DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello, everyone, and welcome to the RZERC teleconference held on Tuesday, the 20th of July 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to start the role call?
TIM APRIL:	Yes, please.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	All right. Carlos Martinez, representing the ASO, I 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.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Tim April, IETF?

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard Eland, RySG?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Daniel Migualt, representing the RSSAC, I note is not on the call yet. Duane Wessels, RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here. Hello.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Geoff Huston, SSAC?

GEOFF HUSTON: Hi.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	All right. Then from staff, we have myself, Danielle Rutherford. Tim, over to you.
TIM APRIL:	Thanks, Danielle. I hope everyone has had a chance to look over the agenda. Any comments or anything to add or remove?
	Not seeing anything. So the first step was to go over the minutes from last month. Any comments or questions about the minutes from the last?
	Okay, not hearing anything. Oh, go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Oh, I said no.
TIM APRIL:	Okay, sorry. Take that as approved and we can post those. The next thing up was … So we got updated advice, understanding from the ICANN Board for RZERC002. I finally just had a chance to review them. They're basically, from my understanding, was 1A, B, and C, their understanding is just basically [inaudible] RSSAC028 and they're marking I think those three as complete. I think they're basically the same text.
	Then the recommendation 2, they revised it to be ICANN Org should determine their own criteria for evaluating the risk. Does anyone have any comments or suggested edits that we should make to this before sending it back to the Board?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Seeing that there are no comments, I assume that means that we can respond that we confirm the understanding for each recommendation in RZERC002 and I can send that back to the advice team today.

TIM APRIL: Sounds great to me.   I believe the next item on the agenda was comments for 003.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I didn't get these out onto the mailing list in time for a one-week review before this meeting, so I thought we could just clarify the clarifying comment text I put for RZERC003. Essentially, you can see them here in this far-right column on the screen.

TIM APRIL: Danielle, could you paste the link in the chat?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Oh, yes.

TIM APRIL: The only question I had looking at these was since we're providing clarifying comments, do we need to say no to them and then start again?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: No, not necessarily. I think there are times if you generally agree with it but you just want to add just, "Yes, and also we'd like the opportunity to review the results," is fine. I think it's when you meaningfully change something in or disagree with the understanding is when you need to say no. I note Kim has his hand up.

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Thanks. Firstly, I like the text of the clarifying comments, but I wanted to confirm my understanding of this group what's meant by opportunity to review. I just want to confirm that there's not an explicit or implicit expectation that the RZERC has to come to a formal decision around the plans that are shared with RZERC for that review, that it's presumably acceptable for ICANN to provide draft plans, to provide adequate time for review, that RZERC's explicit consent is not required to move forward with those plans if it's not forthcoming. Is that a correct interpretation of what we're saying here?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. Look, Kim, I didn't actually think that RZERC was meant to be the project manager of the implementation of this and it could be interpreted that those clarifying comments are kind of inserting it as a role of project manager which I think is kind of overstretch for RZERC to be perfectly frank.

I suspect that the safeguard here is that if these engagement results tend to suggest that it's a bad idea, I think RZERC would like to be able to see and understand what is going on, because RZERC wrote RZERC003 on the understanding that they thought it was a damn good idea, and if

it's not so or if engagement tends to point in the other way, it would be good to understand why and I think that's there in the clarifying comments. I don't see it anymore than that and I certainly don't see it as RZERC trying to assert some degree of project management or coordination myself. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. I fully agree with Geoff. I also have the same interpretation.

[TIM APRIL]:   Same with me as well.

KIM DAVIES: Wonderful. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. If there are no other—

DUANE WESSELS: Is that something that we will just keep as an internal understanding then or do we need to tweak the wordings in this spreadsheet?

KIM DAVIES: I think, from my perspective, I think that it [inaudible] with the wording and [inaudible] with my understanding. I know on last month's call, we were kind of I think vacillating between a few different approaches and I just wanted to confirm we had a common understanding. I think it's

certainly reasonable, so I don't see a problem with the wording as it's written.

TIM APRIL: Okay, thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I think especially since the wording is "appreciate the opportunity and to provide comments" and not "we would appreciate the opportunity to approve or disapprove." But if anything comes back, I'll send any responses to the committee if that's misconstrued. If there are no other comments on this, I can also send that back to the advice team today.

TIM APRIL: Sounds good to me. Thank you, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right.

