DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello, all, and welcome to the RZERC Monthly Teleconference held on Tuesday, the 20th of April 2021 at 19:00 UTC. Tim, would you like me to start the roll call?

TIM APRIL: Yes, please.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. I'll note that we have regrets from Carlos Martinez, representing the ASO.

Peter Koch, ccNSO?

PETER KOCH: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: PTI, Kim Davies?

KIM DAVIES: Hi, all. Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: IETF, Tim April?

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Registry Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, ma'am.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: RSSAC, Daniel Migault. He was trying to join. He might be having some technical difficulties but I expect we'll see him in a little bit. Duane Wessels from Verisign as the root zone maintainer is not on the call yet. And Geoff Huston representing the SSAC?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, hi.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you. Tim, back over to you.

TIM APRIL: Keep going down the agenda. I'll start by saying I'm happy to be chair. Thank you for all the people that participated in the voting and everything. I'm more than open to feedback. If you want to contact me offline, I'm happy to talk to anyone who would like to.

So, if we want to start with the review of the minutes from the March 16th meeting. Anyone have comments or objections to anything in there? Hello, Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Hi. It took me a while for getting connected. I apologize.

TIM APRIL: No worries. You didn't miss much. We just started with reviewing the minutes from the last meeting. Not seeing any other comments. I guess we take that as approved.

Then the next one, I believe it was … I can't remember who asked for this at the last meeting, but Danielle has drafted a letter to thank Duane. It seemed good to me. I didn't know if there were any other comments before we shipped that off.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I believe it was Kaveh's suggestion to start this as … This is the first chance that we have at an outgoing chair, so he wanted to start this as part of the RZERC culture.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That is correct.

TIM APRIL: [inaudible] to me. I read it just a little while ago and figured it was good to go. If there are any other comments, please feel free. A yes from Peter. Okay.

And then the next one was … So we've had some feedback from ICANN Org on the Board understanding of the advice from RSSAC002 and 003, if you're able to share that.

So, Duane went through and made a bunch of comments—basically, clarifying comments—from the Board's statements of understanding. I meant to send this to you a little earlier, Danielle. I had two other comments I'll paste to the chat now for the first item. Just that basically bullets three and four don't have—that they're documenting. The second bullet says that they're [going to document something]. This third and fourth don't actually say anything about actually what they're doing.

And the fifth bullet about they're going to do a bunch of research, but I guess we actually want them to write it down and share the results of what they find. Otherwise, I agree with everything Duane said. If there's any other comments or feedback on the statements of understanding for bullet two and bullet three that we should get before sending that back to the ICANN Org.

Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Is Duane not here? Okay. The clarifying comments on the second point, a reduced set of glue records means when the additional section of a primary response contains fewer than 13 IPv4 records … It's just disappeared off the screen. Yes.

If you actually look at the responses from the root servers when you restrict the UDP buffer size, or don't provide an EDNS0 buffer size at all, invariably you get fewer than [30], invariably. You actually get random selections depending on which root server you ask.

So, what does Duane's comment mean? Because I can't understand what he's getting at there. Anyone else have a clue?

TIIM APRIL: So, I think he's referring to the second bullet point in that, from what the Board had said—what Danielle just highlighted.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Just emphasized the text I think Duane is responding to.

GEOFF HUSTON: In that case, I think there's a misunderstanding that you actually ever got the full set of glue records in any case. Frankly, getting a full set of glue records, oddly enough requires setting it up. It's not the normal course of events if you drop EDNS0, for example.

I must admit, it's a preamble to the primary thing of documenting how different resolver records respond when answers contained [inaudible]

set of glue records. That's certainly true. But the text goes on to kind of assume that these days you get a full set of glue records, and these days you don't.

TIM APRIL: I had understood that to be just more of a documentation exercise so that we would know—so that the community could know—how different resolvers would react to different levels of responses from the root. So I don't know of anywhere where that's currently documented.

