

MONTREAL – Root Zone Evolution Review Committee Meeting [C]

Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT

ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

DUANE WESSELS: Welcome, everyone. We just had one straggler join us here in the room. We're in a very big room with about seven or eight of us, so there's a little bit of an echo chamber in here. Thanks, everyone, for making the meeting. Danielle, do you want to start with the roll call?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yes. Thank you. ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar? Here.

Kim Davies from PTI.

Russ Mundy from SSAC.

We have Brad Verd from RSSAC. Carlos Martinez from the ASO, not here.

Jim Reid from IETF?

JIM REID: Yes.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Howard Eland from the GNSO Registries Stakeholder Group.

---

**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.**

---

HOWARD ELAND: Yes.

DANIELL RUTHERFORD: Duane Wessels from Verisign as the root zone maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

DANIELL RUTHERFORD: And then for staff we have Steve Sheng and Danielle Rutherford. Oh, sorry. ccNSO, Peter Koch. Okay, great. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you, Danielle. So, I guess we have the full hour-and-a-half if we need it, but we'll go through the topics for the agenda today. We want to spend some time talking about member reappointments, chair election procedure, and I think all these things are kind of related. We'll talk about the cadence for future meetings and any future work. I added a late breaking development which is just in the last couple of days the KSK rollover plan was published and maybe we want to talk about that as well.

Are there any other items that people would like to add to the agenda at this point?

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: I just checked my calendar. At least mine says it's one hour just for the—

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, it's just one hour. Sorry. We'll try to keep it to that, then.

RUSS MUNDY: One other thing that I'd like to add under AOB is: is there something needed from RZERC with respect to the threat document discussions that have been going on, especially at the Board level? Looking at things that people are worried about from a threat perspective, does RZERC need to do anything or be aware of anything?

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Russ. So, I guess let's go through the administration topics. So, RZERC has not had a meeting for quite a while. I don't actually remember. The date of our previous meeting feels like at least six months ago or nine months ago, something like that. So, there has not been any work before the committee, and we haven't met. I believe that has led to a little bit of us being a little bit lax in remembering some of our things such as our appointment schedules and chair election procedures and so on.

So, as we were preparing for this meeting, I was working with Steve and we were thinking about all the things that we need to do that we haven't done for a while, such as reconfirming some of the member appointments and so on and reappointing the RZERC chair. So, my

---

term is up officially – I forget the date but it's very soon. This month, I believe. Or was it the previous month?

Anyway, historically, with the help of staff and myself, we have sent letters to the appointing organizations asking them to reconfirm their appointments on a regular basis.

I would say this meets with mixed success. Some of those organizations don't respond right away, some of them do. This can take quite a while. I think, Steve, didn't it take three or so months last time to get everyone to confirm the appointments? I find this a little bit frustrating, dealing with the way that all the other organizations appoint members to RZERC because some of them have open-ended appointments, and some of them have fixed schedules and term limits and they're all sort of different. To date, that's the way we've been operating is to, on some regular basis, ask them to reconfirm. We haven't done that for a while, and so maybe it's a good idea to do that.

At the same time, I think maybe we might want to consider changing the way we do this. It's not a particularly efficient use of our time and resources and it's very complicated. Would anyone else would like to speak to this issue at this point? Any input?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, this is Russ. One of the real challenges we have is this group is made up of appointments from a bunch of different groups and each of the sending groups has the latitude of making the choice in their own manner. And, from our end, we can't really control how they do

that. So, we're, not a slave, but we're subject to their process, whatever they may choose to use.

It seems to me that we need to ... I like the idea of having at least a reminder come from RZERC that member X or Y that their term, as we have it, is up at a point in time. That way, it moves the responsibility from RZERC to the sending organization to do the right thing. So, I think it's a good thing to notify the sending organizations at some appropriate time. I'm not sure if three months, six months, one week, I don't know in advance.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Thanks, Russ. That's good input. Peter? All right. Go ahead Peter. And I see Howard, you have your hand up, too.

PETER KOCH:

Okay. This is probably a communications issue only. One of the issues could be, I'm just second guessing, that reappointment or reconfirmation might trigger certain things that we don't want to trigger and may contribute to the confusion.

I could imagine, though, that the very able staff that supports both the ACs and SOs, as well as ourselves, could have marks in their calendar to actually talk to each other and then trigger the things that are necessary. And just for the record, I got my second term of length of three years from the ccNSO earlier this year and I hope that has arrived at this committee. If not, we can trigger the official announcement as well.

---

But it's on the record for the ccNSO. And maybe it's important in that follow-up to Russ that we ask the various SOs and ACs that they explicitly state for how long the term of the appointee is so that we don't have to ask every year, and then probably stir some confusion because the sending [inaudible] also might think, “Well, we sent somebody for three years, why are they coming back after one?”

That's again, second guessing, but should it be a clerical thing that can be done by a corporation calendar. Thank you.

Unless there's a serious issue, but I think we have stability on the committee for quite some time. That might change because some of us are term limited based on the sending organization's roots and that might make the things more important actually. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Howard, you wanted to make a comment, I believe?

