

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello and welcome to the RZERC Teleconference held on 18 February 2020. Duane, over to you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thanks. So, thanks, everyone, for making the February meeting. Let's start off with a roll call for the record. Danielle, do you want to do that? Go ahead.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I see that he's present. PTI, Kim Davies?

KIM DAVIES: I'm here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: SSAC, Geoff Huston?

GEOFF HUSTON: I am here.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RSSAC, Brad Verd, not on the line yet. ASO, Carlos Martinez?

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Jim Reid?

JIM REID: Yup.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes ma'am.

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

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane's here.

---

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And we'll note that the ccNSO rep Peter Koch has submitted his apologies, and for staff, we have myself, Danielle Rutherford.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you very much. So, today it should be a pretty short agenda. I've got a few just administrative items to go over, minutes, previous emails, then we'll do the ... We have an update on the chair selection, and then we've got a couple of potential work items still to discuss and any other business. Does anyone have any proposed changes to the agenda at this time?

Okay, guess not. Thank you. So, Danielle sent out the minutes from our January meeting. Hopefully, everyone had a chance to look at those and I didn't see any proposed changes come through, so if there's anything to discuss about the minutes, now would be a good time, otherwise we will take them as approved and have them posted to the website. Any comments about the minutes?

HOWARD ELAND: Not from me, [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you. So, Danielle, if you can have those posted as soon as possible, that would be great.

One of the things from the last call was there was a request to send out the results of our exercise from 2017, and since we had considered some of those topics a little bit sensitive, that was sent to the RZERC

---

members individually. Hopefully, everyone received those and I just wanted to give a little chance for anyone to ... First of all, if you didn't receive those, please speak up, and if there's any questions about that or if that was sufficient for what we were looking for. Any comments about the exercise from 2017? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Actually, I found it unusually informative. I think it describes in far more practical terms what folk think is this kind of scope of this particular work party, and I for one think it was actually a useful exercise. I could quibble with a few sort of ins and outs, but quite frankly I think overall it was a good piece of work and I appreciated the reminder. Two years hasn't changed things much, has it? Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, probably not. Okay. Thanks, Geoff.

JIM REID:

Just an observation, Duane, but I think it might be useful now that there's a significant change in the composition of RZERC that RZERC maybe goes through this exercise again. Maybe the circumstances have changed. They clearly haven't changed all that much in the last couple of years. It would also be useful also for new members of RZERC, Geoff, to get a copy of that document just as is this is of common understanding for what stuff we think is in and out of scope.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Fair. Yeah, that's a good idea. All right. So, thanks everyone for that. Next, let's get an update on the chair election from Danielle. Do you have any news for us? So, I submitted my nomination. I don't know if anyone else did.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I did not receive any other nominations for the chair. So, according to the operational procedures, we can now vote by affirmation on the call to reelect Duane as the official chair through March 2021.

DUANE WESSELS: That's fine with me. Of course, anyone want to discuss this before we move to formal vote? Do the procedures ... I guess the procedures do say to vote by affirmation during the call, right? Not on the list.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: So, if there's only one nomination for the chair, we can vote by affirmation on the call. I do note that we have two members absent, so we can also put out an anonymous seven-day poll on the list to receive votes from everybody on the list.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I think that might be good, again to the absentees. Is everyone okay with that?

---

JIM REID: I don't think we need to vote. There's only one candidate. Why don't we just say Duane's it and be done with it?

GEOFF HUSTON: The two absent people can't change an affirmation online here. It can't overturn. The majority of the quorum of the group is actually here. So, you can proceed right now as far as I'm concerned.

HOWARD ELAND: [I agree with you].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Well, that works for me. So, I will continue to serve as the chair for approximately one more year, and after that somebody else needs to step up because I'll be term limited. So, thanks everyone for that.

Moving on to the schedule for the recurring meeting times. We have a Doodle Poll with something like six or so responses. The Doodle Poll lists a number of dates and times. If I remember correctly, the most popular dates were Tuesday at 18:00 UTC and Tuesday at 19:00 UTC. The poll does not specify which Tuesday. My suggestion is to do as we have done before, which is to go for the third Tuesday of the month and really we just need to settle on the specific time. One reason it's a little bit cloudy is because I think, Howard, you had question marks in your responses.

---

HOWARD ELAND:                   Sorry, it's because I originally voted and then I think we changed the poll.

DUANE WESSELS:                Yeah, I think that's what happened. Something happened there.

HOWARD ELAND:                Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS:                So, Geoff, how is this time for you?

GEOFF HUSTON:                This time is actually brilliant because when Daylight Saving shifts around, because we're UTC-based, it's a 6:00 AM call that goes to a 5:00 AM. I'm a happy little camper. If you move it an hour earlier, a 5:00 AM call, which I can do, becomes a 4:00 AM. call, which kind of makes me grumpy. So, my preference is to keep at 17:00 UTC for that reason, but I will well-understand if someone else is really inconvenienced by that. I'd grudgingly go to 4:00 AM call, but I'd prefer not to.

