

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, everyone, for joining us. This is the RZERC monthly teleconference held on Tuesday, 16 June 2020. Duane, over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Welcome, everyone. Thanks for joining today. We'll do a quick roll call. Danielle, you can go ahead and do the roll call, please.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: For ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar. I'll note Kaveh is on the call. I don't know if he is having some microphone issues.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hello. Hi, yes, I'm here. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Ah, perfect. Thank you. PTI, Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: SSAC, Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: Awake.

---

*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: RSSAC, Brad Verd.

BRAD VERD: Yes, yes.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ASO, Carlos Martinez, I note is not on the call. IETF, Jim Reid.

JIM REID: Yeah, but I'm asleep, unlike Geoff.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Registries Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland, I note is not on the call. ccNSO, Peter Koch.

PETER KOCH: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And Root Zone Maintainer, Verisign, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep, Duane is here.

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, so we have a relatively short agenda today. You have it on the screen in front of you and we sent an email. Anyone have proposed changes to the agenda before we proceed? Okay, it doesn't seem like it?

So the first thing to do is to approve the minutes from our May 19 meeting. Hopefully, you've had a chance to see those. I made a couple of corrections from the draft which I think were corrected before they went out to the group, so my corrections are in there. Geoff, your hand is up.

GEOFF HUSTON: It is. You did the any other agenda items too quickly for my sleepy state. I'd actually like to add one item which at this point is a small item about the Root Server [System] Governance Working Group and its interaction with this group. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. We'll add that, and there should be time for that. Okay, so back to the minutes. Anyone have comments on the minutes, questions, or discussion? Any reason that they should not be approved at this time? They're up on the screen there. Okay, not hearing any, so I think we can take the minutes as approved. And Danielle will post them to the website shortly after today's meeting.

---

I wanted to go again through some of the things that we talked about last week. I sent you some updated PDFs of the two things we talked about: the root zone protections and signing root-servers.net. I'm going to try to share those with you right now from my screen.

The document I sent you, this PDF and what you see right now, is sort of similar to the one that you saw last month, last meeting, especially at the start, but it has changed in tone. Whereas, the previous one was phrased as sort of a request for work, this one contains some recommendations which capture our discussion from last month.

I took the liberty of writing this up based on the transcript from last month, but I just want to be clear that you should consider this a strawman proposal. I wanted to get the committee's feeling on if this is the kind of document that RZERC may want to publish as a document or a report or something like that.

If we are to proceed with this, then I would suggest that this document go into a Google document that we can all edit and make suggestions on. Does that sound okay with everyone? I lost my window where I can see everyone's hands. Participants. Peter, you have your hand up.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thank you. I think you taking the liberty of changing that perspective is well done. Regarding the editing process, I am Google abstinent, so it would be great if we had other opportunities to get there. I'm [going to] use it; I'm not going to have a Google account to work on it. But other than that, I'm willing to contribute.

---

More on a perspective, I think this is very much written with an engineering background, engineering target audience. I think in a later stage, we might want to add a bit of explanations here and there. But that shouldn't stop the main work if this is going forward. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Yeah, with respect to Google, I suggested that because that's, I guess, how I'm familiar with working with other groups. But if there are other ways or even if you wanted to send Word documents or whatever you're comfortable with, I'm sure we can accommodate that. Thanks. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I see the recommendations at the end of this, and I [inaudible] should say this is a great document and should proceed. There are, however, some small [nits] about this.

I'm not sure the IETF ever "casually" considers any document these days. It's careful to the point of obsession irrespective, so you might just want to say the IETF might want to consider. Or in fact, you might even say when this becomes an RFC, because you note the publication as an RFC is a prerequisite for adding it to the zone. I think it's also a prerequisite for Steps 3 and 4.

If it doesn't get published as we envisage it by the IETF, the consequent steps kind of fall into a gray space. Because I think all of this is contingent on it being accepted as the standard, including the issue of a new resource record in the root, how is it signed, etc., which I actually

---

believe the IETF would address as part of that process of draft to RFC. So in some ways we need to consider Steps 3 and 4 as being contingent on the outcome of Step 2. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

All right, I hear what you're saying. I guess my thinking was that these kind of go hand-in-hand in some sense because, as we talked about last [month], it would be important to get broader feedback from the technical community at some of these conferences and whatnot. But are you really saying you think that 3 and 4 should not happen until RFC status is granted?

