
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, all, and welcome to the RZERC Monthly Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 15th of June, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to start the roll call?

TIM APRIL: Yes, please.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Carlos Martinez from ASO, I'll note, is not on the call yet. Peter Koch, ccNSO.

PETER KOCH: Yes. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kaveh Ranjbar, ICANN Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Kim Davies, PTI.

KIM DAVIES: 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: Tim April, IETF?

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll note Howard Eland from the Registries Stakeholder Group has sent his regrets. Daniel Migault, RSSAC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane Wessels from Verisign, as the root zone maintainer, has also sent his regrets. And Geoff Huston, SSAC.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yep. I'm here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you. Tim, over to you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So next on the agenda is reviewing the agenda, if anyone has any modifications to the list of things we have for today. Not

seeing anything so we can go on to the minutes of the last meeting. Any comments on the minutes from last month's call? Okay. Not seeing anything. We can mark those as approved. [inaudible]. And then the next piece was to try and finish up the discussion on the Board advice from RZERC003, if you can bring that up. I think we had some comments in the document between this week and last—last month, not last week.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I believe the discussion from last month ended on how much RZERC wanted ICANN to—with this first recommendation, how much RZERC wanted ICANN Org to engage with people as far as implementing and oversight.

TIM APRIL: I'm just checking back to the notes to see where that discussion landed as we finished.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'm not sure we came to a resolution because we spent the bulk of the time discussing and finalizing the RZERC002 recommendations and I don't think we got to resolution on any of the RZERC003 recommendations.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Yep. Now I'm remembering this. Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Thanks. That matches my recollection as well, in terms of where we did or did not get. Just one point that I hope I remember for the correct document, namely 003. Our suggestions were someone should do something. And I believe it was Paul, representing OCTO on the previous call, who then took it as, "Oh yes. OCTO should do this." And my recollection is we ended up there and said, "Well, maybe also do this." But we would have to identify whether we make this an open call or find somebody in particular who should do the work, understanding that we advise the Board and then the Board would find the right entity within ICANN. But then again, it could be somebody else doing these outreach efforts in other fora. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

That's what I was remembering just a minute ago. We were trying to decide ... RZERC can basically give advice to the Board and the Board has to decide what to do with it. I guess the Board is passing it to ICANN Org to try and figure out how to do it. I think Duane had opinions on how the interaction from ICANN to the root one maintainer—whether ICANN Org is asking the root zone maintainer to do something or if it's just the ICANN Org is checking in on the root zone maintainer doing it voluntarily. Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah. Thanks. I think that is right not specifying what part of ICANN Org is doing this work. I think, as you said, the resourcing of this particular task will be handled internally. But I think, really, the aim here is to clarify to what extent ICANN Org needs to take a role in this and if

engaging is the right verb there, if it's confirming or some other descriptor of the nature of the way this be done.

I will note that the root zone maintainer is a Contracted Party to ICANN Org. So there is a contractual relationship there, so I think that is materially different from the other relationships that exist and there are mechanisms in the contract, for example, to change the scope of service. And then ICANN and Verisign can do a contract change control process to include this, for example. I'm not sure that that necessarily needs to be spelled out but I think there are very specific mechanisms by which evolution of the service can be formally documented between ICANN and the root zone maintainer in an appropriate way.

I think what's perhaps less clear, at least to me, is the expectation with respect to the root zone operators. For example, is it sufficient that ICANN org make a one-time outreach to each root server operator and ask them to confirm their readiness to implement this and that they confirm that they understand that there will be negative impact? Or is the onus higher? Is the bar higher, that there is an expectation that ICANN Org will do something more comprehensive or more thorough than just that? So I think that's the area that, at least from where I sit, deserves a little bit more clarity. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Kim. Any other comments on this? Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Thank you. If I understood Peter correctly, I agree, of course people can engage by other means. But I think about the framework of RZERC. Basically, this is us asking ICANN Board to do something and I think there are basically two things we can ask them. Either direct ICANN Org to execute something, which is documented here, and we can discuss that. Or they have also some limited engagement possibilities. I just wanted to remind that to the group that since we are talking to ICANN Board, our options are limited to the remit of the Board, which is either engaging—ask the Board to [the rest the world] or direct ICANN Org to do something.

TIM APRIL: Is that an old hand, Kim? Peter, if Kim's not ...

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. It's an old hand. Sorry.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter, for the record. This is an addition to the root zone that is not of the size and complexity of adding DNSSEC. But going back to the roots of this committee, it would likely be something that the then oversight entity would have wanted consultation to happen and a bit of a risk study. Who are the affected parties and what could go wrong? I think that is the part where we could have different approaches.