HOWARD ELAND: Sure. Thanks, Duane. Just to somewhat conflate to 4A and 4B, given the length of time that it takes to get some of the organizations' feedback, I'd like to suggest that perhaps what we do is shift the chair election procedure out a full six months or so from the time we call the reappointment polling, if you will, because that way it gives us enough time to do that, plus it gives folks a month or two to bake in, plus or minus, however we do this cadence in 4D, that gives us a couple of months bake-in time, but not too long, so that we're waiting too long

---

for a new chair. Just to try and synchronize how we do all of these things together.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Howard. I think one of the complications that I see is that not everyone's terms are synchronized on the calendar. And so, if I was ICANN staff supporting this, I think I'd be very frustrated that I would have to do one reminder in July and another reminder in August and so on. It doesn't all come at the same time, right?

I don't know if you want to speak to that, Steve, but I would be frustrated in your shoes and I think it makes a lot of this complicated, like you said, Howard, like the way that it relates to the chair election schedule. Jim, I know you would like to speak to this as well.

JIM REID:

Yeah, thank you, Duane. Some of you remember we had an email conversation about this a couple of weeks ago, and this synchronization of appointments I think is a bit more problematic than we meant when we first realized.

The IETF process is to appoint someone to RZERC in the summer of each year for a one-year term for a maximum of four terms. So, if we're going to change this, the high-tech procedures that the [inaudible] will have to be changed. And there's a document on that RFC [81-82], if I remember it correctly, and conversations I've had with members on the idea about this and [inaudible] and myself have had with ways on the IAB last week.

---

You're suggesting that, well, I think there's some concern from the IETF side of things. They're not too keen in making changes unless it's an overwhelming or a compelling reason to do that.

So, we need to think about this a little bit more, and I think there's another issue here, which also relates to the appointment process for the RZERC chair. But the issue I've got here at the moment is that the appointments, as I understand it, we've got a mixture of people who have been appointed essentially semi-permanently to RZERC. There are people appointed typically from the supporting organizations of the advisory committees on a three-year term. And then you've got me as the outlier for the IETF appointed on an annual basis.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks, Jim. Can just one clarification. Is your appointment on a calendar schedule like an annual? You start in January kind of a thing?

JIM REID:

Well, no, it's to be done by the summer. The IETF schedule is fairly vague technically from the point of view of flexibility. But the idea is, in the past it's been is you come to me about April or May, she will say, "Jim, do you want to continue for another year, yes or no?" And if I was to say no, they would run another selection procedure and find someone to replace me and that replacement, or my reconfirmation, will be done in the summer every year. And that's how it has been done over the last few years.



---

BRAD VERD: Hey Jim, this is Brad. So, confirmation in the summer doesn't mean active. So, you could be confirmed in the summer, but you start in January. It doesn't sound like that's the case. As soon as you're confirmed, you are itk. Is that correct?

JIM REID: I don't think I was really giving any thought to that kind of finessing of the situation, but maybe that would be a nice way to try and align things with all the other organizations. I don't think that was really going [inaudible]. Great suggestion.

HOWARD ELAND: The other thing that's problematic, Jim, particularly with your appointment, is that—correct me if I'm wrong—but the term of the chair is greater than one year, right? So, it means that Jim can kind of de facto never be chair, which I think is unfair.

JIM REID: Well, it's not unfair to me. I'm quite happy not to take on that responsibility. But, yes, that point also was made in the IETF discussions I had privately with her about this because it's a two-year appointment to the chairmanship. I realize we're going to have that problem at some point with the other members that are appointed to this committee because I think most of them are on a three-year cycle, a two-year cycle for the chairmanship position. So, at some point those will go into an overlap or straddle in a way which is going to be suboptimal.

---

And the point that they make on the list about this was the group may end up in the situation where there's only one eligible candidate to take the job of chairman because the only person that's left is the three year term, or a two year term. I think that's a separate problem. I think first, we ought to deal with this synchronization issue. So, the synchronization of appointments and then as you said before, Howard, how that then affects the appointment procedure for the chairmanship.

DUANE WESSELS:

So, I'd be interested to hear your thoughts, Steve, and maybe how this works in committees or if you've seen this kind of problem before.

STEVE SHENG:

Thanks, Duane. So, for the RZERC terms, we have for some members— for example, Russ—that's by calendar year. So, your term ends December 31st and we have some like August 31<sup>st</sup>, August, August, some November. So, it's a mix there everywhere.

With other ACs, I can speak for the SSAC where you can be appointed to SSAC and that your term starts immediately, but it will end on December 31st. So, you can start at any time of the year, but your term ends December 31st. So, that may be one way to think about because taking consideration that the different appointing organizations have different timelines. So that may be one way to get around that.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry, Russ. Do you think it would work to align the appointments in RZERC to like a calendar year schedule or something like that? Is that something we should consider or is it not a good idea?

STEVE SHENG: No, I think it will be cleaner because right now if we send out a request, we will be sending out a request to every organization every other month, say your membership term is up, let's please confirm and then another months to another organization. So I think it's—

DUANE WESSELS: And they're likely to fall through the cracks, I would think. We're going to forget.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I think it's certainly reasonable for RZERC to ask the sending organizations to do that, but I don't know that we can force them.