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry, I feel like I'm kind of catching up on some of this stuff. Can I ask a question about third one, which is about engaging with software developers?

So, the original ICANN understanding was resolver software developers—we had set up some comments here about how maybe it should be broader than that.

I guess my concern would be from the point of view of actually getting this deployed to the root zone. I wouldn't want this to become something that drags it out for a long time, like ICANN feels it necessary to engage with every last DNS software vendor out there and that sort of thing.

So, am I worrying about something that I shouldn't worry about or do you think that needs to be addressed somehow?

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. I think that there's two aspects to that. One is this narrowly focused discussion of ZONEMD and then explaining to a wider audience and to the DNS software community, so to speak, what this is for. And maybe these two channels need to be addressed differently and the details can be left to ICANN Org in a way.

My understanding was that with this comment, we were not specifically endorsing hyperlocal because that was not the question asked to us.

So, if we now suggest that ICANN Org go and engage with software vendors, that might be seen or could be perceived as an endorsement of hyperlocal. I don't think there's any bad thing in endorsing that, but if I remember correctly, there is still one question open which is the distribution of the root zone outside the current channel. So, do they all get the copies?

I know there's lots of sources but maybe that distribution infrastructure needs another pair of eyes or so. So I would distinguish that and maybe clarify that.

One thing is there we are adding something "we" but the RZM is adding something to the root zone. What is this for? And then if you think that's reasonable, you go there, but we don't say you should do hyperlocal—maybe not yet at least. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Hi. Look, this is based on RFC8806 and one way to actually address the issue of software developers is to communicate through an update to RFC8806 that points out the existence of ZONEMD and effectively advises in section 3 or section 2. Maybe section 3 and 4 with some security considerations that clients should look at the ZONEMD record and validate the contents of the zone.

Now, for RZERC to say, "Let's do an RFC," is kind of daunting. The short circuit would be for RZERC to gently suggest to Mr. Hoffman in OCTO that he should update RFC8806 sounds like a possible way through this without the same degree of formality.

But nevertheless, I think it remains the fact that the way we communicate in software development is by standard specifications and the way to do it in this case is to update 8806 to catch that ball and to actually distribute that information.

So, Paul or maybe Duane would like to push out an update to 8806. And it is really an update. It doesn't obsolete it. It just adds more information that says, "ZONEMD is there. You should check it." Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: So I think my concern was a little different and maybe I didn't state it very well. At some point, ICANN is going through these recommendations and check off when they are done. So how will they know when this one is done? Is it just that they have been in contact with implementers, software developers, or is it done when implementations have been done?

Again, my concern is I don't want this to become something that can drag out the whole process. So, how does ICANN know when they can claim—when they can check off this recommendation from their list? I hope it's not update an RFC.

TIM APRIL: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, to me, it looks like checking if it is being implemented by developers is pretty straightforward to check, but I don't think it's sufficient to … It's not because it's implemented that is being enabled by the people operating resolvers. So I'm wondering …

I mean, my first understanding of Duane's comments was that we want it to be used as opposed to simply implemented. And I feel that this is what we were willing to measure.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. So, I guess the thing I'm struggling with a little bit is certainly I think the implementers should be encouraged or the developer should be encouraged to implement this, but I don't think it should be something that holds up the deployment of the record or of the future to the root zone. It's not required. We can deploy the record without any implementations. I just think we should encourage them. You can tell me if I'm inventing problems that don't exist. But I just worried a little bit that maybe, as written, this could become a blocker—at least in somebody's mind.

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, I don't think it means that degree of formality of making sure both producer and consumer are checked off, and quite frankly engage with software developers is really an amorphous statement that's close to impossible to figure out when [you're done].

I do think, Duane, as you are a co-author of 8976—one of many I note—that the reference to 8806 and the use in hyperlocal is somewhat passing and it really is phrased in a "eh, it's there," "eh, you might like to do it," and that's kind of a very loose and very vague endorsement of actually doing the check. And it seems that if we really would like to see this as part of hyperlocal, then it does require some engagement in the IETF venue to make it part of the standard specification of hyperlocal.

If we don't really think it's our problem, that's a fine answer, too. But you're kind of straddling the fence in this particular entry of engaging with resolver software developers, saying, "Well, okay, you should." But if you're not going to make it as part of an update to hyperlocal, then what are you going to do? Post a notice on the door outside of ICANN's office? Seems a bit crazy.