GEOFF HUSTON:

That's a really interesting question about 3; 4 I would certainly say nameserver folk after DNS [inaudible] are wary about any changes and, quite frankly, I think it's contingent on whoever is proposing changes to get it out as an RFC to sift good from kite flying.

3? I don't know. The IETF resists [barracking] from the sidelines, and I'm just not sure about how to alert the technical community to the progress of a draft that they might have an interest in versus saying you should join DNSOP and cheer loudly at the appropriate times. The former is good; the latter is a little bit [off] to one side. So I'm not quite sure how to handle it, Duane.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay, but regardless what I'm hearing from you is that this list of recommendations should somehow capture these thoughts that these things have to go in order and be thought about carefully.

GEOFF HUSTON:                    Totally. I think it's a great document on the whole and, yes, I'm absolutely with you. It's good. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay, thanks. Peter?

PETER KOCH:                        Yeah, thanks. I had re-raised my hand because I had deliberately not gone into the substance of the document. I think there are some things that we still need to discuss, so it's not ready to go. Like publication as an RFC is a prerequisite, that's something that needs a reference, I believe. And then we should talk about whether an RFC is the thing we are looking for or the standard status or whatever, but that probably can be deferred.

That said, I have no doubts that DNSOP, if that haven't, that DNSOP is going to adopt the document because there are no orphans anywhere near the DNSOP working group. Everything is adopted. The question is actually to get real operators to look into this and more real operators than those that are usually in the vicinity of DNSOP, and that's an important thing.

---

Yeah, and the rest, I guess, is something that we should chew on in subsequent sessions. One thing to add maybe to the recommendations is buying the problem statement and making an assessment there. That is taken for granted or is just taken out of the current Internet draft, but maybe when we propose a solution or make recommendations we should have our own wording of the problem statement. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thanks, Peter. Just so everyone knows—I guess I sort of glossed over this—the Internet draft is, of course, adopted by the working group and it has completed working group last call and the chair marked it as having consensus. So the next step, I guess, would be IETF last call for the document. Jim?

JIM REID:

Thanks, Duane. A couple points. I think something needs to be added at Step 1.5. [We have probably some statement] from root server operators that they have software that supports [inaudible]. I'm thinking particularly about the case of [inaudible] because they outsource or they have something [inaudible]. And so the F-root server is not completely covered by [inaudible] as part of the [inaudible]'s control.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, part of that is covered by Step 4, I believe. I mean, that's the part that asks implementers to add this to their....



---

JIM REID: No, no, no. That's a completely separate thing, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, I misunderstood. Sorry.

JIM REID: What we need to have is a statement from the root server operators that, yes, they are ready and able to support ZONEMD irrespective of implementation they choose to use.

DUANE WESSELS: Isn't that captured in Number 1 sufficiently? It says root server operators should verify and confirm the addition of the resource...?

JIM REID: [inaudible] It doesn't say they're going to implement it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so you want from them some kind of promise that they would deploy it once it's available.

JIM REID: Yeah. I think if we [inaudible] DNSSEC deployment, that statement should be so that it's said the root server operators are collectively saying that, yes, they are willing and able to support [a signed] root zone.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay, that's helpful. Thank you. Brad?

BRAD VERD:                       Yeah, Jim, I think getting that from the root operators shouldn't be that hard. But I find it interesting that it would be a prerequisite or even, I don't know, even a requirement. Because a lot of this is in support of hyper local and the root going everywhere, and we're not going to demand that from resolvers or anybody else. So it's just something to think about, I guess.

JIM REID:                         Well, yeah, I understand that, Brad. But I think this is a case of being able to eat your own dog food, if I can put it that way. If it's not [inaudible] for the root server operators, why should [anybody else do it]? [inaudible] or whatever.

BRAD VERD:                       Yeah, I mean, I think getting it from the roots is very easy. I think that will happen without issue.

JIM REID:                         As I say, I think the immediate concern I think [inaudible] if there are [any other] root server operators that are using for want of a better term commercial DNS service providers to back up their offering, are

---

those commercial partners in a position to fully support ZONEMD or not?

DUANE WESSELS: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I think there's a distinction between serving the ZONEMD resource record and serving AXFR. As we're aware, not every root service letter constellation actually supports AXFR and we're okay with that collectively as a community.

