
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, all, and welcome to the RZERC Monthly Teleconference, held on Tuesday, the 21st of July, 2020 at 19:00 UTC. Duane, would you like me to start the roll call?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, please. Let's take a roll call.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar, I note, is absent. We have recorded apologies from Kim Davies. From the SSAC, Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: Desperately searching for the mute button. Yes, I'm here. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From the RSAC, Brad Verd.

BRAD VERD: Yes. Present.

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

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.

JIM REID: Yes. I'm here.

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

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am. I'm here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From the CCNSO, Peter Koch, I note, is not on the call yet. And from Verisign, as the Root Zone Maintainer, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. This is Duane.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And then, from support staff, we have myself, Danielle Rutherford, and Steve Sheng. Duane, back over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks. So, thanks, everyone, for being here today. We have, probably, a pretty short agenda. We'll do the minutes. We'll talk about the two work items we've been talking about recently. Jim has asked for some AOB time, which I'm confident that we'll have. And then, we'll close.

So, Danielle shared the minutes from our June 16 meeting. If anyone has comments or concerns about the June meeting, please let us know. Otherwise, we'll approve those and have them posted on that RZERC website. Any comments about the minutes?

JIM REID: There's a typo.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh! Where do you see the typo?

JIM REID: One page two, there's the last decision, "recommendations regarding signing the root-sermers.net zone."

DUANE WESSELS: Ah! Okay. Thanks, Jim. I wonder if that's a real word that passed the dictionary test there.

JIM REID: I should have registered that domain just for fun and see what would happen.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks for catching that, Jim. So, if there's no other changes to the minutes, then we'll take those as approved and Danielle will post them on the website.

Okay. Moving on to the work items. Let's talk about these two documents that we've been talking about before. One of them is adding protections to root zone content. This is the ZONEMD draft. I will share my screen in a second here.

So, hopefully you see this. This is approximately a two-page document in Google Docs that I asked Danielle to put there so that we could have some group editing. There hasn't really been much commenting or suggesting on this document. There's a couple of little nitpicky things from myself on RFC 7706, which is now updated to 8806. And then, Steve has a suggestion here about the last paragraph.

I know maybe not everyone had a chance to visit the Google Doc. I know on our previous call, I think Peter said he wasn't able to use Google Docs. But I wanted to give everyone a chance to make some comments here or discuss this here on today's call. If there are no new proposed comments or changes, then the next step, I think, for this document would be to format it in a manner like a formal RZERC numbered document and proceed in that direction.

JIM REID: One small [nit], Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

JIM REID: On point two of your list, you're saying the IETF will consider the ZONEMD draft document. I think that really should be "the appropriate IETF working groups."

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: That was me that made that slight wording change, Jim. I think instructing the IETF to carefully consider a document is kind of presumptive. And I was making the point that there's IETF procedures and I'll just follow them to consider this draft. And whether it's the IETF and their procedures or the working group and the IESG, don't forget, who take it through, I actually think just simply saying the IETF will, basically, use their established procedures covers all of that. But if you think the working group should be mentioned, then yeah. Sure.

JIM REID: I don't really mind. As you say, Geoff, it's a bit presumptuous of us to say the IETF will or will not do something because I think, as we all know, the IETF's not exactly receptive to those kind of [orders]. So, I think we need to finesse that language a little bit.

DUANE WESSELS: Would it be better to say, "We expect the IETF to consider ..."

JIM REID: I think, "Expect the IETF to progress the document. We expect the IETF to progress the document." I'm sorry to be really fussy about this but I'm spending too much time in IETF ... [We're just adding] all sorts of stuff [inaudible] what the IETF will and will not do on behalf of the ITU. So, [inaudible] this right now.

DUANE WESSELS: Are you able to enter a comment or edit the text, Jim?

JIM REID: Not directly. I don't have the Google Docs right in front of me. But I think if we just say, "We expect the IETF to progress the ZONEMD draft document ..."

DUANE WESSELS: All right. I'm not sure who anonymous unicorn is but thank you for doing the typing there. It's not me.

GEOFF HUSTON: I am anonymous unicorn.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Geoff. Appreciate it. All right. This is good feedback. Anything else? I'm not looking at the hands. So, let me figure out where that went. Anything else to bring up in this section or elsewhere?

STEVE SHENG: Duane, I have one thing to add.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: So, we have four recommendations, right? And it seems after this, there is one step missing for it to actually get implemented. And that is if as a result of these four steps above there is no issues found, then maybe a recommendation for PTI and RZM to develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in their root zone. So, that concludes—as the last recommendation, concludes, as a concrete step, for the actual implementation.