One way could be, yes. And we already have thrown it over the fence to the ICANN Board. And then the ICANN Board or the ICANN Org figure out how to do that part of the homework. And we could alternatively, or in addition, go back into our communities and make sure that awareness is there because that's another task of this committee. Make sure that all the affected parties have been heard or have had a chance to intervene.

Interestingly, maybe the entities that would be affected—and that is amongst others, people who already today run shadow root servers—may not necessarily fit in any of our constituencies quite naturally. So again, that's something to take to a broader community and maybe that is done by ICANN Org. But it shouldn't stop us from going back to our communities in addition to that. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yeah. If I may, I just want to say I fully agree with what Peter said, definitely. I also have same interpretation of our charter. So if you think can also engage, we should. On the ICANN Board side, just to add a bit of clarity, we can of course advise them. We can be more specific in what we expect from them to do. If we don't, they still have options, correct? They have different advisory boards, or engagement mechanisms, or ask Org to do some additional research. But if we wanted, this is the place to do it. So we can actually advise them to do it before doing anything else. So I think that's also good, too.

It appears to be, from the charter, a particular task for this committee. And it's not, "Go back and consult with your constituencies." It truly does appear to be, "Launch a public comment." And I'm not sure the other is necessarily precluded but it's certainly not stated overtly, as far as I can see in the charter, in a quick reading. I could have missed it but I just can't see it. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: What's that part? Oh. Danielle's pulling it up right now.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So I think Geoff is referring to under section three of the charter, scope of responsibilities. It's this paragraph right here.

GEOFF HUSTON: Having said that, I look at the paragraph just before it and I actually see "responsible for ensuring that all those involved in the recommendations include all relevant and impacted bodies to have access to necessary expertise." So the previous paragraph talks about, as Peter had suggested, talk with our respective bodies and inform them of this. And I certainly did inform folk of this when it was being discussed and considered.

But post-publication, it's not quite clear. Have we done this already and passed the results on to the Board? Should we do this now? That's where I'm unsure whether this refers to the developmental process of the recommendation or one the recommendation has been made and

we have gathered inputs on this, what are our further obligations as a committee is not entirely clear to me. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

The way I'm reading the charter and thinking of the scope of RZERC003, I figure that ... My interpretation of 003 was that we're asking ICANN Org to do some research into trying to figure out if it's reasonable to do this and then there would potentially be a follow-on document after a plan exists, which would probably end up needing to go through a public comment, which I think would align with ... I don't know if the public comment would come from us, or from ICANN Org, or some other party. But I feel like that aligns with what's outlined in the charter. But I think before we get to that point, I think we need to get the results of the recommendations from 003 back. Am I interpreting that wrong or do people interpret it similarly? Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Tim, I think this is all greenfield, in some sense. To Geoff's question, whether the committee should do the public comment before issuing the recommendation or do the public comment as part of the recommendation, I think that is to be debated. Generally, in the ICANN community, what it does is a committee does an interim report that goes out for public comment. And then, taking into consideration the response from the public comment and issue the final report. So I think that's the normal practice within ICANN. In this case, I think in the case of RZERC003, RZERC directly issued the recommendations for ICANN to do. So I think in some sense, we may have missed a step here.

But I think, retrospectively, it's the committee to decide. This is a learning experience. Perhaps one path forward is just, for these four recommendations, confirm the understanding with ICANN for ICANN to proceed in doing some of these. In the end, whether it will be an ICANN public comment or it will be an RZERC public comment, I think getting back the data from these consultations, it's just that RZERC put a requirement saying, "In the end, there needs to be a public comment, with all this relevant information and before the final changes have happened." I think that's really the spirit of the charter. That means to ensure there's a broad public consultation before changes actually happen. So that would be my recommendation Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Okay. Thank you, Steve. Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

I wanted to endorse what Steve just said that this is the first time we've really done this so I think we're all learning. And Geoff has made a really good catch there, referring back to the charter, about the process we've set for ourselves in the first year. But that being said, I didn't come away with the impression that we were thinking there would be a second set of recommendations from RZERC as a separate document. I'd interpret it that this was RZERC's stance on it and these were the steps that needed to be done for ICANN to implement ZONEMD and the prework required before it could be operationalized.