So, I'm not sure you can have it both ways. I think the best way to do this is to actually do this through the IETF process and make specific updates to hyperlocal and say, "Well, that's the way software developers actually inform themselves of common standards."

But RZERC, I think it would be a tough ask to ask RZERC to build such an RFC and get it through the process. Part of the reason why this is a representative group is that there are, oh, ten representatives from the IETF and it would be good to say gently to that representative, "You know, an update to the standard specification of hyperlocal could actually be a good thing." And maybe that's the best way of doing it without actually involving the ICANN Board. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Is that an old hand, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Oh yeah, it's an old one.

TIM APRIL: And then Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks. I agree they should not block the deployment. The one thing that, because it's been quite a while and I probably have forgotten about that, did we anyway have an impact assessment on systems outside the official root server set where we, I think, have the commitment off the root server operators, too, that they can cope with this. What would happen in today's scenarios when this unexpected record shows up in the root zone?

Well, I do know it was 3597 or something that actually says, "Thou shalt not stumble across unknown [inaudible] types." But then again we don't know. Do we have that impact assessment anywhere?

TIM APRIL: No.

PETER KOCH: Okay. But it's rather the opposite side. One thing is that hyperlocal deployment should be encouraged to make use of this. The other one is the risk avoidance of will anyone who does hyperlocal or anything else like that today—will they face issues? And in theory, that is no problem. And most likely, most of the [inaudible] either. So we may choose to ignore it. Just wanted to raise it because I was confident we had [inaudible] authority. Sorry.

And it actually might not necessarily be the name server software that stumbles across this. It could be some integrity checker or something else.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. And I had a similar concern that you had, Duane, of the timing when I was reading this a while back and it made me wonder about it. When I read the last sentence of this, of the proposed update, it made me think it would be the public comment process where it would have a time bound on it. But we're not actually calling for public comment now that I look at it and I didn't know how that would be handled. But I'm happy to go back to the IAB, and they're not sure how they would do it but we were talking about how they might be able to help RZERC if we had the request exactly like this to push something through. And I can go back and have a conversation with hm about that if that seems reasonable.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Geoff's suggestion to update the 8806 I think is reasonable. I just think it should be separate from this process of deploying the record to the root zone. I don't think those should be tied together. And I'm not sure that … Geoff, do you think they should be tied together or not?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, chicken and egg, Duane. If we update the RFC and it's not in the root zone, that's a bit of a wasted effort. If we update the root zone and 8806 isn't updated [inaudible], it's a bit of a wasted effort. So there is a dance going on.

                         The point that I was trying to do in responding to Tim is that I think, in most of the cases, RZERC acts as an advisory body to the ICANN Board

and says, "These are good things to do and you folk—the doers—should actually enable processes to do them."

But I think in this case, this is one of coordination across a number of bodies where RZERC's cross-body representative structure can actually be used appropriately.

So, this thing about having ICANN Org engage with resolver software developers—and we talked about this broader DNS community of developers—is one where the ICANN Board is actually in no better, and maybe a worse position, than RZERC itself. So I applaud Tim's suggestion that this is something where the IETF as a group can actually do the right thing and actually help this along by creating an update to 8806 that mentions ZONEMD and I think that's a perfectly good resolution. I just don't think necessarily that the ICANN Board and ICANN Org need to necessarily track the progress of that. I think that's something that the RZERC can hand to one of its representative members and say thank you to. Did I say that clearly? I'm not sure if I'm seeing a puzzled expression on your face or not, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, my interpretation of what you just said would mean that we would withdraw this recommendation then because these recommendations are to the ICANN Board.

GEOFF HUSTON: And again I think what I've said is actually the case, that literally to help folk along that path of adding that as protections into hyperlocal is not

something where the ICANN Org or Board necessarily have a responsibility but it is a case where the IETF is the purveyor of industry standards has a direct and active role in specifying what is regarded as a standard behavior for inter-operations.

So, the more I speak, the more I talk myself into the fact that that, as action item—implementation—that is necessarily an IETF outcome and it's a case of how do we [seed] that work into the IETF.

So yeah, I think I agree with you, Duane, in some respects.