GEOFF HUSTON: That's true, Tim, but I think it's almost independent on the issues around signing this, signing the name server data. It happens in any case, but that was my point. I was just confused about the default assumption that you always got a full deck of answers, when the default assumption is probably wrong. You don't get a full deck of answers anyway.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Hopefully, Duane will join in a little bit and we can push that a little bit more. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Tim. So, I have one or two meta questions. Is the goal for today to work through this or is it just the start and we continue over email or until the next or end of the next meeting?

TIM APRIL: That's a good question. I should probably ask. Have people had a chance to review the content of … I think it was attached to Danielle's agenda email. Happy to push it to next meeting if we want to review between now and then and discuss on the list.

PETER KOCH: I have no objection to go through it and talk about this today to get a common understanding of the questions, maybe. I myself didn't have enough time to go through it very thoroughly. I've just glanced over it and didn't even get to the point where Geoff was, finding interesting things in the responses. So, happy to continue. Just wanted to know what the timeframe is and how we intend to respond. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I can jump in and provide a little bit of context on the process. So, right now these items are being tracked similar to how advisory committees' advice is tracked. So, SSAC, RSSAC, ALAC, and GAC. Now, RZERC002 and 003 are in the Phase 2 or understanding phase. None of these can move forward until the RZERC and ICANN Org have come to a common understanding. So, the ball is really in the RZERC court right now to respond to these, so there's no timeline but the ICANN Org SMEs can't move forward with consideration and implementation until we respond. So, it's on the RZERC's timeline, given that caveat. And Duane has also just joined.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Danielle. That answers my question at least. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The question I have is that the clarifying questions are coming [for] RSSAC002, and my question is we cannot update RZERC002. Am I correct?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Unless the RZERC wanted to issue—go through the consensus process again and issue a version two. But the clarifying questions are kind of built into the understanding process, so this is just an opportunity for the ICANN Org subject-matter experts to just gain extra clarification on what the RZERC is requesting in RZERC002. So it's not a request to change the text in 002. It's just basically formalizing a channel for the committee and ICANN Org to communicate on the basis of this advice once it's been published.

Duane, I think you have a question or want to state something.

DUANE WESSELS: So, first of all, sorry for being late. I got my shot yesterday and I'm very sleepy, so I fell asleep. But I think the point that I just heard Danielle raising is something that I also recognized in this advice request, that there did seem to be some questions about an RSSAC document that … All we can do is say that came from the RSSAC document. We can't really answer it other than that, I think.

TIM APRIL:

Okay. So, knowing that I hadn't fully worked out the timeline beforehand of … This means they're waiting on us. It seems like it would probably be worth it to go through and see if there's anything simple we can knock out here. And then if there are longer things, switch back to the list. Geoff, would you be able to restate what you said a minute ago right before about Duane's comment on bullet two?

GEOFF HUSTON:

The assumption behind is it bullet two or bullet three? The comment is reduced set of glue records means when the additional section of a primary response contains fewer than 13 IPv4 glue records. And my point is these days it's very common for a primary response to contain fewer than v4 and v6 glue records for all 13 identified server names. Some root servers only give you v6 glue records, etc. And when you don't do EDNS0, then obviously you get a very [inaudible]. So, to some extent, that point about reduced set of glue records is actually orthogonal to signatures in the additional section of the names of the root servers. That was all. And the implication in the understanding was, well, if you weren't going to sign it, you'd get a full deck. And the answer is, well, you never did. That was not a default case. And that was what I sort of highlighted as it's not reduced because you're signing the names—the name server names. It's actually reduced anyway for a bunch of other reasons around size and DNS [inaudible] 2020, etc., etc., etc.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I agree with Geoff. This is really tricky and a little bit unfortunate that we ended up in this position with the language.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thanks, Geoff. Peter?