So, let me quickly put the suggestions in here and see what people think. Yeah. So, that's what I propose to add, as a last step.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Steve. I think that's helpful. So, you have one through three here, intentionally omitting number four because that would not necessarily be a blocker for the final step. Is that right?

JIM REID: I think it's [inaudible], Duane, because let's face it. PTI and the Root Zone Maintainer can develop a plan. But if there's no deployed software for it, that plan isn't going to go anywhere.

DUANE WESSELS: Can you say more about that, Jim? You mean ... So, number four, maybe it's not clear enough. When I wrote that, I was thinking, in particular, of software that consumes zone files—so, like a recipient of the zone file.

JIM REID: How about if we just change Steve's text for five so it says, "results of the studies and concentrations in the above recommendations" and we don't bother numbering them?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: I must admit, I think it's kind of presumptive to wait for development, implementation, and deployment before you go and do the thing—the developing, and implementing, and deploying. You can't wait for something that's a consequence of your actions. And that's why four ... Oh. Okay. I can live with "above recommendations." But quite frankly, formally, you can't include four in there because four is consequential, not conditional.

JIM REID: Yeah. But [inaudible], Geoff. When recommendation five is saying "develop a plan," you can develop the plan at any particular point anybody wants. But the plan's not going to go into effect until all of the above four conditions have been met.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, but hang on. The fourth condition can't be met until it's out there, beyond the plan. The time when the DNS folks started cutting code well before we understood what we were doing, I think, is over. I think these days, most of the DNS vendors are way more conservative. And that's why I'm more in sympathy with either enumerating one through three or at least making it vague about consultations in the above recommendations. But beyond that, I think it's a little bit difficult to accept such a recommendation.

JIM REID: Or we could actually just do away with the whole condition here and just start it, "RZERC recommends." So, take point five. Delete from [f], all the way to "recommendation" and say, "RZERC recommends PTI and RZM develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in the root zone," not saying when that plan would be put into effect.

GEOFF HUSTON: That makes more sense to me because, certainly, it would be good if they, RZM and PTI, do develop a plan.

JIM REID: And they could start developing that plan right now.

GEOFF HUSTON: Based on the draft? Totally.

JIM REID: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. That works for me, too.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. Steve?

HOWARD ELAND: And that's specifically why I put in the little blurb about "no substantive changes." Obviously, if someone blows up the draft for whatever reason, then none of this is true, right. Or at least has to be re-evaluated and reconsidered. So, I think that's okay.

JIM REID: Just another point for RZERC, if and when that plan's developed, should that come back to RZERC for consideration.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know. Steve, what did you have in mind when you were thinking of this fifth recommendation for the plan?

STEVE SCHENG: I was thinking with it, we ask the Root Zoom Maintainer and the Server Arbiter to confirm that. Obviously, the ZONEMD draft is finalized. The

community is made aware. And then, the name servers are encouraged to implement. But it seems to me there is a step missing. Someone needs to hold the token to carry this to finish line. So, that was the reason I thought to add that. Let me think.

JIM REID: I think there are several people—there are several organizations—that will be holding different parts of that token, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Right. Exactly.

JIM REID: What I would suggest is that we recommend that the plan is put together by PTI and RZM and then that plan comes back to RZERC for consideration because, after all, RZERC is supposed to be having that kind of notion of a sanity check over significant changes to the root.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Okay.

HOWARD ELAND: So, given the sentence that I highlighted here as the anonymous jackelope, before the enumerated bullet, [where it] says, “subject to the following recommendations.” If we change five even further—not even say, “RZERC recommends ...” Just say one of the recommendations is that, “PTI, RZM to develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in the root

zone.” And if you want to add, “and reviewed by RZERC or what have you,” I guess we could debate that point. But you could add that at the end, should you so desire.

JIM REID: Yeah, and make that plan available to RZERC for review.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah.

STEVE SHENG: So, we'll just remove this. Is that what you're saying, Howard?

JIM REID: “Develop a plan to deploy [RZERC] in the root zone and make that plan available for review by RZERC.”

STEVE SHENG: Yep.

HOWARD ELAND: Yep. Because we're saying, “These are the recommendations.” We don't have to reiterate “recommendations.”

JIM REID: Yeah. Exactly how it's ... Yeah.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. I think that takes away that dependency that Geoff was mentioning.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. That's good. Thanks. I think this is a good list. We've focused on this section, the recommendations. I just want to make sure that people have a chance to comment on the text that's earlier, although that hasn't changed since the last time we looked at it.

JIM REID: Just one minor [nit] on point five. "PTI and RZM develop ..." Delete the word "to."