TIM APRIL: I haven't thought this all the way through yet, but I'm not sure … There may still be something that the ICANN Org can do to help advertise this change beyond just the update to 8806 because not all name server developers are heavily involved with the IETF, so I think people in OCTO may have contacts that other resolver or other name server software vendors that they could encourage to adopt a change there but it may be a multi-pronged approach where it's us suggesting to ICANN Org that they work within the IETF and then do other outreach as necessary or something like that.

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't think it's an anarchic as you're making out, Tim. Quite frankly, customers rely on developers adhering to standards, because otherwise the product that they get from the developer is anarchic rubbish. So, standards are the way we orchestrate all of our actions to produce one outcome.

So, I think it's really important that the standard specifications map up RFC8806 and 8976 together saying, in the context of hyperlocal, this is a really good idea and you should use it in client software, full stop.

The only residual thing that I think might be useful here is that, in the primary authoritative source of ZONEMD, it is indeed the root server operators and it is indeed RSSAC and either RZERC directly engages with our RSSAC representative, Daniel, and directly communicate this to them or communicates via the ICANN Board itself saying that this engagement in creating hyperlocal server software has to be ZONEMD aware, but we assume that anyway but we'd like to check on that understanding. Thank you, ICANN Board. Maybe you should ask RSSAC to confirm this understanding.

But I don't think it requires ICANN Org to do much more than that. It's not well engaged to directly interface to the software developer community, whereas I think the IETF is the place where customers rely on developers who rely on standards as the way this industry works. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If I could gently propose a way through that qualification of understanding in the right-most column. I think if we said RZERC intended that anyone—and leave out the ICANN Org—to engage with. So, RZERC intended that anyone that writes name server software should incorporate ZONEMD, RZERC notes that engagement with this larger community would entail an update to the standard specification of hyperlocal in particular. The outstanding action for ICANN Org is to

ensure that RSSAC, as a potential hyperlocal publisher, is aware of ZONEMD and confirms their ability to include it in their published zone file.

So, I think that whole thing about public notice just doesn't work. It's got to be an RFC.

TIM APRIL: Howard? Howard, your hand is up.

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah, thanks. So, based on a lot of this conversation, I'm kind of steering my thoughts towards Geoff's comment of saying should we even do this at all? And the reason I say that, it was from a slightly different angle and that is, when I go back to our illustrious charter and scoping, just comments to name server software providers that they should implement X or Y out in the [fray] or as it relates to any hyperlocal zone that they may be—that folks may or may not be running.

It just seems like we are getting way down the long-tailed scope, if there at all. So, a better consideration would be if someone had built in this functionality and then was—if a root server operator had this functionality capability ready to go and they were pondering whether or not to want to try and add things in, this part of the root zone [operation], now it becomes an RZERC thing, right?

But before that, I'm scared of the precedent of checking every RFC and advising name server software developers on which things they should

implement and which things to not. That just seems like the wrong path to me. So, welcome comments. Thank you. Over.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. So, I think the crucial part is getting the things in the right sequence, and since there is this … [I believe it's standards track], at least it's the record definition from the IETF. The question upon RZERC would be has everybody who may or could be concerned being part of the discussion? And we just … Or maybe we haven't just identified it but obviously the current distributors of the root zone, namely as reflected or represented by RSSAC, they would have two questions to answer.

One is, whether there's two way of communicating this … The one is can you confirm that it will do no harm to your infrastructure if we add that new record type to the root zone? That's one thing, that's the do no harm clause.

The other one … And from there, we could go and say, well, the conversation has been had and RZERC now has no objections to entering the record in the root zone.

The next one is—and is probably RSSAC internal or even Root Ops internal—whether or not the root server operators would want to make use of that actual record, which is again a different thing.

The remaining part is what I mentioned before. The rest of the community, which is today probably the operators of hyperlocal or similar things that even existed before hyperlocal was named hyperlocal, how would they be affected by this new record type in the root zone? And that's probably an unknown to us and we still can discuss whether we put any effort into that. The critical path, of course, is the Root Ops, but from my perspective, first and foremost, this do no harm question or does it interfere with the operations?

And secondary to that, the question of is there a recommendation to the Root Ops to actually make use of that record? Thanks.

And sorry, by the way, and only after that record has appeared in the root zone, of course it makes sense to have this updated hyperlocal RFC which is informational, I believe, but doesn't necessarily matter. But that should only be published after the record has been made present in the root zone.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Peter, when you mentioned, do the RSO are going to use that functionality, you mean if the check is not validated then we reject the zone or abort the zone transfer?

