
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello all and welcome to the December RZERC Teleconference, held on the 15th of December, 2020. Duane, would you like me to get started with the roll call?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, please.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: From ICANN board, Kaveh Ranjbar.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: PTI, Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: SSAC, Geoff Huston.

GEOFF HUSTON: 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: RSSAC, Daniel Migault.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ASO, Carlos Martinez I note is not on the call at this time. IETF, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Registries Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland.

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

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Carlos Martinez has just entered the room. ccNSO, Peter Koch, I believe is not on the call yet. And from Verisign as a Root Zone Maintainer, Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And then from staff, myself, Danielle Rutherford is present. And I note that Carlos Martinez has just joined the call. Back over to you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you, Danielle. So, hopefully, this can be a very short meeting today. After we approve the minutes, I just want to talk briefly about the two work items and then adjourn for the day and for the year. So, the minutes, our last minutes are from October. We skipped the November meeting. So, does anyone have any comments about the minutes? Okay, so let's take the minutes as approved and Danielle will get those on the website as soon as possible.

All right. So, we still have these two documents, these two work items which in my opinion are very, very close to being complete. And I'd like to wrap things up. First, the document on signing the root zone name server data, where we left this, well, so first of all, I guess Tim mentioned before the meeting that he'd just gone through—did a pass and made a few edits for readability which I looked at and they seemed good. So, thank you, Tim.

Other than that, I think where we left this off was, we wanted to decide if the RZERC wanted a chance to share this document as a draft with its constituents before we publish it as an RZERC document. So, I'm assuming that that's something that we would like to do. And if that assumption is true, then I would suggest that we vote on that or decide to do that today and then give the committee members the next month or so to share it with our constituents and at our next meeting which

should be in January, we can hopefully finalize it. Does that sound like a reasonable plan to folks? Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

It's almost in the point of order category, Duane. But I actually don't quite understand to what degree my role on this committee is bound by confidentiality otherwise. I'm like, do I need explicit permission to brief RZERC on what we're doing or is this an expected thing that I would normally brief them? And I appreciate calling out this document saying, go ask your constituency. But in the normal course of events, do I have some constraint or am I capable of consulting SSAC at any point? I actually don't understand—maybe it's my ignorance—what constraint I work under in this committee.

DUANE WESSELS:

Sure. I appreciate the question, Geoff, because I think you replaced Russ on the committee and some of this stuff was discussed very early on when the committee was just getting started. So, just in case you don't know, the charter of the committee is that it works transparently so its mailing list archive is open.

So, anything that is posted to the mailing list as a topic, it's essentially public information. You can consider bringing that information to SSAC. The recordings are available of course on the ICANN website, under the RZERC Group shortly after they happen. And the minutes, as you know, are published there also about they take a little bit longer.

The only thing that sometimes we're a little bit—I don't want to say—secretive is not the right word but sometimes when we are at the beginnings of editing our documents, we may not share the Google doc URLs.

So, even though the discussions in the mailing list is public, the actual content of some of the documents may not be public at the start. But at this point for these particular documents, I'll note that those Google doc URLs have been included in the emails and they're on the mailing list archive. People can find them. So, I would say you should feel free to talk to your committee about these at any time now.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks for the clarification, Duane. Most helpful.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think, based on some of our previous discussions, I know Daniel Migault in particular, I think wanted a chance to convey this to RSAC and maybe some others did as well. I'm not sure everyone felt the need to do that. But it seems like a reasonable thing to do to me and I would just like to start that process if the committee agrees.