I, I must admit, had the expectation that if a resource record in the root is an RFC, it is incumbent on the root server operators to support such a resource record in terms of publication and dissemination, answer queries for it. So I would have thought the addition of a single word in 1, verify and confirm that addition will in no way negatively impact and that they are able to support this additional resource record, as a caveat on 1 would be enough.

We're not asking everyone to do AXFR or anything else. It's just that resource record. And I don't think the commercial arrangements that E and F, is it? There's one other one did an arrangement with a [inaudible] operator as well. I'm not sure that's any of our business. It's incumbent on these operators to serve what's in the zone. If that ZONEMD is legitimately in the zone, we should ensure that they can serve it, but the obligation is on them to actually serve it once it's an RFC, in my view. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Did you want to respond, Jim?

JIM REID: No. I think Geoff's point is well made. I just think we need to say something more than just saying the additional resource record wouldn't negatively impact the [inaudible] of the root zone.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I was just going to add that maybe supporting the record type is a bit of an ambiguous wording. That should be the case by RFC 3597 that the [inaudible] transparency. I'm wondering whether for full support of the semantics there is anything else needed. I think maybe that was what Geoff was referring to in terms of doing the AXFR and delivering that signature [slash] message [digest].

GEOFF HUSTON: Let me respond in saying in no way was I reading this document as saying that all root servers letter constellations should support AXFR in all instances. I'm not saying that, and I don't believe this document is saying that. It's simply if you're asked for ZONEMD record, you should answer it according to the RFC [to be]. Thanks.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay. This discussion has been good for me. It sounds like people are interested in progressing with this. So my plan will be to send this over to Danielle. She can create a Google document or otherwise figure out some way to manage group edits. And then as a group we can propose changes that we'd like to see, nitpicky things or even non-nitpicky things, and keep iterating on this. Does that sound like a reasonable plan forward?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:            Yep.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay. So then let's move on to the other one if I can find it here. Okay, so the other thing that we had talked about last month was signing the root-servers.net zone. Again, what you have before you is derived from that previous document.

Here the recommendations are slightly different. Mostly the recommendations here are asking questions, asking maybe for other groups to do work to address some of these questions. I would say it's not as certain that something like signing the root-servers.net zone would proceed. There are lot of things still to be answered here.

These recommendations don't task any group in particular. They're just sort of open questions. Although, I think one does maybe mention RSSAC. But if this committee thinks that certain groups may be best tasked with answering some of these questions, we could certainly add that.

---

Again, if the committee thinks that this should proceed in some form similar to what it is, then I would say let's put it into a group edit doc and hack away at it. Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Oh, it's an old hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

PETER KOCH: But still I can say a few words. I think the discussion is interesting and important. I'm not sure that we [are] not duplicating things. I believe that has been dealt with in RSSAC, and then most of you will be able to tell me. At the moment, I'm not sure that RZERC should be viewed as considering the status quo a problem. I don't think we're there yet. So that would suggest that these [research] questions be phrased maybe even more carefully than they are.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, I think that's fair. I agree that to the extent that this is a problem is sort of tricky. This question of whether this zone should be signed does continue to come up in various other groups from time to time. But, yeah, whether or not it's really a problem is an open question. Jim?

---

JIM REID: Thanks, Duane. I'm still not quite convinced about this. Yes, I think it's probably a good idea [on balance] [inaudible] signed, but in all honestly should we as RZERC not be thinking about getting rid of the zone completely. Why can't we put address records for the root servers in the root zone itself? Then this whole problem goes away.

DUANE WESSELS: That is kind of what Number 5 here addresses. The background is that did investigate that. There was an RSSAC caucus work party that investigated that maybe two or three years ago now and decided not to recommend any changes. So Number 5 here says, do we want to reconsider this again? Because that would certainly be a solution to the problem.

JIM REID: Maybe part of this analysis may be to just sort of compare and contrast between the two approaches. Maybe there are other approaches as well for all I know.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So in general, I'm sensing hesitancy about this document or this concept. If the committee thinks that it should be dropped, that's fine with me as well if we come to that conclusion. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm not in favor of dropping the concept. I think this is important to understand deliberately why we have or have not signed these names.