So, sending this out to make it, at least as much as we can, to have consistency. But one of the things that I wanted to do before I got here, and I hadn't had a chance to actually dig into it, is to look at our current procedures to see if we have in our procedures, a plan of supersession, if you will, both for the chairman and if a seat goes empty because it can happen at any time.

Again, speaking from the SSAC perspective, an SSAC member can resign from SSAC at any point in time. And so, if I decided I'm done, walk out the door, the SSAC seat is empty. So, we should have at least

---

something in our procedures that would address filling an empty seat and what we are going to do. And I think something similar, if that person happened to be the chair of the group, then we should have something that would document how we go about filling that.

PETER KOCH:

Yes. Thank you. It appears to me that this synchronization issue is kind of important in the long-run. We apparently have this filling of the chair position in front of us more immediate. However, the decision to have the terms based on the customs and habits of the sending organization was hopefully deliberate and it's enshrined in the charter. And any change that we would imply or suggest would have to go into the charter.

Now the charter is going to be up for review in, I think, one and a half years anyway. So, my suggestion would be maybe you can do some preparatory work, like understanding what the consequences are because, Russ, you just mentioned that once you are out of SSAC, you also lose your position. That's what you said and, how I read it at least, this is not necessarily true for other people.

Because, for example, Jim, you can't get out of the ITEF and lose your position. You can of course resign in any way, and at the same holds for others that might be true for it. That might be true for the RZM assignment as well, if you go away. So, we should understand what the risks are, what the scenarios are.

---

On the other hand, now doing a synchronization work, which involves going back to all the SEs and ACs and SOs, quite frankly for a committee that doesn't do any visible work at the moment might be difficult task as well to convince them that they need to agree on a joint scheme. So again, my suggestion is to postpone this until we do the charter review and then get some input and try to understand what the real issue is and find a pragmatic way to get the chair appointed or reappointed for the running year or two. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Jim, you have a comment please?

JIM REID:

Yeah, thanks. I'm going to shock everybody by saying I probably agree with everything Peter has just said, and people that know both of us, usually Peter, myself, almost always I have. But the point I'm just going to bring up, it was just an informational thing, that in RFC 81-28 which is the IETF's appointment procedure for RZERC, [inaudible] IAB expects to see new seek RZERC members in time for ICANN's annual general meeting being [inaudible] each year.

So maybe this is a useful metric that maybe some of the appointing organizations might like to consider if it we are going to go by this process of re-tweaking the charter, which I think is something we may inevitably have to do in 18 months' time, although that wouldn't involve me because I'll be out of RZERC before that.

Just to go on that little bit in that document in section 3.4, so the IETF will go about four to six weeks for solicitation of nominees or review of incumbent, four to six weeks for review of nominees, deliberation, selection. So, in Q2 of each year, the IAB will announce the specific dates for the RZERC selection process for that year, taking account the guidelines for IETF, ICANN meetings, blah, blah, blah. So that's the process which the IAB is using on behalf of the IETF's nominee and maybe this, again, is something else that might be worthwhile considering for other quality organizations to consider.

DUANE WESSELS:

All right. Thanks, Jim. That's, that's some good data points I think to keep in mind. Any other comments about this particular item before we—

BRAD VERD:

I guess I'm curious. Russ, you made the comment that we can't force the organizations to change their timelines or whatnot but do you really think ... I'm trying to think of how to word this, but what type of pushback would you get if we went to our organizations and said there's a problem and they're asking to change our appointment dates. Is that a big deal?

I think with RSSAC, it'd be no big deal. I think we can fix that. No issue. I think RZM, we could probably address. IANA, you probably address it. I guess the questions are for SSAC, IETF. How big of a deal would it be if we went around the table? Would it be a big deal? I don't know. I

---

think you guys know your communities, so that's why I'm asking the question.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Just to let everybody know that this meeting is being recorded and per the RZERC work operational procedures, will be posted online.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I don't know how to interpret that, but, okay.

PETER KOCH: So this is Peter for the record actually. And I'll be careful what I say. I appreciate the additional information or not additional, but the reminder.

I'm not going judge big deal or not, but at least for the ccNSO, I just can say that there's of course also an internal procedures document that has certain dates and so on and so forth. And while I have the RFC in front of me, I don't have the ccNSO document right in front of me, but it's public as well. And the question is who to put the burden on and what's going back and forth and what are the internal consultation procedures. And again probably should understand what exactly the issue is, like synchronization might be nice, but that then means a deviation from the general rule that the sending organization determines what the terms and the term limits are because we have two-year terms and three-year terms.

---

And going back to the chair situation, that could also mean that somebody would not be eligible as chair because the rest of their term is only one year or you name it. And then again, going back to what is actually the problem that we're trying to solve. Synchronization sounds nice, but people who wrote the charter probably had something in mind when they thought of giving that leeway to the organizations, and that might or might not be a big deal. I don't think we will enter into civil war or something.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, it seems like maybe we just need to ask them, at least informally, and see what people say. All right. So, remote guys, any last words on this or can we move onto the other topics?