If others feel differently, I'm very happy to hear that but I don't recall that being the nature of this work. And I don't want to speak for them as

a they're not on the call but I think Verisign was not anticipating a second round of recommendation development on this. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Kim. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

In looking through what we are recommending in RZERC003, we're certainly not recommending, "Do it." It's this "before we do it, let's know what we're doing" theme that is the spirit of these recommendations. "Verify" and "confirm" in recommendation one. "Awareness" and "offering feedback" in recommendation two. "Encouragement to implement" in three. And "others should develop a plan for making it so," four, is kind of, I think, assuming the outcomes of one, two, and three. It's the next thing before clicking on the on switch.

In some ways, the way we phrase this, it certainly is consistent with these recommendations to confirm ICANN Org's understanding to have the organization, through the Office of the CTO, through PTI, through whatever mechanism they choose, to implement these recommendations.

It may be appropriate and reasonable to offer RZERC's assistance, particularly in recommendation two, in the assessment of feedback, to confirm that either the feedback is consistent with the recommendations and the future of adding ZONEMD to the root zone or to offer a view that the public feedback has offered some insights that RZERC itself had not considered when it wrote RZERC 003.

So to offer some further input, particularly in terms of the community feedback proposed in two, there also may be some opportunity to offer feedback in terms of recommendation three because “encourage to implement” and “implement” are two different things. Understanding the diversity of who contributes software that handles the root zone, particularly in this age of hyperlocal, we might we be able to assist in that process of assessing the results of any such consultation. Did they ask a broad enough number of folk who product this software? How did they interpret the answers?

So without necessarily taking over these processes of gathering feedback, which is really what the first three recommendations appear to be about, the other option, which goes beyond the charter in some ways, strictly ... But it’s unclear exactly what the charter had meant in the first place, we could offer assistance to ICANN Org or a point of consultation at the end of these processes of, in data gathering and confirmation, to actually reach a point of agreement with ICANN Org that we are ready to proceed might be a way through this.

It's hard to understand the charter in respect of actually doing this. Was RZERC meant to do all of the groundwork and lay down a relatively clear recommendation for change, “Let’s do this,” or whether, as we have done with RZERC003, say, “We think this is a good idea but we’re not going to say, “Let’s do this.” We’re going to say, “There’s a whole bunch of others beyond us—stakeholders that need to be consulted. You should consult them,” which is what appears to be what we’ve done.

So the option of a way out might well be to suggest in this understandings document that following the engagement in

understanding one, understanding three, I think ... Look, I need to read the document more carefully. But following this engagement, RZERC is consulted with the results of this of the summaries of this feedback and given the opportunity to make comment. Would that be helpful? Thank you?

TIM APRIL: Is that an old hand or a new hand, Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Another old hand. Sorry.

TIM APRIL: So my interpretation of the document was the same as yours, Geoff. It's us asking for a bunch of investigation but not actually saying, "Do it." And I like the idea of including consulting us after those paces are done in the understanding. Are there other comments on that point of discussion?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From an administrative perspective, I just want to check in. It sounds like what the RZERC is saying is that we want to say yes to these understandings and then add in a clarifying comment about consultation after the engagement occurs to request a consultation with RZERC.

GEOFF HUSTON: That was certainly what I am advocating here. Yes.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay.

TIM APRIL: I agree with that approach. And then Peter had added ... I noticed where Peter added two comments to the document about for 003, expanding it to more than just resolvers but saying anyone that write name server software. Reading [six] now.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Then I think we would say no and then provide in a clarifying comment that the RZERC intends to engage with a larger group of people. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I just wanted to point out that in that particular area, there are some logistical considerations that while there are a small number of mainstream vendors of resolver software for the DNS, and we all can enumerate such a list, there is a much larger set of folk practicing in the DNS space who either directly operate their own software or have sources that the rest of us are unaware of, of where their implementations came from.

So in some ways, we're unable to advocate engagement with all of these in the spirit of direct, one-to-one, "Hello. We're thinking about this. How do you feel?" And it becomes more of what would normally be engaged in public consultation. "Attention, everyone with an interest. Here's what we're thinking of doing," says ICANN, "Please offer feedback here or

please be aware that these changes—RFC whatever—are being seriously contemplated and you would be well advised ...”

So engagement here might well take various forms, once you move away from that small circle—known circle of resolver software vendors—into the larger circle of DNS practitioners. So I just wanted to flag that, that engagement takes various forms in a wider circle. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Do you have a suggested change to how we clarify that, Geoff? I think we went through this with the KSK roll as well.