GEOFF HUSTON: I agree.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Geoff. And I see Howard's got a yes indicator in the participant list, so thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Kaveh speaking, same here. I agree.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks Kaveh. So, I don't have edit permission on this document. So, I will ask Steve and/or Danielle to—and I'd be happy to join either of you on a call if you'd like. But I think for the most part, you should accept the pending suggestions from myself and Tim and then we can maybe save it as PDF and send it out to the committee so that you can share it with constituents.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can take care of that, Duane, and send it to the list later today.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right. And then, in our next meeting which should take place in January, we can discuss any feedback that you've received from the constituents. So, Howard is raising a question of the document numbering. I would say let's leave it unnumbered at this point, I think, and then we'll give it a number when it's actually published. I think it's okay to share it around as a draft an unnumbered document at this point. Is that okay with you, Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Sure. That's fine.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

HOWARD ELAND: But I do think it should be watermarked or otherwise categorized as draft. Sorry. I stepped on you there, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. That's a good point. We'll make sure that it's clearly marked as a draft. Yeah. And the other document which is about adding the root zone data protections, I guess that we would want to do a similar ... for this. We want to give you a chance to share it with constituents.

One of the lingering items in this document was a comment from Peter who wanted to see some added texts about how this impacts different parties. And Peter offered to write that text. I think he offered twice and he hasn't gotten to it. So, I did some of Peter's homework for him and wrote something up today quickly. It ended up being a little bit longer than I thought but I essentially added a new section.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I am wondering because I had a question for Peter but I think that was related to the previous document. When you mentioned that as far as I remember, it might impact the registries if the glue records would be signed, or at least influence some TLDs. And I expected that comment to be to the previous document.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't see anything from Peter in that document. There was a time where we had some recommendations related to that but we agreed to withdraw those. And so I guess I'm hoping that that is no longer a concern for Peter but he's not here to speak to us yet so I don't know for sure.

GEOFF HUSTON: That raises, I suppose, a potential misunderstanding or discrepancy in thinking here. I had thought it was the entirety of the text of the root zone that was being signed here. Daniel's comment seems to suggest that glue records may not be part of that. I just wanted to either confirm my understanding or refine my understanding, depending on what we're talking about here.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So, Geoff, I think I could explain. Daniel was raising a point about the previous document which was about signing—well, initially it was about signing the rootservers.net zone. And I think Daniel's channeling Peter's point was that if the recommendation in response to the document turns out to be that that delegation data needs signatures,

then TLD operators and whatnot may look to the root for guidance and may head down that same path. And we just wanted to acknowledge that, I guess.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. Previous document discussion. Okay. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. But I think your understanding of the ZONEMD document is correct. It signs or it hashes, it digests the entire content of the zone, not just a subset.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. I see that was my confusion in interpreting one comment in the other document. Okay. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So, lower down in this document, Peter had a comment about, that there should be a text about impacted parties and so I threw this together today hoping that it might be what Peter was after. I'm not sure. Personally, again, as someone who's had the pen on this document for quite a while, I thought it was fine before but I'm willing to accommodate Peter's request here.

So, I don't know if people want to take a look at that section real quick and give their thoughts on the call. If the new section three is needed, if it's on target or if it's irrelevant, we'd be interested to hear from you. And

if Peter's not willing to contribute text, then I would suggest that we forge ahead and move on without it. I think—Carlos, did your hand go up? I see Geoff's hand is up.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Look, I don't know about the conflicting desires to try and do this job as completely as possible versus get it out the door. I don't think section three changes the impact or conclusions, the new section three, the impacted parties, makes any substantive change to the document.

But I actually do think it's a useful piece of due diligence that it has, I suppose, exposed some of the thinking behind this recommendation that points out that the potential impacted parties and any change here has been considered, and the ramifications thought through and the conclusions noted here, all the way through from the root zone maintainer through to the end users.

So, to that extent, a demonstration of some degree of completeness or willing to completeness in due diligence, I think it's actually a nice section. But I do know it doesn't substantially alter the document in any way whatsoever. But if it is possible to leave this in without unduly delaying it, I would argue that it is a useful section. But if it causes another six-month delay, it's kind of, oh my God, do we really need it?