JIM REID:

Yeah, just one thing. Thanks to go back to what Brad was saying before, I can't speak for the IETF or the IAB issue because they've not giving me any sense of direction. My reading of the situation of it is that they view it as the current arrangement is not broken enough or don't need fixing. So, if they have to be changed, there should be a really good reason for doing that. I don't think there's a big deal of actually making a change documents, but I think they want to see there's a good reason for doing it. And perhaps [inaudible] come back enough to do it all again in a year's time because we've missed out in something else.



---

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks, Jim. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Quickly rephrase. Big deal was probably the wrong choice of words, now that everybody is hung up on it. So let's just say what would be the amount of effort involved in synchronizing the appointees amongst our organizations?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. So, I think we should move on to the related issue, which is the RZERC chair election procedure. Ideally, we would probably be sort of in the middle of an election right about now to reelect the chair. But as I said, since we hadn't been meeting for a while and we're a little bit out of practice—and I take the blame for some of this, of not remembering soon enough that all this needed to happen this month. We weren't really able to put the election together.

We wanted to get some reappointments done first to make sure that the people in the committee would actually be here and be able to stand for the chair election.

So, there was a proposal, which I think you all have seen which is that myself and the staff would send out reappointment letters to at least a subset of the organizations and then the election would take place in February. Right, Steve? And meanwhile, I am willing to continue to serve as an interim chair with the understanding that this interim period would not extend my second term or if there were to be a

---

second term in any way. We would continue on the previous schedule for the end of the chair's term. That's basically the proposal. Comments?

RUSS MUNDY: I think Howard just suggested a six-month time period instead of about three, though, before the election. Didn't I hear that about five minutes ago, Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Russ, yeah. Yes, you did. Since our conversations about the relative impracticality, at least in the short term, of the synchronization of reappointment, it sounds to me like it doesn't matter when we do it. It's not really the best time, at least until we get through that sync process. So, from that perspective, it sounds like it doesn't matter when we do it and I don't even necessarily see a need to wait until February. Right? Just to put the shoe on the other foot.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks for the clarification, Howard. I think maybe, Carlos, have you joined us just now? Maybe, maybe not. Well Carlos, if you're—

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Sorry, yes, I have joined.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks Carlos.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: A couple of minutes ago.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. So, we are currently on agenda item 4B. We are talking about the process to elect the RZERC chair and hopefully you've seen the proposal in the email about that.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Yes, I have.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you. So, feel free to speak up any time if you have a comment and anyone else as well. Raise your hand or speak up if you have more comments about the proposal for the chair election.

Okay. I guess not. So, we can probably proceed with that then, I guess. And I'll work with Steve and the staff to get the appointment letters going out and get going on that as soon as possible.

JIM REID: Just a moment before we move on, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure.

JIM REID:

I think there's two aspects to this chair election mechanism. There's an immediate problem, failing your successor or extending your terms to such [inaudible] we can appoint a successor, but I think we're going have to look at things such as the RZERC chair's term because of this problem with synchronization of not just the dates of appointments or the timings of the appointments, but the terms of the appointees to the committee.

Peter made the point earlier on we're going to have to—and I made this point before. We're going to have a situation where we will have appointees, the committee whose terms as appointees, which straddle the appointment as the chairman. No matter how we do this, you've got three-year appointment for several members of the committee, one-year appointment for others and we'd have to figure that out a way of solving that. So either we may have to change the chapter and of course that could be two months down the line when we review it, or we have to come up with some model of inter-mechanism and that could be something as simple as ... You know that I discussed with you, Duane, at the [inaudible] meeting last week was that we could, let's say for argument's sake, Peter's been chosen as a new chairman of RZERC. Then go back to ccNSO and say, "Is there any reason why the ccNSO [inaudible] this year a two-year term as chairman?"

So maybe we need to think about something as a quick enough fix as we try get around this problem of having in RZERC's chair term straddling the boundaries of an appointment term because we need

---

to fix that and I think they'll need to fix it that practically if there's going to be to change the charter.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks Jim. Yeah, I don't know about changing charter versus procedures, maybe one of them. But it sounds like at this point at least, you're not really suggesting that the chair term be changed to one year instead of two. Is that correct?

JIM REID:

I don't have any strong feelings about this either way, Duane. One thing I just had as a suggestion off the top of my head was that the chair could be set for a one-year term that's renewable for a maximum of three or four years. That might be a way of running it in the longer run. I think in the shorter term, I think we need to have something that [inaudible] whoever succeeds you has got some kind of indication from the appointing organization that they would be able to serve a full two-year term.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Thanks. I think there's a comment in the room. Brad?

BRAD VERD:

It would be nice to see a visual. I hate to say it, but all our names, a swim lane format kind of shows, year, year, year, year two, year term, two year term, two year term, one year, one year, four year, whatever it is, so you can kind of see how bad the problem is and see what

---

boundaries you need to put in to make it work. That would a starting point rather than ...