PETER KOCH: So, on this particular item, I don't have 002 next to me, but I understand that the description column is an excerpt of our own document. What seems to happen here is that the authors of this try … It occurs to me that they try to answer the response—sorry, to answer that request already, expanding on what the research question could be, and our recommendation just was go figure what the research questions are and I'm not sure that … I'm struggling with the level of detail. So, the description here is kind of abstract and we say go find out what you want to find out and they come with their first findings. Am I completely off in the weeds?

Apparently, I am and everybody is just too polite to tell me.

TIM APRIL: I was just trying to pull up the document to skim that section.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't think you're necessarily off here. I'm hesitant because I haven't swapped all this into memory yet and I don't have the document with me either. But in the column G, the understanding of requests column,

they do quote a lot of text which I believe comes from our document, either that we wrote or that we quoted from the RSSAC document.

TIM APRIL: Howard's hand went down. I was just reading the section that is bulleted in the second bullet there of understanding reduced set of glue records to mean one glue record of the full set. Sorry. I think any subset of it, which is basically what's going on now, I think according to what Geoff was saying—potentially just the clarification of one or more records I think clears that up in my mind. But I do agree with you, Peter, this is basically an open-ended research quest for them to figure out what would go wrong or what could possibly go wrong. I don't think anyone has a clear idea of that. I don't know how to point them in the right direction to have more defined research goals.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Tim. My point maybe was that instead of dealing with by means of clarifying questions and responses, isn't what we're asking for—we're recommending—basically doing that research? My impression is that, with this dialogue, we're going maybe in the right direction in terms of figuring out what to research, but that is probably already beyond clarifying questions. No problem with having the dialogue, but maybe we want to separate the clarifying questions with the steps into the solution. Does that make sense?

TIM APRIL: Yeah, I believe so. Geoff I believe was next.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. I think we're down into the next step discussion, which is actually beyond the Board understanding in my mind. It's one point to say ICANN has, if you will, some research capability—OCTO, whatever, doesn't matter where or how—and we are reminding them of RSSAC28 and saying we're not aware that you've actually done that work and we think it's important work and we think you should perform those studies and you should add that onto the agenda of your research program. That's a conversation.

A second conversation would occur when the research team—whoever, however it gets placed with this—conducts a conversation with either RSSAC or RZERC or anyone else going, well okay, this is on our plate. What should we be doing? Is a lab test okay? is a practical test on the live system? Should we look at primary behaviors in the wild, in the lab, etc.?

This understanding of the request seems to have jumped into the second conversation about research methodologies, whether we're looking at resolver implementations or the resolvers people use today, whether we're looking at the way root servers actually behave today or how they behave in terms of protocol, etc.

So, I think we're deep in a second conversation and I'm not sure that that's appropriate to be deep in that conversation, when in actual fact we're trying to ensure that the research topic is on the agenda of ICANN Org's research program. And understanding the request would be you seem to want some studies done. Clarifying comments, yes. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Geoff. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: So, plus one to that for sure, and in addition to that, I'll say—even kind of take it a step further to say exploring some of these questions without the presence of RSSAC to comment at the same time is almost dangerous because now we get into more [inaudible]. I think that's something we want to avoid in case we have a nuanced interpretation of their document that is not in line with their intentions or what have you.

So, I definitely agree that the answer should be we told you all to go look at it, so go look at it. Then we're happy to engage further down the line once the research is done. So, plus one to Peter and Geoff's comment.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. I think, trying to share the perspective from inside the organization a little bit—and my colleagues will correct me if I'm wrong. I think what ICANN Org is trying to do is not adopt recommendations without a full understanding of where the expectations lie. I think historically this has been a challenge where it's only after adoption that it was recognized that there was a gulf between the expectation of the community group

that was putting forward the recommendation and what ICANN Org expected will be involved.

So, I think what you see here is an attempt to try and make sure there is alignment prior to getting too far down the road.

