that Kaveh is abstaining and therefore will not be casting a vote, the total would then be eight, and that cannot be a three-way tie in round one.

As Peter notes, it can still occur if only six members vote. If we don't have any more questions, I did include the coin toss rules in the event of a three-way tie, because that one is less obvious. This will be changed if it is a coin toss between two members, but in the event of a coin toss, I will declare the rules and definition of a coin toss as throwing the coin into the air such that it rotates edge over edge several times, caught, and then inverted onto the opposite hand. So should it come to that, that is how we will define that event.

Do we have any other questions related to the logistics around voting or the election procedures? All right, not seeing any. I think some comments have come through in the chat, but this is just an opportunity for anybody to express our gratitude to Duane. He's been the founding chair of RZERC and he's given the committee four years of service as the RZERC chair, so this is just an opportunity to say thank you to Duane for that. Steve Sheng, your hand is up.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Daniel. I guess on behalf of the staff support, I just want to thank Duane for his service. Duane is the founding chair of RZERC, and at the beginning, we worked together, first to work on the operating procedures, so that took quite some time and getting the committee set up. Then Duane led a ranking exercise of what falls within RZERC's purview and what isn't. I think those exercises were very helpful in helping RZERC to think about the various items that you can take up. And then Duane worked with the staff behind the scenes to get things organized. So, thank you, Duane. I know you are not far, but I just want to thank you for your service to RZERC. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you very much, Steve. Appreciate it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Thanks, Duane. I think it's been an interesting journey to bring RZERC to where it is now, and you've really facilitated that in an excellent way. I'm very appreciative to what you've done. Just thinking back to the original discussion that led to what is now RZERC, we had this interesting dynamic pre-transition where as the IANA team and as Verisign in the context of being the RZM, we were consulting with NTIA to get approval for anytime we wanted to make a significant change to how root zone management is conducted.

So the transition presented an opportunity for us to create something new that had a bit more multi-stakeholder involvement to make sure that the community was happy that appropriate review was done of these kinds of significant changes, and RZERC was the result. But RZERC itself kind of came with a clean sheet of paper and not a lot of guidance about exactly how it would work, and I think the process over the first year of walking through potential scenarios and so forth was done in a very useful and collaborative manner, and I think you certainly more than anyone else, Duane, should take credit for that. So thanks again, and I don't envy the next person to come into your shoes. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Kim.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. I think yeah, Kim really covered it well, so I won't repeat all of that. I just wanted to make a suggestion, because in my experience, these committees and groups establish their own culture, and RZERC has been around for four years now, and Duane is our first outgoing chair, so I thought maybe it's good to establish basically this culture of making a statement from the whole group, possibly with our names and then thanking the appointing organization. In case of Duane, it is RZM or Verisign. But I suggest—I assume Duane or I guess Duane might not even care, but I think it is a good gesture, also for ourselves,

to basically let the appointing organization know how much we appreciate all the efforts, because it takes a lot of additional time and effort than just joining the meeting. So it's a suggestion. If nobody objects, my ask is for Org and staff to kindly prepare a draft, circulate it around so next meeting, we can basically all agree and then [inaudible]. Thanks. Just a suggestion.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Kaveh. I'll take that action item to prepare a draft. Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Look, I too want to basically extend a vote of thanks to Duane for all of his work here. I've actually only been on this for a small amount of time and certainly not the entirety of the four years, but I have seen careful and considered leadership by Duane, and I'm very appreciative of that.

I think the best testament one can have as an outgoing chair is to leave behind an organization that is capable, an organization that is effective and an organization that understands its role and procedures and does so effectively. And I think, Duane, you have achieved all that, and I think RZERC is all the better for your leadership. So my grateful thanks for all of your work and commitment in getting us to this point, and I for one truly appreciate it. Thanks indeed.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Geoff.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thanks. I would also like to thank Duane very much for his impartial, patient and really guiding leadership. The committee is an immediate consequence of the IANA transition. So without being too [prophetic,] this also has been history in the making. The committee is very special in that it doesn't really follow the examples of the other ACs, and so the ship had, say, a rough ride in the beginning when we had to find ourselves and position ourselves in the ecosystem, and I would like to thank Duane for addressing that very well. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Peter. It was interesting at the start, I'll say.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Tim.

TIM APRIL: Plus one on the suggestion for the thanking document. And again, thank you to Duane. And I said this to you privately the other day, or a couple weeks ago when we were talking, but the assistance coming up to speed on RZERC when the transition from my predecessor to me happened was quite helpful in getting an understanding of the groundwork of what was going on and how I could be helpful here. So, thanks again, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard.

HOWARD ELAND: Kudos all around for Duane for sure. And I'm thoroughly enjoying this review of the evolution of RZERC, which is kind of funny. So yes, Duane, really appreciate all of your hard work and effort. Corraling us all towards consensus is never an easy thing, and as one of the folks who's also been around since we started here, some heartfelt thanks in all the hard work. Really appreciate it.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you very much, Howard.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So I think I've addressed everyone's hands. Assuming those are old hands in the queue.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, I did not raise hand, but I thought you were doing a roll call.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Please go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So I'd like to thank Duane. Though I haven't spent a long time in RZERC, and so it's very good to spend a few weeks and have two documents going out of RZERC, but it's just reflecting a lot of work before we were there. So yeah, I do remember when Duane ran a special call to have that discussion and address some comments made, so yeah, thank you for being available when it was needed.

DUANE WESSELS: [inaudible] Daniel, thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Any last comments? Duane, is there anything you'd like to add?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, just thank you, everyone, for the overwhelming support here. It was kind of unexpected. I feel like I should go on like a six-month vacation now, maybe go to the Bahamas and hide out and let you guys figure this stuff out on your own. No, I'm just kidding. I'll be here for a long time, so I look forward to working with the new chair and everyone on the committee.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Alrighty. Well, on that note, you are still the chair, so ...

DUANE WESSELS: Any Other Business? I guess I still have to finish this out. Last chance to keep this meeting going. Otherwise, we will adjourn, and maybe by the April meeting, we'll have a new chair. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]