PETER KOTCH: Yeah, that would be a question … Well, it might be inappropriate for RZERC to discuss whether the operators—

DANIEL MIGAULT: No, what you had in mind.

PETER KOCH: I had in mind, okay, the expectation is that they make use of it … Well, yeah, but thanks for asking that question. I could clarify it in a way that "make use of" could mean that they don't accept the zone or at least check whether their copy is matching the hash and then do something out of [band] or something.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

PETER KOCH: But today's integrity checks aren't subject to public discussion either, I believe, so that's the part where it might appear inappropriate. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I actually put a comment into the spreadsheet, and if Daniel sort of expands the screen to the right, you'd actually see it there. I think, to summarize what I've heard so far, I actually think that this particular recommendation is not a recommendation to ICANN Org. It's a recommendation elsewhere.

So, one way of looking at this is to say, "No, ICANN Org's understanding is not correct." The clarifying comment is that RZERC intended this as a recommendation to the broader community of software development and the appropriate action is for this to be taken up as an update to the standard specification of hyperlocal, 8806. No further action by ICANN Org directly is envisaged in this recommendation.

So, it kind of leaves it dangling, but it says quite explicitly it's not a box that ICANN Org needs to tick, which I think is really the focus of this discussion? At some point, other folk have to take up that particular piece of work. And that's fine. But ICANN Org is not responsible for that, per se. It's something that others need to do, not ICANN Org, is where I'm going with this.

So, yes, I would simply say there is no actions for ICANN Org here. It's directed at the IETF and the standards associated with this. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: So I think that's a good way to put it, Geoff, and I support going in that direction if others do as well.

KIM DAVIES: It might be worth being explicit, if that's the case, to also say ICANN is not expected to wait for conclusion on that matter by [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Right. Yeah.

TIM APRIL: Does anyone disagree with that approach? Seeing nothing.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can take the text from the transcript of the recording later today and then include that as the response back to ICANN Org by the end of day today.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, Danielle. Were there any additional comments? Should we look at one and two, [have] the discussion about three, and then there's the response to the fourth recommendation. We talked briefly about this but I think this was addressing or we discussed this on the last call. Did you want to say something, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I think it's good. I don't have any further comments on this one. Did you have something to say, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. So, just to clarify, we would like to update an RFC. Is that to somehow encourage to use of the ZONEMD record or …? Just to make sure I understand it completely.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think what's going on here, if I could jump in with a quick answer to you, Daniel, is that 8806 comes before 8796. In other words, it precedes it, and makes no particular mention of saying, you know, it's a really good idea to check the integrity of the entire zone—which is really what's going on.

8796 was way more generic than the root and it makes passing mention to 8806 but doesn't explicitly formally update it to say it would be a good idea too. And that's the missing bit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I get it.

GEOFF HUSTON: And it is as simple as an RFC that updates 8806 to saying it would be a good idea to check that record if it's in the zone file, and if it's not in the zone file you're getting, it may be a good idea to think about why it's not there because it should be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON: And that's as simple as the update need be. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

Thank you, Geoff. Any additional comments on the responses to 003? Okay. Let's move on to the next step.

So, the next one is the topic scoping exercise. So I noticed that Danielle had mentioned that she had been talking to some people within ICANN about the update to the charter review that [inaudible] complete the share.

Ahead of that, one of the things that was done in the past or when the charter was created was a topic scoping exercise, and I proposed redoing that to make sure that we're all on the same page of what the charter should be. And thanks to Duane and Danielle for having the old documents. I pulled out all of the contents from the Google form that was used last time and we sent that around to the mailing list. I wanted to see if there was any changes that people would make to that list.

My rough idea of a goal for this exercise would be to try and kick off between this meeting and the next meeting so that we can review the results and depending on what Danielle has for an update about the charter review. I don't know exactly what the timing that we need to complete that by is but to try and get as much done as we can as quickly as we can. So I don't know if everyone has had a chance to look it over. This is exactly the same as it was the last time this was done. We can start with Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Sorry. Yeah, I looked at this through the week and had my own comments which I was thinking about sharing here. But then I think, in some ways, this is a mix between the evolution of design and

architecture of the root, the evolution of the procedures and processes that manage the root, and the tactical operational issues in serving the root.