With that said, I appreciate RZERC if it's taking a position that it doesn't actually want to get into this level of detail. Just wants to make sure it's on the radar. I'm sympathetic to that point. But that's really I think what this structure of this understandings document is really trying to accomplish.

We fundamentally, there might be variance in the details, but are we going in the right direction? Is this the right distillation of the kinds of things we want to see done as a consequence of this recommendation? Hopefully that's useful.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, Kim … Okay, you've raised the topic, so I'll go there. This is a replay of the issues with the research questions about the KSK rollover. It's kind of easy to do benchtop tests because you can change the trust anchors, etc. You can change the root and then aim implementations at it. It's all in the lab. It's easy.

It's kind of I wouldn't say impossible, but incredibly challenging, to actually test the live system. And if you will, put forward variations of

EN

behavior in a production system and get production resolvers with real users using it.

In listing the objectives … The real caveat is actually the practical limitations of any testing and measurement regime in the research program. And I can understand in some ways of going, "Wow, this would be really good if we understood X." And I think how current resolver implementations behave if they set the DNSSEC [inaudible] in their prime inquiries is one of those.

It's kind of a hypothetical without looking at the live system, but we can't do that. You can't change the root servers in order to test the theory of how resolvers are going to behave in response.

And it's kind of the second-level conversation, which I think is actually a research measurement conversation that is beyond the scope of I suppose this group sitting here today to try and provide some clarification. And certainly I think, firstly, it was RSSAC's work as well. So, it's a bigger group required.

But secondly, you've actually got to have a conversation with the folk doing the research who would actually gain a further understanding.

I think, at the RZERC level, oddly enough at this point, we're just simply saying we're not sure what was on your study agenda. We'd really like some confirmation that this will be studied and perhaps some timeline as to when you might get around with it. Full stop. Because the further clarification kind of gets into a world of hurt that I've just tried to illustrate. So that was my point. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: I believe Danielle is typing about what I was about to type into the chat.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. So, it sounds like for this one, for the process wise, we want to not approve the current understanding and say that we defer the understanding of terms, so any of the questions or the understanding statements in the bullets, we want to defer understanding of those terms to the RSSAC. So maybe deleting these first four comments and defer understanding of terms contained in RSSAC28 to the RSSAC. The RZERC … Maybe not recommends. But the RZERC recommends the ICANN Org continue to research these questions. Maybe not continue, but conduct the studies.

GEOFF HUSTON: If I could ad hoc, it would be RZERC wishes confirmation that this research is on the agenda of ICANN Org. Or on the agenda of ICANN Org's research program. What we're really trying to say is: are you going to do this work? And a simple yes/no is perhaps what we're after. Yeah. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: That works for me.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I have a thumbs up from Howard. Do we want to move on? Looking at the time, do we want to keep talking about some of these responses?

TIM APRIL: I think that's probably a good use of time. The other two topics after I think would be fairly quick to go over.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So, I think for recommendations 1B and 1C, our response should be similar to 1A. Looking back … Well, oh maybe not. Maybe not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Duane may remember, but was the text you copied into your clarifying comment from RSSAC28, Duane? I can't remember the document.

DUANE WESSELS: We're looking at row 12 here?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: It's on row 13.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, row 13, sorry. Yeah. No. These numbers were totally made up by me. Because I think either we have to say here are some made up numbers—or here are some numbers that the committee thinks are appropriate … Or we go back to what we've done for the previous one

which is to say we don't know. That's for you to figure out or for someone else to figure out. And I'm fine with either one. My assumption was that it would be good to be helpful and give them something specific. So I just made up numbers, the 20% and the 5%.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I think we're, again, wandering off into the weeds. It is unclear to me at what point the root servers would implement the reduced EDNS0 UDP buffer size recommendations coming out of the DNS [fraternity]. And of course, if one implemented that 1232 limit, in theory there is no UDP fragmentation but there's a hell of a lot more TCP depending on what queries are going to the root and how they're being answered, which of course varies server by server.