I'm trying to have this conversation and I'm listening to Peter and listening to Jim and listening to everybody, Howard, and I'm just like, okay, he was one year, he's two years, you're three. So, it's different across the board. While we clearly have a problem, like Jim pointed out, like you pointed out, that there would be a situation where somebody gets elected and either they're not able to be chair because they're terming out like say next year or they would term out the following. It gets a little complicated.

So, I think having a visual to start the conversation and then my suggestion would be to go change the procedures document and I can go change the procedures document for RSSAC and get it voted. I think that would be a fairly simple task. It's not a bylaw, it's not something that has to go for public comment. This is an internal thing obviously. I know it's different for every organization. I understand that. But that would be one way that I can address it, if that helps. I don't know.

DUANE WESSELS:

That's a good idea. I think the visual would help when we go to the other groups and explain the problem to them. Howard, your hand is up.

---

HOWARD ELAND: Yeah. So just to kind of tee off what Brad said, a couple ideas here. Hopefully no one has tomatoes in the room.

The first is perhaps the way we word it is that when we go to make a change that we say the minimum length of term ... The term for the chair has to be, at most, the shortest length of any particular AC or what have you nomination.

Yet, another way to do it may be that it's not an individual that is elected chair, but the representative from that AC or working group or what have you. So, then that actually eliminates the issue of a new person has been nominated because whoever fills that role is still in that chair seat. So, a couple of different ways to skin that cat, neither of which I think I'm too crazy about, but they're just suggestions.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks Howard. Peter's got his hand up next.

BRAD VERD: You can throw the first tomato.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Maybe first on the point, on the point of getting informal notice from the sending ACs and SOs, I think that was Jim who suggested that, I'm not speaking for the ccNSO Council, but I could not imagine that a standing ccNSO Council would bind the succeeding ccNSO Council in their decision to appoint somebody. So, that informal note or something is probably not anything that we can

---

build upon. However, I would like to support the suggestion met by Brad and also seconded already by Duane, that the visual could help us identify, well maybe not the problem, but curious about who are we likely to see in a year from now.

Then the members of the committee can actually make that decision and then, unfortunately, might not be able or might agree not to appoint a chair that is foreseeable leading the committee in less than a year.

The tomatoes. I think members of the committee are appointed by organizations but serve on personal title and therefore I think the succession plan, as laid out by Howard, is kind of incompatible with the compilation of the committee and would violate the spirit. But, engineering-wise, I like the idea, but I don't think it's workable.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I'd kind of second what Peter said around the succession. The way I can think about addressing this succession is that the committee appoint a new chair to fulfill the existing term of the person who lost their seat or left or for whatever reason. But that term, however long it is, doesn't count towards the term limit based upon them in their own capacity. Does that make sense? So, somebody might get it for two terms, plus some, but I think that's ... And again, I would address that in the procedures document.



---

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks. So maybe by our next meeting we can have some specific recommendations around updates to the procedures document or the charter, if necessary, to address some of these issues. I'll work with staff and maybe Jim, you want to help us out here too, since I know that you're passionate about this?

JIM REID: I wouldn't say passionate, but yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. So again, in interest of time we've only got 15 minutes left. Item 4C is any foreseeable work for RZERC. I think we've got some of that on the agenda already. Maybe with that KSK rollover, but briefly is there anything else that people are aware of at this time that they would like to mention but not maybe spend a lot of time discussing right now?

BRAD VERD: I have one that I hesitate to mention, which is signing of rootservers.net. That continues to come up in conversations here and there and whatnot. And while I'm not in favor of it, but I know others are, but my question is would that fall in here with RZERC? I'm not sure. So that's why I wanted to...

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think that's a question for maybe our next meeting

BRAD VERD: We don't need to spend time here, but that's something maybe we should talk about.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Yeah.

KAVEH RANJBAR: And I think in a similar spirit, the future of a KSK rollover plan, which is an AOB thing. Same question, first of all, does it apply here and then see if we want to take it in here?

DUANE WESSELS: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think we discussed this as a scenario in our early planning, but for awareness, we are developing our next generation root zone management system. We are talking about changing some of the procedures and the approval thresholds for certain TLDs to approve their change requests. I think based on our discussions we'd agreed that wouldn't be in scope of RZERC, but nonetheless, I'm very happy to give an update at a future meeting just to explain what is potentially implied by that and if we felt differently and we felt it did require more RZERC attention. Happy to see how we would do that.

---

DUANE WESSELS: All right, thanks. There's one that I will mention, a project of mine recently within the IETF has this record type called Zone MDs, zone message digest, and I'm hoping that that's getting near to complete and when it is, we would like to suggest that we actually put that in the root zone in the future. So, we'll talk about that in a future meeting as well, hopefully. Anything from Carlos or Howard or Jim before we move on?

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Not from me.

JIM REID: Yes. I'm not sure if it fits here or not, but I wonder whether the new gTLDs, maybe I thought that we should analyze at some point.

DUANE WESSLS: Was that a no, that I heard in the background? Oh, sorry. Alright.

JIM REID: Forgive me, I'm at a soccer practice. Sorry.