It gets back to this charter discussion of where does RZERC fit in in the scheme of things? And certainly there are some issues where it's actually unclear, and let us both point out the DNSSEC key size of the KSK and the ZSK for the root and the algorithm. To some extent, one could regard them as operational. Moving the key size of the ZSK from [102 to 42048] did not to my only partial knowledge—I'm not sure—but did not involve an RZERC signoff. It, in some ways, was considered operational, I'm sure, and managed within other processes.

So, if one wished to filter out this list to say "yes, no, yes, no" which is what I was trying to do, I found in my head going where's the boundary of RZERC? What makes sense for this particular representative group to engage and what makes sense for others also engaged in the root system to manage those particular topics? That was kind of my hesitancy at this point in looking at such a large list. It just left me wondering about charter, primarily, because I think the charter should come before the list in some respects rather than picking out things we'd like to do and then making the charter match what we'd like to do. That seems a bit backwards to me. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: So, I think … As someone involved in creating this list originally, we were sort of handed a charter and then we used this list to sort of test our understanding of the charter. That's how this exercise is done. Some of

these questions or topics, as I and the community were writing them, we knew they were going to be out of scope, but they were here anyway for completeness and again to test everyone's understanding.

In some cases, we got unexpected answers, and in some cases we got the expected answers. I think the list is mostly still relevant and good. Some of these things … Geoff mentioned the key size change for the ZSK. These have already happened and they happened [inaudible] RZERC. So there are maybe some cases where we know that those should be considered out of scope. But by and large, I think it's a good list.

Yeah. The other thing that I find interesting doing the exercise the first time is that if you ranked the results by in scope to out of scope, it was very continuous. There was no obvious points where all of a sudden we got into topics that were out of scope. It was a whole continuous spectrum of responses. So, thanks.

PETER KOCH: Just as a short follow-up to Duane, I would use this as a stress test or scope test for the charter rather than a wish list of what we would like to do. The idea is that if we suggest that something is within or without scope, and as Duane said there are clear-cut issues and something that may or may not be in scope, depending on how the question is precisely framed, that would actually help us in turn to go through the charter review rather than vice-versa. So I would agree that doing this exercise is a good preparation for the charter review.

TIM APRIL:	So, going off what Duane said a second ago, would it make sense to have two questions for each of these, of one considering the current charter, is this in scope? And then the second question being should we revise the charter … Should it be in the members opinion? Should it be in scope or out of scope? And basically determining whether or not we should revise the charter to bring it in or push it out of scope. Duane I think was first.
DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. I think that would be good feedback to have. I don't know necessarily about two questions. I mean, you could have that in a comment or whatever, but I think that might be good feedback to have.
	When we did the topic exercise the first time, if I remember correctly, it was mostly multiple choice: in scope, not sure, out of scope. So three choices. And then there was a comment field where people could write down their thoughts as to why they made their choice or ask clarifying questions about the topic that ….
	I like your suggestion to think about whether or not the charter needs to be revised in the context of some of these.
TIM APRIL:	Peter, is that a new hand or an old hand?
PETER KOCH:	That's indeed a new one. I like that suggestion. Maybe revising the charter is already getting a step ahead, but finding out for any of these,

when you think that it's not in scope, then the question is, is it dealt with elsewhere or does it fall between the cracks or does it involve two or more of the other groups that may be involved and therefore needs or could benefit from RZERC having a look at it in addition to the others? So, this out of scope or in scope should always come with a reason or some thought why it is here and there before we discuss whether the charter should be amended.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Look, I think Duane and Peter have made really good suggestions here. I don't think RZERC is in control of its agenda with complete autonomy. It can't just say what it wants to do and everyone else goes, "Oh yeah, that sounds like a fine idea." There are many people involved in the root service and many different interests being expressed. And that's great. That's fine. But what that means is a change in the charter for RZERC sort of ripples around a whole bunch of others and I don't think there's autonomy for RZERC to simply assert a different charter.

But looking at this list and reconsidering in the terms of the charter whether it's in scope or out of scope, in some ways once we've got that kind of understanding and an understanding about the scope of the current charter, there are a number of consequent questions which are great questions.