So, to fixate on UDP fragmentation per se is kind of getting this sort of twisted around a little bit. Flipping to TCP has its own issues. I think the real question is an understanding of the size management behavior of the root servers now and going forward and the level of common understanding as to the reactions of recursive resolvers.

And this is a tricky piece of measurement that, quite frankly, not all recursive resolvers support TCP. The UDP loss rates vary.

So, we're in the weeds again, and quite frankly, we are looking at an RSSAC recommendation. So I am tempted to say, much the same as the previous response, we just wanted to confirm it's on your research

agenda. These details are leading us in places that is actually the content of research, not the question as to whether it's on your agenda or not. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: That was part of my question or why I asked the question of Duane of could we just defer to RSSAC28 or I don't know if it's reasonable to just defer to RSSAC in general of what they operationally think in this area.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a question. Who is asking for those clarification? Is that the Board?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: It's subject-matter experts from ICANN Org. So, when a review committee or an advisory committee issues a piece of advice, it first goes to the ICANN Org and is assigned to an executive, so a department, and a subject-matter expert who drafts the Org's understanding of the request, once the committee confirms that statement of understanding—so kind of what Kim was saying when we agree on what direction the advice should go on—then the ICANN Org SME takes it before the Board to consider before the Board can determine implementation.

So, right now we're discussing this with the ICANN Org which is why the statement is ICANN Org understands those to be a request. They will eventually take it to the Board if it requires to get authorization for implementation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Because my understanding from what I remember from SSAC002 is that, as Geoff mentioned, we were simply asking for a study that has already been recommended is again recommended. So I see that as mostly addressed to the Board. And from the comment, I have the impression we have a technical analysis as if the studies were already been done.

So it seems to me that the questions are a little bit [inaudible] in terms of the document. I tend to agree that we should refrain our response to the scope of the document which is do the study.

TIM APRIL: Peter I think was next.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. I think we could agree that these questions are valid but probably not at this point in time and not directed at us for the time being. Like Geoff and others said, this is basically an RSSAC document and clarification to their recommendations should be solved by them.

That said, I would want to avoid this exchange of liaison statements through a firewall, where essentially most of us know most of the people on the other side of that firewall and we would otherwise talk on details and would probably reach a conclusion or at least make progress.

Maybe that question is … Well, or the confusion originates elsewhere. If I try to recollect or rephrase what we've said, "Dear ICANN Board, make sure that you reserve the financial and other resources and get this

study done." That is the understanding that we would like confirmed. And by having sent this to a group of researchers maybe, they are already down in the details and maybe we should convey that in some way so that we're not saying we're not going to talk to you, but we talk to you later. Or maybe we talk to you or the RSSAC is talking, so that we shouldn't look so [ITU] like at the moment. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Peter. Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: One thing I will say—and this may be a different frame of reference. And that is, because we specifically called out these questions in the document above and beyond just saying go look at RSSAC28, perhaps the way to phrase it is to say these questions were introduced as examples of the type of things that should be answered in the research. Now go do the research. Actually frame it that way so that we are, in a way, addressing the specific callouts that we have in our document rather than just punting completely. We at least give them some frame of reference to say we meant these questions to be part of that research and study when you're doing the work that you need to go do. I know that's a bit of a nuance but I think that kind of steers them … Because I don't want them to come back to say, "Since you asked these questions …" Thank you.

[TIM APRIL]:   Yeah. I was just reading recommendation two in this and explore the risk-benefit tradeoff and risks of the signed root zone. I think I agree with [everyone] of we're basically asking them to do the research and these are the things that we're critical to, what we were thinking in this area for the evolution of the root zone and all of that. So, I think the rough consensus is point them back at … We would like the research outlined in RSSAC28 to be done. This is more … I don't know how to word it in Board speak. But we would like … This is more guidelines of where we're looking for information from the output of that research. Does that make … I'm not sure if that even makes sense.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: I think I understand where you're going with this. If we want to move on to talk about other recommendations, I can take the action item to come up with the specific wording, for at least 1A through 1C to convey that message and then share it with the RZERC on the mailing list.