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Any more changes to propose here? Then, I assume that we're all in agreement that this will be published as a numbered RZERC document in the style of other numbered documents from other groups. Do we have any numbered documents already, Steve? I don't think we do, right? RZERC doesn't have any numbered ...?

STEVE SHENG: [inaudible] this one, we have a numbered document providing feedback on the KSK rollover.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh. That one got numbered? Okay.

STEVE SHENG: But this is a substantive one.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right. So, if there's no more discussion about this, then, as I said, the next step we'll maybe reformat this a little bit and put in some of the boilerplate for the numbered documents and then take it back to the group for another review.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Perhaps format it into a 48-hour review like the last call.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. And if any committee members would like to be a part of that process of editing the document into its next state, please let me know and we can have a group meeting. Otherwise, I figure it would just be myself, as chair, and a member of the staff working on it.

GEOFF HUSTON: Go for it, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. So, moving on to the agenda, then, the other thing that we can talk about today is the signing of root-servers.net. And as I said in my email message, we get lukewarm support for this, I think, within RZERC.

So, I would like us to decide whether or not this should turn into some sort of formal communication from RZERC—perhaps a letter from one group chair to another group chair. Or we just drop it and let the representatives bring it up directly with the respective groups.

Certainly, I think the latter is less work for us, if we just drop it within RZERC. But I'm still open to making it more formal—a formal ask or a semiformal ask from RZERC to SSAC and RSAC, for example. Thoughts?

JIM REID:

For what it's worth, Duane, I think we should take the path of least resistance here. I'm not too keen on RZERC initiating work. I think we should be more passive and responsive to the [questions][inaudible] for advice. I think that should be the general model.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I have a different view there. I actually think this is a useful study, insofar as it's a longstanding question and no one's quite sure what the right answer is. And I was thinking about who could do this work. And unfortunately, SSAC is not DNSSEC-heavy. Oddly enough, the one group which is DNSSEC-heavy and actually available to ask is ICANN's Office of the CTO. That group is a small and DNSSEC-heavy group, in terms of expertise. Particularly, I think Roy Arends was there from the start in DNSSEC design.

And I would have thought that it is within our sphere of influence to be able to pass this document—and whether it's a recommendation for

further research or discussion or a simple ask of OCTO—to actually say, “OCTO, could you study and report?”

And it’s quite fine that report would be public, given that this is a public question of many years standing, whether it’s worth the effort. And those are fine questions and OCTO is certainly resourced to either answer the questions on their own or even spin up advisory groups from the community under their [ages], much as the same as the KSK Design Team, if they wish to include others in their investigation.

So, I would actually put on the table that perhaps this could be passed—through whatever ICANN procedures are necessary—passed to OCTO to understand if OCTO is interested in supporting RZERC in this way.

JIM REID: It’s an idea, Geoff. I would have though the RSAC Caucus might have been a better place to work on this, possibly.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, it’s just that this is really detailed DNSSEC questions.

JIM REID: Yeah. Maybe another approach would be to poll these various other bits of the ICANN machinery and say, “Who do you think should be working on this? Who’s got the resources and capacity to do it?”

GEOFF HUSTON: That was where I started, Jim. And immediately, I thought there are a group in OCTO who work for ICANN, who actually have respect, understanding, and capability to answer these questions and, indeed, have processes that could well involve the interested community. Because I think, to some sense, it's actually more than RSAC.

Part of the issue about signing this is actually the workload you're imposing on validators. And so, it's not really a simple production problem but it's actually more of a consumption problem. Are you making life worse for users or not, if you did this? And that's why I would humbly suggest that OCTO is actually, I think, perhaps the best candidate here, to do this review, and research, and reporting.

JIM REID: Well, I'm not so sure. I think it may be a good idea to punt this to OCTO and say, "You figure it out," whether OCTO can actually do the work themselves, or more likely they try to assemble some kind of design team, or taskforce, or whatever to do the work, or maybe engage some contractors. I don't know. I'm not so sure I the OCTO group would be all that keen to take this on themselves, given all the other stuff that's going on right now.

HOWARD ELAND: So, I have two comments on that. One is if we do a true punt to them and OCTO decides, "This isn't work for us. It belongs in group x," let them feel free to go ahead and punt it wherever they like. I don't have a problem with that.

I do have a purely selfish reason for liking the punt to OCTO, as well. And that is there are ramifications for TLD operators and such down the line that are forced to sign—in the TLD counterparts, the zones for the [other side]. So, Because ICANN has mandated it that far, should OCTO go ahead and say, “Well, we really don’t need this for the root because it’s really not that important?” Then, I could see TLD operators saying, “Wow. It’s probably not important for us, either. So, we can remove that requirement, right, ICANN?”