---

And I can certainly see cases for and against it. So I'm not ready to drop the conversation. I suppose the question in my head is to what extent can resources and attention be brought to this topic, and is RZERC the right place? As you mentioned previously, RSSAC has visited aspects of this in a work party in the past. Does RSSAC have more resources than this relatively small work party? Would that be a place to refer this question? Are the resources of something like OCTO in ICANN a resource that could investigate this further?

It's not a case of guessing what the answer might be, but you've enumerated five incredibly valuable questions. And I think they're the right questions and they're responsible questions. The next step is to understand who and how could we research this to understand the parameters of answers. What are the issues around this?

The who becomes a really big issue because I'm not sure RZERC commands a huge amount of resources in and of itself. And where would it tap to also engage in this becomes the question for me. Not willing to drop it, but just not sure how to take it further. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I think it was pretty clear from our previous meeting that we felt that we [RZERC] did not have the resources or even the mandate to do this work ourselves and that it was best done elsewhere. So I guess one of the open questions before us is, if we just put these questions out into the universe, is that sufficient? Or do we need to direct them at maybe more specific groups who might take on the work? Jim?



---

JIM REID: Thanks, Duane. Well, where did this request come from? Were we asked to look into this problem?

DUANE WESSELS: I can answer that, I think. Obviously, this was looked at in RSSAC. I believe that also it has been a topic of discussion within SSAC. From time to time RSSAC will meet with SSAC, and I was in some of those meetings where I think it came up.

The reason that it came to RZERC within the last few months is because at Verisign we thought, well, maybe this is a good idea. Let's see if we can actually make progress on this and bring it to RZERC and see if they support it. Does that answer what you wanted to know?

JIM REID: Kind of, Duane, but I'm still a bit puzzled. I think what would you want as a response from RZERC going back to, in this case, Verisign? I think we all agree that getting [this signed] one way or another is probably a very good thing. There's a lot to be done, and Geoff has identified that work is probably best done elsewhere, not in this [inaudible] committee. But it's still not clear what kind of output at this stage is required from us because it's not really clear to me what the input was or the motivation for it.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. I'm going to let Brad take a first step at answering, I think, and I can also provide more of [background on this] [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: The only thing I wanted to add is just a little background. But I think there are a few RSOs that have pushed pretty heavily for this in the past. Some of the operators, and specifically I think it was the M operator WIDE, had some concern about some indirection attack via .net. Since root-servers.net wasn't signed, then that [was] a problem. But I think there was a corner case there.

Anyway, there are a number of—or I'll just say a handful of root server operators that bring this up periodically, so I think that's where maybe some of the community is coming in. And maybe Duane saying that Verisign was interested in this, we're kind of channeling what we're hearing from [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I would further say that we're hearing these questions. And, again, Verisign wants to be responsive to the community's needs here. So if there's a lot of support for this from the community, whether that's RZERC or RSSAC or whatever, we want to make that happen. At this point, I feel like everyone is sort of on the fence, and Verisign needs some direction whether or not to pursue this. Brad, is your hand up again, or is that old? Maybe Peter is next?

BRAD VERD: Sorry, that's old.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. So I think what we might want to consider is given some operators had probably bad feelings—maybe a bad word—would like to err on the side of caution. That’s how I interpret these contributions.

In the end, the ideal would be, in some people’s minds at least, that every zone is signed. In that case, would root-servers.net still be special? [Would we] ask, could it be signed explicitly? That’s one point.

The other is, what exactly is the problem that we’re trying to solve? What I’m hearing is that is probably a bit less the DNSSEC question but rather the dependency question that goes back to both what Question Number 5 and Jim said and the discussion that was referred to in, I believe it was, RSSAC again with the .net domain in between and so on and so forth and what the consequences are. So there’s a bit more work maybe to invest in the actual problem statement.

And what I think is important is people look at the root zone, for better or worse, as an example. Now if this is going to be changed for the root zone or explicitly recommended for increased security, what would that mean for operators of TLD zones or operators of other zones? At least the larger ones. Maybe we could have that in mind even if that’s a recommendation explicitly for the root zone.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep, that’s good input. Thank you. Jim?