TIM APRIL: Perfect. Thank you, Danielle.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And I have also one comment that I'm … I think that Kim said the intent of the question is to understand we are on the right directions. I'm just wondering … I understood at the time he was saying that "we" was the ICANN Org. So, if that's the case, I think we have to go one [bound] further to the questions and to actually explain or make it clear why we want these studies to be done or to be some sense that it's not that we

don't want to respond to the questions and we are just asking them to do the study. It's more to give them confidence that, yeah, we believe that it is going into the right direction.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I'm not sure how much of it is driven by a need to understand the underlying rationale between why you're asking, why you put this recommendation together. It's more about, as Danielle noted as well, ensuring there's broad alignment between what the staff who ultimately will be implementing this recommendation think the recommendation entails versus what the community group thinks that they're recommending, just so that should it be adopted and it moves along, that there's not this gulf between those two sides down the road.

I appreciate that not all of these details are understood and I think it's perfectly reasonable for RZERC to defer to RSSAC, particularly when it comes to that RSSAC guidance before.

But really, that's what's driving this document and these questions is really, as much as possible and maybe it's just not possible at this juncture, can we have some confidence that it's being interpreted correctly so that can be conveyed to the Board when the Board takes its decision. It has confidence that we're not [across] purposes.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, Kim, that does raise an interesting question and it's probably a good time to ask it. In theory, I would have thought a similar analysis either has been or will be undertaken with the RSSAC document. And in theory, if it's already happened in the past, those answers have been provided by RSSAC and action is taken—or it's yet to happen.

Now, if it's already happened, it would be good or reasonable for us to understand that interaction and to confirm that the Org's understanding and RSSAC's understanding of that understanding confirms with ours. We're busy dancing a dance here amongst three parties and I don't think we should be answering in isolation or even getting to this level of detail when it was RSSAC that started the recommendations in the first place.

And I suppose what I am saying is, if this has already happened with the RSSAC document, then it would be helpful if we were at least privy to that interchange and could offer any deviant comments that says, "Well, we saw the conversation going to X and we thought this study would include why." We'd just like to add that why might be relevant here. If it hasn't happened, we can't do that.

So, without understanding whether this same conversation has happened with the RSSAC recommendations, I think we're kind of in the dark here. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	So, maybe Duane is going to add something on that, but I do not recall that we had such conversation between RSSAC and ICANN Org.
TIM APRIL:	Yeah, I don't think it's happened. I think the [inaudible] of the advice [inaudible] begun after the publication of the RSSAC documents. I don't think this was in place at the time that RSSAC028 was published. But it's a valid question of why has the same advice [inaudible] sent to RSSAC in that context, I think.
KIM DAVIES:	I think we can take it back inside the Org to check with the subject-matter experts who would know under one of them what the status is and what evaluation was done on that advice and perhaps we can come back with some additional insight.
GEOFF HUSTON:	That would be helpful to both RSSAC and RZERC, actually, Kim, wouldn't it? I mean, it's a decent conversation to have. I applaud the intent. It's great. It's just that, in this three-way conversation, it would be nice to understand what happened if there was a first iteration what happened to it. Thanks.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	This is something that I have personal expertise in and I can parse the publicly available information on the ICANN Board advice webpage to get the history on RSSAC28. I do know that the board did recently

resolve on RSSAC28 and it looks like it just moved to Phase 4 implement and this happened at the end of March, so probably during ICANN70. And I put the link in the chat.

But as far as the understanding and looking at did RSSAC28 get this type of conversation, I can look back on the Board advice page and get that history for the RZERC.