GEOFF HUSTON: In the KSK roll, I think there was much more of an issue with relying parties—everyone who works with the root zone and validates. This is not quite at the same scale but I think it might be worth clarifying we don’t quite agree in the issue of engagement, noting that engagement entails both direct correspondence with known DNS software vendors and a process of notification in some form of public notice and commentary to inform other software developers that have DNS products of this intention—or of this likely intention to add this RFC to the root zone—and provide a mechanism to comment if the vendor feels that it’s appropriate.

Some might say, “We have timing considerations. This might take a year.” Others might say, “We’re ready.” That is useful data, I think. So you need to just clarify what engagement means here to point out that there

is a variety of engagement because there's a large pool of software vendors. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Geoff and then I think the last comment was from Peter. So I think the way to address Peter's last comment would be to have no as the [inaudible] understanding and the clarifying comment of it should be in consultation with PTI. PTI and the root zone maintainer should be involved in developing this plan as well. Does that [seem] correct understanding, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. With all the discussion we had about that, I think that's the way to go.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think in this instance, that is what is meant by contractors. Both PTI and Verisign are contractors to ICANN Org in doing their respective roles. So that might be as far apart as it might seem.

PETER KOCH: If I may, I think when I wrote the comment—and we've discussed this in depth afterwards so we're going back in time a bit—my concern was that ICANN Org shouldn't understand RZERC's advice to mean that

ICANN Org do it but whoever is—and I think if I understand Kim correctly, that is what is in the contracts—that the relevant parties in their respective roles do it. That’s, I think, where I came from.

KIM DAVIES:

I’ll admit it’s a fine nuance but PTI is only contracted to ICANN. There’s no formal direct relationship between PTI and Verisign in its role as the root zone maintainer. So I think from ICANN Org’s side, they’re just trying to document in a way that respects their relationships. It think in practice, of course, it’s going to be my team and Verisign’s team sitting down and working this all out. But ultimately, our deliverables would be to ICANN Org, as the contracting party, to coalesce and approve them. I think that’s my understanding.

TIM APRIL:

This goes back to the previous conversations about who can ask who to do what. Would it make sense, Kim, saying yes to this and then just clarifying that by “contractors,” we mean PTI and the root zone maintainer? Make sense, just to be sure that everyone’s on the same page, or is that being over-prescriptive?

KIM DAVIES:

I think that works for me, for the avoidance of all doubt. Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. Without diving too much into the formalities, I understand that, yes, both are contractors to ICANN and they need to report to ICANN. If I

remember correctly, our message basically was that it shouldn't be imposed on the entities that eventually would have to execute on that but the entities should be made to talk to each other, which they, in practice, do voluntarily anyway. And the "with its contractors," can be read either way. That should be fine. But the point is, let the people who work on this in practice do the work and then find somebody to sign off on that, if I may say so.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Any other comments on that representation or approach?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Just to clarify, for this last one, we're going to say yes and then clarify that "with its contractors" does mean jointly together with PTI and RZM?

TIM APRIL: That was my thought.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. In that case, if we have a plan for all four recommendations, I can take the notes from this meeting and put together the clarifying comments and then put that out on the RZERC list for a one-week review before sending it back to ICANN Org. Peter, is that an old hand?

PETER KOCH: Apologies. It is.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I can put it out to the RZERC for a week-long review before sending it back to the ICANN Org. If there are no further comments or questions here, I think we can move on in the agenda.

TIM APRIL: Not seeing anything. Sounds good. Next up was onto a discussion of whether or not it would make sense to have, basically, an invited liaison from OCTO these calls like we had with Paul last week in a more formal capacity. This came out of a discussion, back when Duane and I were switching the chair. It had been considered in the past and there may have been this role designated long ago but it hasn't happened in a while. Wanted to get the opinions of the other members of the RZERC, if people think this would be valuable, helpful, or potentially cause issues. I'll open it up to anyone who has comments. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I asked RSSAC what are their thoughts on having someone from OCTO joining RZERC. I did not put the name of the liaison. I basically said a member or non-voting member. The response from RSSAC was that they do not see that necessary. If we need to invite them for discussion, like we had these discussions on clarifying things, it's possible to have that. It's not that RSSAC does not want OCTO to be part of the group at any time but my feeling is that RSSAC does not see it needed to have OCTO as part of RZERC.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, Daniel. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks. I think the exact topics that we discussed this and in the previous call show that the ad hoc addition works and is helpful. We also learned that there are multiple people in OCTO dealing with different RZERC inputs to the Board or advice to the Board. So on a working level, the system that we employ is fine and helps the committee improve the advice and obviously also helps, hopefully, the Board to better understand what we intended to say.