BRAD VERD: That was amazing timing.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter?

---

PETER KOCH: I was wondering whether the evolution of the ... Not the root server system, but components that are beyond the root servers themselves, as in local root or hyper local or how you name it, whether they might need or might benefit from a different collection of eyes that goes beyond what RSSAC is. I'm sure, already looking at in terms of future evaluation—future evolution, actually. And I'm not mentioning DoH.

KAVEH RANJBAR: May I add to that point? I think in general, yes, that's good. But for not RZERC because this is root zone evolution review committee, and I think it specifically talks about one root zone, correct? So, in my book, this is the compilation of that one root zone and what goes inside that, how it's distributed or how it's accessed or other root zones that might be created. I don't think it would be part of the scope of this committee.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Peter is not violently arguing in favor of the point I raised. We might just want to understand that if it's on us, is there anybody else looking at that with that holistic angle? Thank you.

RUSS MUNDY: And one of the things that's in our charter is that any member can bring up anything for discussion. And so, bringing it up for discussion and talking about it is different than necessarily publishing anything about it. So, I think perhaps we need to keep in mind that before we

---

put anything out, we have to start talking about it and the results could be, no, we don't have anything to say there.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, thanks Russ. So, to be honest, this topic elicited more ideas than I was expecting, and so I would say that if you would like a specific topic on our upcoming meeting, please be very specific and say, “I would like to talk about this at our next meeting,” because it sounds like we will have a lot of things to work on probably in the upcoming meetings. Okay.

That sort of relates to one of the next topics, which is the cadence of meetings. As mentioned before, we hadn't met for a long time and I think in hindsight that was maybe a mistake, and I was going to suggest that the committee should at meet at least every quarter. I don't think we'll maybe have that problem in the future, but that's a proposal I would make. I don't think it even needs to go into the procedures. It could just be an informal policy, if you will, that we should meet at least every quarter. I'm seeing heads nodding in the room. Any comments remotely?

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

I agree. I agree. We should meet periodically. Once per quarter sounds okay.

DUANE WESSELS:

Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Is there any desire or non-desire to align meetings with ICANN meetings? Just a question.

DUANE WESSELS: You're suggesting that rather than every quarter we just meet at every ICANN meeting at least. Is that kind of where you're going?

KIM DAVIES: I think it's a consideration. I mean, if we think we get work done more effectively at ICANN meetings, we have three of those a year obviously. But on the contrary, sometimes if we don't have a lot of people traveling it might be easier if we don't try and cram it into the ICANN agenda except for our sort of annual meeting we might do.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Jim, I see in that the chat that you noticed ... You lodged your protest. Do you want to speak to that?

JIM REID: Yeah, thanks. Thanks, Duane. I don't see the point in having meetings unless we get something specific to discuss. I've got no problem with people suggesting you have meetings every three months or so and maybe aligning with our other industry events, well enough of the committee will have to be in the same place at the same time. But I don't think we just have a meeting for the sake of having a meeting. If

---

we've got nothing to discuss and there's no pieces of work in front of us, I see no point in having a meeting. Frankly, it's just a waste of everybody's time.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Well, I guess I don't agree with that. I think a one-hour meeting every three months is not really a huge waste of our time and I think it would help us stay on top of our procedures and our schedule, things that we need to remember.

JIM REID:

Yeah, I appreciate you're point, Duane. I just have this concern that if we get into the habit of having meetings for the sake of having meetings, all sorts of other [craft] and stuff will just accumulate and we end up just having stuff and end up having discussions about things which are really not perhaps necessary or germane or we have meta discussions which don't serve any useful purpose.

So, I'd strongly object if you're going to have meetings, there has to be clear agenda and a clear topic or something that needs out attention and if that isn't there, we shouldn't meet other than having the statute requirement of having one physical meeting a year.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Yeah. Thanks, Jim. I'm certainly not suggesting to have a meeting without an agenda, but I take your point. All right, Kim?

---

KIM DAVIES: Just briefly, I mean it seems to me that the essential element is not necessarily the meeting. It's that we make an explicit effort every three months or so to review, do we have anything that we need to do, and get some kind of consensus about whether there is a need to meet. So, if we could somehow work into our routine that we do that and then we can make a call online whether a meeting is warranted or not.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Sorry, just real quick. Aren't we, by our procedures, say we will meet once a year? So just to add that to we must meet once a year. So just to add that to the ...

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I'm going to skip item 4E because I think this is now sort of overcome by events. I think we don't need to really worry about that at this time.

And in the remaining time I would like to discuss the future KSK rollover plan, which was published in last few days and has been getting some attention here at ICANN.

One of the meetings I was in, I believe that the deadline has been extended now. Is that official? So, the deadline for public comments is January 31, I believe. So, even though that's a couple of months, given



---

all the stuff that's coming up with holidays, that's still not a lot of time I think for us to get something out.

We have a few minutes. So would people like to express an opinion on whether or not RZERC should make a comment on this as we did for the previous rollover plan?