So, that’s totally an aside and it’s probably more personal than anything else, or certainly a different hat. But I think those ramifications are also another reason why OCTO may be the best point of first punt, if you will.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Howard. I think that’s good to know. Maybe is this something that you would be willing to discuss more broadly with GNSO? You said it’s a selfish concern but maybe it’s not just you. Maybe it’s a lot of other entities, also.

HOWARD ELAND:

Yeah. I’ll take it up with my group. Again, I don’t necessarily know if I want to try and get my group’s consensus on where is the best place to punt. But certainly, a question of, “Do you think this is worth us investigating further or asking ICANN to move someplace else?” I think might be okay.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Steve, I guess I have a process question for you. Does it make any sense that a group like RZERC can ask a group like OCTO to do work or would it have to be more general—like some kind of request to the Board—to have the work done and maybe hint that OCTO would be a good place? How do you see that working?

STEVE SHENG: I think instead of in the recommendation ... First of all, I think it's within RZERC's remit to recommend ICANN do some work. So, I would not be so prescriptive in saying, "OCTO," but saying, "ICANN Org," And this will be advice to the Board. And the Board will then direct the Org to do the right thing. And the right group would probably be OCTO. So, if the group decides that path, that would be what I would recommend.

The other thing is, as a courtesy, you want to socialize this with David Conrad before [the draft is] finalized, as a courtesy to know this is coming. So, I think those are the ... Did I answer your question?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: So then, I would go back to Geoff. Geoff, this was your idea to go to OCTO. Would you be okay just making a request of the Board more generally?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, I think that the concept of first informally passing this through David Conrad, going, "If we went to the Board with this recommendation, would OCTO be interested in doing this work?" and if the answer is, "Well, it's up to the Board but yes," then it becomes easy to then pass it the Board on the principle of no surprises.

If David comes out with, "Under no circumstances. This is a demonic recommendation and I don't want to touch it," I think we might then want to take a step back and think, "If we put it the Board, what would happen," and rethink the strategy.

But I understand it's certainly some value in firstly, informally approaching David and doing that circle, going, "Is this something OCTO would view as being interesting work and wish to do? And if we sent it to the Board, would you be available for the Board to do it?" would be a good question.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm supportive of it in general.

BRAD VERD: I would add that [inaudible]. I'm supportive of it. I would add that with RSAC, we've gone to OCTO numerous times via the recommendation of the Board, also. So, I think it's just about however David responds.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, Jim and Howard, are you comfortable with myself or staff reaching out to the OCTO group and taking their temperature on this and then we'll talk about it at a subsequent meeting?

JIM REID: Yeah. I'm fine.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. That's fine for me.

JIM REID: [inaudible].

HOWARD ELAND: I'll refrain from bringing something to my group on this until we find out what the informal advice is.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

HOWARD ELAND: There's no sense having people raise pitchforks at nothing.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Okay. I think that covers that topic, then, unless there's anything else from someone. So, we've got a lot of time, still, in our scheduled slot here. And Jim had an AOB item to bring up. Jim?

JIM REID: Yeah. Thanks very much, Duane. This is almost certainly my last RZERC meeting. So, I'd like to say thanks to everybody. It's been an interesting experience. And I've enjoyed it and I've enjoyed working with you. My term as the IETF IAB representative is up. It's a four-year term. And the IAB is in process of now selecting my replacement.

I expect an announcement of that to be made at the plenary at next week's IETF meeting. It's a week tomorrow, in fact. There's still time to comment and [two] candidates to be [approved], Fred Baker and Warren Kumari. But I expect my replacement to be announced week. And they will then take over from then on. So, with that, so long, goodbye, and thanks for all the fish.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you very much, Jim, I knew your term was close but I didn't actually realize this would be your last meeting. So, thank you for bringing it up because I probably wouldn't have realized it.

JIM REID: Not to worry, Duane.

BRAD VERD: Thanks for your service.

JIM REID: Cheers, guys!

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you, Jim.

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks, Jim.

DUANE WESSELS: I guess it's kind of crazy because that means it's been four years, hasn't it, Jim?

JIM REID: Yeah. Doesn't time fly?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. All right, well that's good. All right. Any last things to discuss before we adjourn? Okay. Thank you all. Thank you, Jim. And we'll look

forward to finishing some of this work on the list and at our next meetings.

BRAD VERD: Thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, all.

DUANE WESSELS: Bye, everyone.

HOWARD ELAND: Bye, all.

[STEVE SHENG:] Thanks. Bye.

JIM REID: Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]