We might want to take this into consideration—maybe not we but whoever does the job—the charter review that is due, I think, in this next upcoming year or whatever. But other than that, I don't think the role of a liaison is necessary at this point in time. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thank you. Anyone else? Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I just expressed the RSSAC recommendations. But personally—so, that's my opinion or the question I'm wondering. I do see RZERC as an independent body from the Board because we need to provide them advices. So I do see OCTO very related to—at least supported by the same organization as the Board. So the question I'm asking is how much do we keep some sort of separation by having too many people from ICANN Org into the group?

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I think the question is almost best phrased in a slightly different way. If you take this mode of operation of RZERC as being one that creates recommendations to the Board of ICANN, where all aspects of the recommendation—and it's obviously a recommendation to either deliberately make a change or deliberately not to make a change in the light of some other pressure to do so—that the ICANN Board has an issue of who is it going to rely on?

Is it going to simply take RZERC's recommendation and implement it blindly? Or is it going to seek other commentary to make sure, as an independent decision-making body, that it has carefully considered these recommendations? In the second case, it would more than likely rely on OCTO, amongst others, for some independent commentary on what RZERC is recommending.

That then brings in this issue of whether RZERC operates in a collegiate mode, where all parties, as far as possible, have an input in these recommendations at the time they're being constructed, which leaves the ICANN Board in an interesting position, or whether, quite deliberately, it might consult with OCTO. But equally, OCTO has a degree of independence and it can be relied upon by the Board to provide an independent commentary from a particular perspective on the changes that RZERC is recommending. It's this kind of tension that sits behind what we're talking about here.

I personally think liaisons are good. Flow of information is good. Creating independent means of commentary doesn't necessarily lead to the best recommendations. And I think gathering input at the time you're thinking is always better than waiting. I think RZERC should quite deliberately strive to actually include as much as possible in its considerations before making these recommendations.

Whether it becomes a standing liaison or whether it becomes an invitation exercised regularly to gain commentary as needed is less of an issue. But to my mind, I think it makes more sense to have the folk working in this space be involved in these discussions as they are being discussed rather than leaving it for the Board to resolve at a later point.

So from that respect, I'm in favor of the idea of having someone from OCTO in this area of consideration. But I would defer to others who would go, "Let's not necessarily call it a liaison." But if that's the case, then I think we should remind ourselves frequently of the benefit in having an invited OCTO person to offer commentary on what we're considering, as and when required, as an alternative, which is not formally a liaison but it's certainly a gathering of input and data to help us reach a balanced and sensible position on these things. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: New hand or old hand, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: It's an old hand.

TIM APRIL: I fell somewhere in the middle of that. I think I'm mostly aligned with Geoff. I think it would be helpful to have them either invited frequently and often—in my opinion, before we actually publish a document, just so they can review it and give commentary before we publish it to make sure that—to try and address some of the recommendation discussions we had last time when Paul was here. But I can also understand the concerns of having too many representatives from ICANN. There are concerns around that. And I see Kaveh puts plus-one to Geoff. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Thank you, team. I think to go along the lines of what Geoff is suggesting, one way to operationalize it is to invite them as invited guests—like a standing invitation. The other one is what you suggested. Before a publication is to be given to ICANN Board, a courtesy to send it to them for them to provide some comment. So in that way, they view it from the perspective as, in my many cases, an impacted party because some of these recommendations would ask them to do something—so that they could provide those earlier input. I see those are two ways to engage without formally calling them a liaison. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just to clarify, my understanding of SSAC position is not that we should not talk to OCTO, and do our own things, and get over a huge process to communicate and so on. But my understanding of SSAC position is that

OCTO should not be a member. But I'm hearing that there is nothing against collaborating in an efficient way with OCTO. So sending documents as a courtesy or inviting them to meetings when needed, I would say, is clearly encouraged.

TIM APRIL: That reminds me. I missed the framing of it—of not necessarily having OCTO as a voting member of RZERC, which is to say invited guest, or frequent guest, or something like that, where they can come and give their opinions and take part in discussions with us.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah.

TIM APRIL: Any other comments on this topic? I'm interested to hear from the members that weren't able to make it today as well. So we'll hopefully get feedback from these, either on the list or next month. Okay. So I'm not seeing any other hands on that.