One is certainly should the charter be revised? And that's a broader question than just to RZERC. But secondly—and I think equally importantly—if RZERC thinks they're important questions but not in the scope of RZERC, what do other folk think about the same question? And it's not necessarily RZERC's problem but it's a root problem and maybe it's RSSAC or someone else might want to take a look at the outcomes of that and figure out for themselves and PTI, if RZERC isn't doing this and RZERC thinks it's important, "What do we think?" is an equally valid question.

But I would stick with the scope that Duane is proposing here. Just look at this about in scope, out of scope and understandings and reasons as Peter has suggested and phrase it that way and not make it as a lead-in for revision of the charter necessarily. I think the charter discussion has its own weight and volume outside of this list exercise which I think is a useful exercise in its own right within the scope of the existing charter. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. I think one bit of perspective I wanted to add, which might be unique to me—maybe Duane shares a similar perspective—is I think, as operators, we really lack a clear sense of what we should be bringing to RZERC and I think, perhaps not this specific exercise, but what I would love to see is a conclusion of these efforts is getting to some kind of consensus about putting in a box "these are the kinds of things that

Verisign and/or PTI should expect within their wheelhouse to decide as day-to-day operational matters." There's common consensus that this does not need to be brought to RZERC or other kind of body for implementation.

On the other hand, here are things that clearly must go for RZERC review. And I'm sure there will be some in the middle there where there's some lack of clarity and there will be a discussion. But we're almost five years into the [inaudible] IANA and I won't pretend that I have a clear sense of where those boundaries lie and I think my default position would be to bring almost everything to RZERC for a first pass. I'm not sure that's the right conclusion but I think that's kind of where [inaudible] right now. So whatever we can do to sort of build our understanding of how this interpretation of the charter impacts our day-to-day operations that will give us greater clarity to make sure the right things are brought to RZERC moving forward. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. So, [inaudible] clear to me [inaudible] topic [inaudible] are we trying to test, to do a stress test to the charter or are we actually using common sense to define the topics that we believe are in charge of RZERC?

Typically, if I see something, even if the charter seems to say, yeah, it's fine, it could be RZERC. I think this topic might be handled in different places and it might be more appropriate in that.

So, what do we expect in that case, for example? Should I answer, "No, it should not be RZERC." I think it might be more, I'm saying, the Root Ops or RSSAC to deal with that. Or should I say, "Yeah, I'm reading the charter and the charter says that, so this is in scope."

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, Daniel, I'm not sure those two things should be different. I guess I don't understand the difference. Again, for me, where this exercise is really useful is, for the committee as a whole, to gauge its understanding of topics being in scope or out of scope.

So, in cases where the committee generally agrees that topics are out of scope, then okay that's great, where it generally agrees—where everyone agrees there is scope—that's great. We're all on the same page.

But there's going to be this whole middle ground where you're going to think something is in scope based on your interpretation of the charter or whatever documents and I'm going to feel oppositely. So then we need to have a discussion about where are we disconnecting? Where's the misunderstanding? Why do you think it's one way and I think it's another way?

Maybe that leads to a charter clarification or maybe we just talk it through and you convince me that I was mistaken and then I've updated my understanding.

So that's really the purpose of the exercise, in my mind. Does that help with your question or not?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. At the end of the day, we want to check which topics are in scope of RZERC? Let me understand.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: If a member brought one of these topics to RZERC for consideration, would you say, yes, this is something we should take on or would you say, no, this is not for RZERC to take on?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. So we are not expecting to have a lawyer reading of the charter. It's more a technical or common sense of the charter.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think so. Yeah.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Good.

TIM APRIL: So we're at the top of the hour. I'll try and review the transcript and synthesize a proposal of how to do this and we can send it to the list or we can discuss it next month and see where we can go from there. Is it possible to get the update you were going to provide, Danielle, as an email to the list or should we wait until next month for that?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I'll send an email to the list this week.

TIM APRIL: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So will we have a sort of Doodle poll or something that we say yes/no?

TIM APRIL: I was going to try and take all of the comments from this and propose something to the list of how to move forward with the topic [review].

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

TIM APRIL: And then it will probably be a Google form or something like that that we fill out.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Oh, yeah, yeah. Whatever.

TIM APRIL: Anything else?

DUANE WESSELS: And I think at some point we need to talk about any sort of sensitivity concerns about the topics themselves, how we want to handle that on list or not on list and so on. But that's going to be next time.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, all. Talk to you next month.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]