RUSS MUNDY:

I'll stick my neck out here and say I think RZERC should respond with something. I think we should look at the plan, and if we like it, say that. If we have specific changes or comments or whatever that are other than 100% endorsement kind of thing, then we should say that also, because what we're really talking about is activities that directly tie into our chartered remit area. This is content of the root zone and changing content of the roots. So, I think we need to say something.

DUANE WESSELS:

I'm going to call on Howard. He has his hand up in chat. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND:

So, it's very similar to what I was going to say. So, plus one to Russ. I would like to suggest that in the event that we don't have a meeting for three months or whatever that we take it to the list to start the review just to make sure that we get a bit of leg work on that first. And then, and use that as at least the kickoff point here, just in case a meeting time comes up short for holidays and what have you.

---

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you, Howard. Kaveh, still have a comment?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Basically, I agree with Russ. I think it's good, especially if we endorse it, it's good if it comes from this group. But if one wants to nitpick because—and I have to open up a charter but it's not changes into the root zones evolution and this is not evolving the root zone, correct? The process is new, but what will go to the root zone. But I think that's too much detail. So, I think especially if you endorse it, I think that goes a long way, if it goes from this diverse group of experts involved and the system.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. So, I would encourage us all to take a look at that and be prepared to start working on a formal comment document from RZERC. And we can talk about it in an upcoming meeting. Which reminds me one thing, not on our agenda, is scheduling our next meeting. So, we'll have to send out a Doodle poll or something, I'm sure, to find a time for a meeting in about a month from now. Is everyone okay with the idea of meeting again in about a month? And of course, discussion is on the list if necessary.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: I'm fine with it.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks Carlos.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thanks for this, because the deadline is January, correct? End of January. So, we need end of January, so we need to conclude by then, even if you want to endorse yourself.

DUANE WESSELS: Yup.

KIM DAVIES: And, and to be clear, I mean, it's not a formal policy process, so if there's a reasonable need to extend or whatever, we are, within reason, flexible.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you. So let's see, we've still got a few minutes. Russ, do you want to talk about the threat document stuff?

RUSS MUNDY: Sure. Thanks, Duane. This week there have been several meetings that I've been in more from the SSAC perspective, but the BTC (Board Technical Committee) is also discussing what is going on with threat, specifically that is faced by the Internet and the root servers and the overall system.

SSAC started a thing last summer as a threat scan, but I'm more curious to hear from Kaveh in terms of what the Board is looking at and what kind of inputs or responses or is there any action that you

---

would see that RZERC would need to say anything about with respect to these threat scan from the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, first of all, I don't think that document is open. That was shared with SSAC, but I will check because I don't think there's any issue sharing it with RZERC.

But there is a document which a BTC, Board Technical Committee, started to create and it came originally from requests from Board Risk Committee because there are very risky items in their organization, risk charter and risk management system basically. And some of them will try to direct root server system, things like that. There is a permeability and there is an impact calculation and then it goes to the whole strategy on top of everything. So, they wanted more concrete stuff. They asked BTC to basically dive into those risks and figure out what are the components and what are the scenarios, things like that.

It started with a small document. Harold, the IETF liaison to the Board started that and now it's become a long one. He's the main contributor.

I would make an action for myself to ask and share. I'm almost sure there is no problem, but I will have to check. But from top of my head—and I think there is about 40 items there, so it's like five pages. From top of my head, none of that is related to the root zone, but still it doesn't hurt to have it. Yeah.

---

DUANE WESSELS: So, do you think the Board would look for input from RZERC or not so much?

KAVEH RANJBAR: The thing is BTC in general is very open. We are always looking for feedback, especially from groups like this. So if we find something interesting, of course I can bring it back and I'm sure it will be it will be considered with a heavyweight.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks.

JIM REID: We should have a mechanism there would be for the Board to send it to RZERC, "Have you got anything to say about this?"

KAVEH RANJBAR: We can go the formal routes. I think if there is any, I don't know, but I think these things are easier handled informally. Basically, if I asked them, I share it. But if you really see the need, yes, I can work with Duane to see what would be the process basically to formally do this.

JIM REID: I'm kind of getting a little bit uncomfortable that we might get into the things which are out of scope for us and [inaudible] expertise. For example, risk management. I'm sure that people on this committee have got a bit of experience there but others don't. So, my inclination

---

would be to not get involved in this unless ICANN would explicitly task us to do that.

DUANE WESSELS

Yeah. Thanks, Jim. So, I think, at least issue for me is I haven't seen this document, so I don't know what its contents are.

At this point, I'm not suggesting that we should comment on it. I guess the question is should the RZERC members look at it and then talk about if we want to comment on it? Would you like this to be an agenda item for our next meeting to follow up on this or not, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

I think this would be a good thing for having the agenda for next time. I don't think there's any particular strong time urgency about it. It's something new that the Board's working on that might or might not require input from RZERC.

They haven't asked for anything formal of any sort, yet. The reason I became aware of it is because of the work that the SSAC is doing that is similar but different. And so, if the Board is working in this space and they're talking to advisory committees, it seems reasonable. We should have a look here.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Brad, go ahead.