The final topic we had for this month was, as Peter was alluding to, [the math]. I was reading through all of the documents related to RZERC. The charter review is due at some point during this calendar year. I believe it was five years from the time the charter was created, was when the review is due.

Ahead of that, in talking with Duane about when the charter was originally created, there was a topic scoping exercise that we done to try

and gauge where the members of RZERC thought they believed the scope of RZERC's remit was. The proposal I had was to redo the same scoping exercise, possibly with adding a few new topics to it, just depending on how things have changed in the DNS ecosystem since the time of that last one. Duane has provided the list of topics that were in the survey the last time.

So I was going to work with Danielle to circulate that list of topics and then ask everyone to look over the topics and see if there are any others to add, things we should remove and whatnot. And then, once we've gone through the list of topics, the next step I would propose is to do something like the Google Form that was done the last time, where everyone can vote of whether they believe the topic in-scope, out of scope, or not sure.

And you can share that. My plan as to share that with my constituency of what my votes would be on all of them and then let people comment and try and convince me to change my selections on any of them. And then we can roll the results of that into the charter discussion and any revisions that we would like to do at that point. Any comments or questions on that proposed effort? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

For my various sins, which have been many in my life, I am the IAB's representative on the Root Server System Governance Working Group. It certainly seems that the discussion topics in that particular working group are potentially extremely relevant to this group, as indeed they are extremely relevant to any group with an interest in the root server

system as a whole because part of the current concentration of ICANN and the Board of ICANN, as the ultimate decision-making body on all matters of the root, certainly falls within the purview of consideration of the Root Server System Governance Working Group.

One view of that particular working group is that it's going to take another five years to come out with anything. And therefore, this group should proceed with the charter based on the status quo in the confident expectation that nothing is going to change for five years. But I think that would be a little bit unwise and complacent. I think we have to at least be aware that there is this work going on. And while it would be folly to presuppose any particular conclusion from that working group, if you have a look at their thinking—and their meetings are, indeed, on the record; their work is open—there certainly is some areas of potential impact in our work here.

One way is to regard the chartering or the rechartering as something that while it might be useful to happen every five years, might be reactive if everything else changes. That's a good way of looking at it. The other way is to look at the charter as a larger body of work, in which case, one would be well-advised to perhaps take some time with it and let some of these other activities—in particular the RSS GWG—come to a more mature understanding of where it is before rechartering this group.

I would certainly say I think rechartering shouldn't necessarily be driven by a five-year timetable. It's useful for us to consider the charter right now and some of the aspects we've thought about as to the role of recommendations. And the role of undertaking public comment and

broader interest on those recommendations should inform our charter, almost right now. And we should look at the charter with the light of the experience of RSSAC003, as being one of the informing actions here that might change some of our thinking in that charter. That's a good thing.

But I just wanted to highlight that there are other activities underway that would potentially have a more basic impact—a more fundamental impact—on this particular committee. And while it might not happen, it might happen as well. So we should at least be aware of that, if we don't necessarily incorporate it into our thinking of a revised charter. Thank you.

TIM APRIL:

Thanks, Geoff. Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

I just wanted to make an observation with respect to that scoping document, where a bunch of scenarios were listed and then everyone voted on which ones they thought would be in or out of scope. I don't have a particular opinion on it but I'll note that when this was devised, the RZERC, as it was composed at the time, felt that it was sensitive information and that document has not actually been published. So I would recommend that you put to RZERC whether that still needs to be kept confidential or whether that is free to be distributed prior to repeating that exercise, just so everyone's on the same page. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Indeed. Duane and I were discussing the confidentiality of that document and I can't recall exactly what his thought on it was. I'll have to check with Duane and get back to you.

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Tim, to provide some context, those documents are not sent to the RZERC list, which is publicly archived. It is sent to individual RZERC member's email address. So there are a few of these confidentiality procedures and that was used for that. I'm happy to dig those up again and share.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thank you, Steve. And thank you, Danielle, for the reminder. We're at the top of the hour. And Daniel just put his hand down. Knowing that, I'll try and circulate the list of the topics that were included in the last one to see if people can review it. I agree with Geoff. When I was looking at it earlier, the GWG changing things had me concerned about going through all of this now. But not knowing when GWG is going to do anything, we have a thing in the charter we have to review the charter every five years. Whether or not we actually change it is up for discussion.

I figure we need to get something going. And whether or not we do the process once the GWG comes to fruition or not, we may adjust accordingly. I think that's all we had for this month. Any other comments, questions? Not seeing any. Thank you all. Talk to you next month. Have a good rest of the ICANN week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]