JIM REID: Thanks again. Peter has made quite a few of the points I wanted to make. I think [inaudible] expectations about this idea [inaudible]. To go back to what we said before, [inaudible]. So at this stage, my inclination [inaudible] in principle this sounds like a good idea, getting the root zone signed. So getting the root-servers.net zone signed is in principle a good idea. But until someone comes up with a concrete proposal [including an understanding] of the use case and requirements, there's nothing for us to consider. And [leapfrog] to somebody else [inaudible] input as to [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: All right, thank you. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: The priming query and its behavior was subject to a lot of study on the KSK roll.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

GEOFF HUSTON: And this is actually the same question. If we had ubiquitous DNSSEC signing, I think this question would come up in the negative sense. That the question would be, oh my God, this priming query answer so [inaudible] because of the [attached] signatures. Maybe it should be

---

unsigned. So the question is important whether it's an outlier to be signed or an outlier to be unsigned because of the priming query. It's nothing to do with the zone. It's everything to do with the viability of the priming query.

So who has explored the priming query in detail in the past? SSAC weighed in I think twice in the KSK roll and applied a certain amount of rigor to their investigation of this. Basically, looking at the viability of the KSK roll, the key sizes, etc. And the other folk that looked at this very hard was this ad hoc KSK design team that ICANN formed.

I suspect that this is the same kind of question. Now I don't think we should sit on the fence. I think a problem deferred is still a problem, and it would be better if we had some momentum on this. But trying to find the right folk to work with or to take this on as a set of basically research questions is really the key. And whether it's a design team, whether it's SSAC which I'd be a little bit more dubious of but it's an option, whether it's RSSAC, the question is still there.

And like I said, it's not the zone. It's really the dynamics of the priming query that is the critical question here. So I'm not a fence-sitter. I'm all in favor of this, oddly enough, but I think it needs just a little bit more understanding of the role of the priming query and its viability. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Would it be helpful to, as a first step I guess, to have some kind of community consensus if that's possible? Some kind of agreement on whether or not the names of the root servers should have signatures

---

regardless of where they live. I guess, is it helpful to break this down into smaller steps and proceed in that way? Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, I think that is slightly the wrong question because it tends toward a yes/no, but both sides might have very different reasons. Because the yes response could be because people think, yes, every name should be signed. And then, of course, it depends on the current naming structure. So I think that as much as I'd like to come up with an easy yes/no question, I think the situation is a bit more complex and needs that thorough thought.

When it comes to finding out who to work with or who to suggest, I mean, RZERC doesn't have a budget to conduct studies and that's probably by design. But the task is by the charter make sure that everybody who should be involved has been involved.

And I believe we could come up at a more abstract level without naming explicit acronyms but asking for certain expertise that should look into this be that research or operators or vendors or some other groups within ICANN and then throw it over the fence to, yeah, probably the ICANN Board or the ACs and SOs within ICANN to find money if the support is necessary or volunteers and the right groups or collective of groups that can address these things, the questions.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Peter. I'm a little bit unsure about exactly how to proceed on this. If anyone has concrete suggestions for whether we, I guess,

---

continue by tweaking the current document and, I guess as I said, throwing it over the fence maybe to the Board, is that a good plan? Or do we need to take a step back and reformulate the whole thing? I would appreciate that input at this time. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

An informal [inaudible] input and one that might be [inaudible] would be to send this document almost as-is to Rod Rasmussen, the chair of SSAC, noting that SSAC has done considerable work in the past on the priming query and is this a topic that these questions might be of interest for an SSAC study and phrase it in that way. And if they bite, they're got budget, they've got resources. They can certainly co-opt folk, and in theory they have the capability of doing a reasonable job at understanding the parameters of the questions you've outlined here. Maybe that's a way through.

It's not the only way, of course, but just simply passing that to Rod as does SSAC believe that there is some merit in this. Because they've been DNSSEC fans for years, and in the ICANN ecosystem SSAC has been strongly advocating DNSSEC for a long time. So I proffer that as one option, not necessarily exclusive of others, but it certainly is an option.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thanks. That's a good idea. Does anyone have some initial reactions to that if we shop this around a little bit to SSAC or maybe other folks? Peter?

---

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I think for two reasons at least copying it to the other ACs and SOs might be useful because one of our tasks is making sure that all the community understands what's being worked on or what's being considered. And also, in that model RZERC is not really a Board committee, so who is the one steering us? And my best approximation would be—don't cry—the Empowered Community, but implementation-wise it's probably the ACs and SOs leadership. So getting it there distributed amongst the ICANN community gives a bit of a chance to getting it to the technical folk there. And definitely SSAC will be receiving this, and if there's any side communication that I'm sure the liaison will convey, then they also know how to explicitly [read] that. But that's distributed a bit broader.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. Jim?