---

BRAD VERD: I think this is premature. So, we had this conversation with SSAC. My comment to SSAC was I'd love to see the document. I can't do anything until I see the document. I don't think there's anything for RZERC to do until we see the document and/or we're tasked from the Board to give an input. Until then, it's not an agenda item cause there's nothing to do.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So basically the situation right now is the Board has not asked RZERC because they didn't see that in the scope of RZERC. I also personally didn't find that. So, we can either wait or see if something comes or if they ask then react, or I can ask to share and then we can judge for ourselves. Up to us. For me, I can do both.

JIM REID: Sorry, Kaveh, I think you should give a passive stance here. This is very premature and I agree with what Brad said. If the Board doesn't ask us to intervene or comment on this, I think we should not interfere.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, Steve. You wanted to make a comment?

STEVE SHENG: Thanks. Brad, I think there are actually two documents. There was one, the threat analysis that the SSAC is working on that is yet to be released. And what Kaveh's mentioning, the BTC itself has done a

---

threat analysis that contains about 40 or so threats. So, whether to have that share with the RZERC.

One thing I would like to caution is the RZERC mailing list is open and the Board document is kind of a confidential document. So, if anything, if the RZERC decides they want to see it, we need to create another mechanism to have all the members here subscribed to a closed mailing list in order to receive that document. Thanks.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Duane. I think we need to look again at the charter a bit because [we are] Board committee not a bylaws committee. So, the Board doesn't have to formally ask us. We have a board liaison and if the liaison decides to share the document, whether confidential or open, that depends on the Board's rules. RZERC members can consider the document, but we don't need a formal submission from the Board. The Board liaison sharing the document is formal enough, as far as I read the charter, actually.

DUANE WESSELS:

All right. We've gone over time. Did you still want to make a comment? Did you get the last word, Brad? Okay. All right. Remote folks, any last comments on this issue before we wrap up?

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

Nope, not for me.



---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay, thanks. So, I'm sensing a little hesitation at this point. Russ, I guess maybe the next step will be that maybe Kaveh and Russ should read through the document if it's public and then maybe come to RZERC with a specific proposal if you think it's warranted. Does that sound good?

KAVEH RANJBAR:                    I will work with Russ to basically make a judgment call that do we see that's something that we need RZERC to see or if it's relevant, and if we find it relevant then we will share. Otherwise we will consider the privacy issue. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:                    All right, very good. So we're the end of our meeting. We need to wrap it up. Can expect to a poll for the next meeting coming out soon and that will be a telephone meeting obviously. Peter, you got a comment?

PETER KOCH:                        Do we have an AOB or are we in AOB already?

DUANE WESSELS:                    We made it to the end of the AOB. There were two items.

PETER KOCH:                        I'm sorry, I didn't announce. I have other other business.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, please go ahead.

PETER KOCH: This is very informal and it's kind of a confession. Just so people know many of you may or may not know the ICANN Wiki and all the committees have an entry there and RZERC didn't, and I felt compelled to start one. It's very rough. If anyone wants to contribute it's now there, so you can point your own pages to that or something just to let the committee know.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you. Any last minute things before we wrap up, Steve or Danielle?

STEVE SHENG: So, I think the action item is to circle the Doodle poll. Another potential action item is the idea that Brad suggested, this diagram of the visualization of the terms of the members and we can work that with the chair to do that. So those are the two action items.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, and we have to send out the appointment letters.

STEVE SHENG: Right. And the KSKs, start that dialogue, and then send to the mailing list. Okay.

HOWARD ELAND: Was there also an AP to start talking about the charter review committee? I don't know if that's a subcommittee or if that's just all of us, but I didn't know if that was actually a formal AP that we described or we just talked about it.

DUANE WESSELS: So I think what I had proposed earlier was that at least myself and the staff would work on a specific proposal, but if anyone wants to join in that, let me know and we can work informally together. Does that sound okay, Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, I thought that was concerning specifically either 4A or 4B. I was talking about we're 18 months away from having to have a formal reviewer or changes made. I know it's a long ways out. It sounded like we may have wanted to start that process and that wasn't clear to me if it was an actual AP or not.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Thanks for clarifying that. We'll record that. I'll talk with Steve and see what he thinks about the urgency of that. Yeah. Okay.

---

JIM REID: I think you're good to capture that as an action item even it's not something that has to be progressed immediately, just have it formally recorded.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. That's a good idea. Thanks Jim.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Probably it's not urgent, but we could probably start like a running list of things people think that needs to be reviewed so that we always keep it there in the backburner and every once in a while review that.

BRAD VERD: I'd love to have that visualization that I described for that discussion, so make it a dependency type of stuff.

KIM DAVIES: Can we make that five-year charter review an agenda item for the next meeting? So that we just wrap up the things that we just talked about?

DUANE WESSELS: Sounds like I'm going to be busy this month. Okay. Thanks everyone. We'll adjourn the meeting.

JIM REID: That's why you get the big bucks, Duane.

---

DUANE WESSLES:                    Yeah, right.

BRAD VERD:                        Thank you.

JIM REID:                          See you, guys.

RUSS MUNDY:                      Thanks, all. Bye guys.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

CLOSED SESSION