DUANE WESSELS:

Right. Definitely agree with you there. Thank you. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. I'd also support the section being left in. I think it's useful. It doesn't force the reader to connect the dots from the other language that's in there. And I think many readers, this is the first thing they're really reading the document to understand like what's the impact on me. So, I think being more explicit is helpful for the reader of the document.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? Any other comments? So, if not, again, I would say let's—my proposal would be to do the same to this document as the other one which is Danielle and Steve can accept the changes, send out a PDF labeled draft. RZERC members can share it with their constituents and then we'll come back together in January and see if we have any feedback that needs to be addressed.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, just to clarify, Duane and maybe Danielle, do we expect to share the Google doc or some PDF?

DUANE WESSELS: I think PDF because as far as I understand, if you share the Google doc, it's either, it's open for comments to either everyone or no one. And so I don't really want lots of people adding their comments directly in the Google doc. That gets unmanageable. So, I would suggest a PDF if [inaudible].

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Right. And then[—please, Daniel Migault.] So, the other question I had regarding RSSAC is, we have RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus. So, do we want to share that with both of them or do you have any preference?

DUANE WESSELS: I think it's fine to share it with the RSSAC Caucus. Again, this is not really secretive in any way at this point so it's fine. Yeah.

STEVE SHENG: And Daniel, I will prefer either you chat with Fred about it before making a decision which way to share. Thanks.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

DUANE WESSELS: Tim?

TIM APRIL: The proposed method I was going to use to share it was, I was going to create a copy of the Google doc and enable commenting, that way I can just accept comments in the document itself, but it won't touch this version of the document. I just figured I'd throw that out there, is what I had been planning on doing in addition to the PDF.

DUANE WESSELS: So, if I understand, you're suggesting a copy of the doc that you would share with IETF constituents and they could make comments there but you're not suggesting like one copy for all of the different constituents, right?

TIM APRIL: Correct. Like I was going to—like if you were to file, you can say, make copy, and then I'm just going to rename it to whatever, dash IETF feedback or something like that. And then that way I can summarize it and bring it back next month.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I don't have a problem with that if you want to do it that way. That's fine. I guess to be clear, the thing that I'm looking to avoid a little bit is, in my experience when you share a document like this, a lot of people focus on nitpicky, editing things, commas, periods, just capitalization stuff and that's all stuff that we can do later. ICANN has professional copy editors who can do that so I just didn't want to pollute the document with lots of little nitpicky comments.

Okay. I think we're done talking about the work items. I feel like we should spend just a little bit of time maybe talking about the next year. I don't know off the top of my head if our recurring calendar invites already extend into 2021. Maybe Steve or Danielle knows but if not, we probably want to have that discussion. Keep the meetings at the same schedule. Although, at the point where we have no more work items, then we will stop having meetings.

And the other thing I wanted to bring up is that my term as chair is up soon. I think sometime between the January and February meeting, probably. So, at least by February, we should plan on elections and a new chair and things like that. I'll be term-limited so I'm ineligible.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can speak to both of those items. As of right now, our calendar invites are extended through the next year and then your term, your second term as chair will conclude at the—by the conclusion of our March meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, March.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, that's scheduled for March 16th so we'll need to start the nomination for the chair period, February 16th.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. That's great. So, everyone think about that and—go ahead.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I was going to say, I can discuss the timeline further in our January meeting and include that as an agenda item.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Great. So, what is the date of the January meeting then?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: January 19th.

DUANE WESSELS: 19th. Okay. So, that works out well, I think.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That should be on everyone's calendars.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. At that point, we'll come back together and discuss any feedback on these documents and go from there. Any other business before we adjourn?

KIM DAVIES: The timeline for getting the—I was going to say final draft but whatever version to send out to the constituency will be in the next couple of days.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think so. I mean as far as I'm concerned, it can be right away. I'm willing to work with Steve or Danielle to accept the comment, the edits, the suggestions, and then get some PDFs out or get whatever you need out.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll get the Google doc cleaned up and PDFs out to the mailing list by the end of the day today.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Sounds good. All right, everyone. I think that's it. Thanks for coming today and happy holidays, Happy New Year, and all that. We'll see you next time.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks Duane. Cheers.

DUANE WESSELS: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]