JIM REID: Just [inaudible] the RSSAC caucus be involved somehow or should [they] be involved in the discussion?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I think so because certainly RSSAC, as we said, looked at this before. So I think it's certainly within their purview. I might even imagine, sort of putting Brad on the spot a little bit, but maybe a joint RSSAC/SSAC thing or some sort of cooperative thing where we have multiple groups coming together would be a really good [inaudible].



---

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I was just waiting for the conversation to go. But, yeah, [if there's] something that RSSAC could clearly take up again and maybe should and maybe we do it in conjunction with SSAC.

JIM REID: I think you misheard me. I mentioned the RSSAC caucus.

BRAD VERD: Well, but in order to engage the RSSAC caucus, the RSSAC would have to take it up as a work item.

JIM REID: Fair enough, Brad, yep.

BRAD VERD: Yep. But, yeah, I mean, if RSSAC took it up as a work item, which I don't see why they wouldn't, certainly that would go straight to the caucus so, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, thanks for the discussion, everyone. This has been helpful. Any last comments on this before we move on to AOB or other agenda items?

Okay, so if Danielle can put the agenda back up, I think the only thing left then is to talk about Geoff's proposed topic about the Root Server

---

[System] Governance Working Group. Geoff, you want to go ahead on that?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, thanks, Duane. This is more of a heads up than anything else. But the point for, I suppose, members of this group to note is that the Root Server [System] Governance Working Group has now commenced work in earnest and are looking at various models that are permutations and forms of RSSAC037 and I think 038, looking at the longer-term foundation of the root servers system and how it sits within various ecosystems out there.

This group is undoubtedly an affected stakeholder one way or another, and I just simply wanted to put in a heads up that either that group might approach this group for comments. They've certainly approached other folk. Or this group might want to consider any working drafts that come out when they are prepared and make some comment as to the roll of this group in considering evolutionary aspects of the root zone and the way that would be integrated within the proposed models coming out.

So no actions at this point but simply to note there is some parallel activity going on about the evolution of the structure in which we sit that might affect the way in which this group works in the future. That was all. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Geoff. Jim, comments?

JIM REID: Quick clarification, Geoff? What would be the mechanism for this [inaudible] party to interact [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: I notice that the chair of the governance working group, Ted Hardie, has certainly solicited input in various [cases] from others and alerted them to the process. I believe that folk have talked to the ASO in the past. So in some ways it would go through the chair in a more formal process if input is solicited. The standard ICANN rules also apply insofar as when and if—and certainly I think it's a when, not an if—draft documents get pushed out by this group RZERC should be in a position to at least look at it, review it, and pass any comments back as they see fit. So there may be a request for some interaction presence at one of these meetings and a briefing. I am not sure that will necessarily happen, but certainly there will be the opportunity to comment and that's really what I wanted to highlight here. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks, Geoff. Oh, Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: Just to add to that, I think there are four or five people on the GWG that are on this group also.

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, it shouldn't be a surprise, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, so hopefully none of us feel too awkward about raising issues that we see in one group or the other. It should be fine.

Okay, any remaining comments? I guess we're at the end of the agenda. We do have ten or so minutes if we need it. Otherwise, we can end up early. Any news from staff or anything we need to worry about, Danielle? Is Steve on the call too? I see Steve in the chat. Hi, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: I'm here. Duane, on the naming scheme draft, I think one way to understand is joint SSAC or RSSAC caucus working group like a study team. So that's certainly one way. The other thing is I would encourage you to think about what kind of research resources and capacities are needed. So in conjunction to those groups setting up, perhaps you can make a request to ICANN to provide some resources to facilitate the study and conclusion of those study teams. So I think that's another something parallel with a study team. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's a good idea. I think based on our earlier discussion about this, I think it's pretty clear that nobody really wants RZERC to be

---

overseeing the work, I guess. We want the work to happen elsewhere. So I guess in our requests we need to be clear that we would request some kind of study group, perhaps a joint RSSAC-SSAC thing, and we would like them to manage it as they do their other groups.

STEVE SHENG:                      Okay, thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:                 All right, well, if there's nothing else, then we'll call the meeting to a close. Thank you, everyone, for your time today.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**