DUANE WESSELS:                You said 17:00. Did you mean 19:00?

GEOFF HUSTON:                I meant 19:00, sorry.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay. Yeah.

GEOFF HUSTON:                   So, the 19:00 call is my preference over the 18:00 call, yes.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay. How does that work for others? Any comments about a recurring meeting 19:k00 UTC, third Tuesday of the month, to be cancelled if RZERC has nothing to talk about?

JIM REID:                         I'm good with that, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Okay.

JIM REID:                         Although, [inaudible]. The meeting only goes ahead if there's something to discuss.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Yeah.

JIM REID:                         So, by default, we're doing half of them.

---



DUANE WESSELS: Sure, yeah. Either way, we're going to try to be very communicative and send out messages about whether there is a meeting and whether there is not a meeting, but I understand what you're saying.

Okay. So, we'll proceed with that. The only one I'm sort of concerned about is Peter because I know he's missed the last two meetings now, and I hope that this time works okay for him. He didn't fill in the poll either.

JIM REID: In my opinion, Duane, he just has to suck it up.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Yes, there is some truth to that. So, okay. We'll proceed with that plan, third Tuesday of the month at 19:00 UTC going forward and I'll ask Danielle to please send out a standing calendar invite just so that it's on everyone's calendar and we don't forget it or we don't get other things scheduled at this time.

All right. Moving on to potential work items. On our last meeting, we had discussed signing of [rootservers.net]. There hasn't been any movement on this since then. I guess one of the things we should talk about is what form ... What we would like to see as a next step. Really this is probably a proposal that needs to come from either myself or Brad, I would say, and Brad hasn't been on the calls either.

---

So we can write something up more formal and throw it to the group for discussion. Alternatively, we could consider doing as is done in other RSSAC groups which is to form a work party. So, I'd like to hear people's thoughts on how best to proceed for this and I guess the other one. Work party or something formal from the member?

JIM REID: [inaudible] something formal. If we got a proposal in from RSSAC or root server operators on this topic, then I think then we make a decision about how we think about how we think is best for RZERC to handle that and then we form a work party and then we just discuss it amongst ourselves. But until something is concrete in front of us, I don't think we can make a decision either way.

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

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't see much point in forming a working party in a group that is this small. I actually believe that if the essence of the work party is to focus attention in a group of think it's eight or so folk, that focus is either there, or it's not, as the group. A work party won't add or detract from that. So, I believe it doesn't need a work party.

I think any kind of consideration like that requires a rationale as to why this is better than not, and the overheads in doing that, who has to do work and what it entails, and then a clear conclusion as to whether the effort is worth the benefit. And, to my mind, that's not a lot of work. So,

---

I think let's just do it as a group from, either, some other drafted input or whatever is appropriate to bring the work item into the group.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? All right. So, I will take an action to discuss this with Brad and see how he thinks we should proceed, whether this needs to come from Verisign or RSSAC or whatever. But I'll do that and get back to the group here.

And similarly, regarding here on the agenda that says Zone MD, previously we talked about doing something a little bit more generalized, not necessarily referencing this specific Internet draft, but rather talking about the need to secure zone data using ... Well, with a mechanism to be determined. So, again, since I brought this to the group, I feel like this is on me to write up something more formal and have something specific for us to consider. So, I will also take that action item.

Any last discussions about the work items before we proceed to the end of the agenda? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Look at that last item when you write this up. I have a slight anxiety over incrementally adding load to the Root Zone Maintenance Operation. One more thing to sign, oh it's only one more thing to sign, oh it's only one more thing to sign.

Now I think I agree that Zone MD is a really good idea, but it's one more thing and I think at some point it's worthwhile noting, yes, we

---

understand this and we understand that if this trend continues it does add to the fragility of the system because in any of those 'one more things' is missed, then what gets pushed out doesn't work.

So, we're looking at this, as well as the benefit. There is some slight consideration that this idea that we're heading toward a root zone that runs the risk of death of a thousand cuts, by simply adding little work items again and again and again to every maintenance update that happens. Now, like I said, I think this one's easy and it's a no-brainer, but it's worthwhile noting that because at some point we may have something a little bit more substantive where the incremental load becomes a real consideration. That was all. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: So, Geoff, are you ... Whatever RZERC produces regarding this work item, would you like to see those sorts of words expressed in that work or are you just making—

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: No. No, I'd like to see it expressed in that work because obviously this is not a decision-making body, and if you go to sort of suggest more work,

---

it's useful to understand the pros and cons of the suggestion of more work.

DUANE WESSELS:                   Yep. Okay. I got it. All right. Anything else?

All right. Unless there's no more late additions to the agenda, we can adjourn and we'll proceed with these work items and look for the meeting invite from Danielle. All right. Thank you, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Thanks, Duane.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Bye, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**