TIM APRIL: I think that doing that and talking with the SME seems like would help a lot with clarifying what's going on here, like Kim was just saying. So, do we take that approach for the first three? And I think that takes us to row 15. Any comments there?

HOWARD ELAND: So, in row 14, I guess … Is it gone now? Anyway, there was one very simple obvious clarification which was they had written [fraction] of queries and it need to be [fraction] of prime inquiries. But the one above it is more in line with the other things we've been talking about where maybe we want to defer that to the second step.

TIM APRIL: Good point, Howard. Should probably skip to the other two agenda topics quickly, then we can continue the other stuff either on the list or in the next meeting because it's relevant to that discussion we were just having a minute ago of in the conversation Duane and I were having yesterday with Danielle about handing over chair, the topic of potentially involving someone more formally from OCTO in our

discussions came up. It seems like, in relation to the Board advice discussion, having someone who is one of the SMEs that may be actually be responding to some of the requests and recommendations that we're talking about available to discuss these sorts of things could potentially save us some of the back and forth in the future. I wanted to get the feeling from the rest of the members of whether or not involving someone from OCTO and having the discussion with someone like David Conrad about whether or not that would be something they would be willing to do would be worth our time. [inaudible] thoughts.

DUANE WESSELS: I can provide a little background on that as well. When RZERC was started, there was a proposal and I don't remember where the proposal originated, but the proposal was that OCTO staff would just regularly sit in on the RZERC meetings and we sort of pushed back on that and asked that that not happen. In hindsight, I'm not sure that was the right decision. This conversation today is an example of that and there have been others as well, where I think RZERC would have sort of done better if those people had been in the meeting. So that's the background on that.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, Duane, for going back in time a bit. I wasn't sure whether I remembered correctly but what you said matched my recollection. The

proposal was there. I don't remember either where it originated from. We I think declined the offer.

I think in a particular case like the discussion we are having today, that would make sense. Or maybe in the next meeting so the committee can work on this and form or phrase questions and enter into discussion. I would want to remember the reasons for pushing back and to understand whether the reasoning would have changed before making a move forward.

Again, in this particular case, a more intensive might actually be helpful. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'd like some more time to think about this. RZERC is constructed not as a series of subject-matter experts but as a series of representatives from other organizations. In theory, we are conduits to those organizations carrying material around potential evolutionary changes to the root and their implications and conveying the messages back to ICANN.

In theory, it's not a doing body. It's a message-passing body and a body of review. That would lead me to think that the previous round of inviting OCTO, the conclusions were probably appropriate. I really don't know—and I'd like some time to think about this a bit more—about comparing where we are now with some specific recommendations in a conversation versus the more generic issues about the root zone and its

changes and our individual roles here as representatives from organizations.

And as I said, I'm weary of transforming this body into a doing body, when in actual fact, it's slightly less than doing. It's more about careful consideration and liaison.

So, I'd like to withhold any personal conclusions about whether we should invite OCTO or not to a future meeting. I just don't have a considered view. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: To be clear, we have had meetings in the past where an OCTO representative did attend. They were invited to attend. The decision back at the start was whether or not they would be included by default in every meeting as representative. Certainly not as voting members but as representatives.

So, it doesn't have to be that black and white. It could be something in between. But there have been cases where OCTO staff have attended.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But is the question of 5A to have a member that is attending hold the meetings?

DUANE WESSELS:	There's not a specific proposal here, but that is one approach we could take. Yes. That OCTO could appoint someone to attend our meetings on a regular basis.
TIM APRIL:	Howard?
HOWARD ELAND:	Perhaps maybe we could meet in the middle there and say … Because I think there's many meetings where OCTO's presence or advice is not required and I hate to throw meetings on people when we don't need to. Perhaps maybe when we have an item that we think requires or will require OCTO [inaudible] in discussion or participation, maybe we invite them to that particular meeting. So we handle it kind of on an ad hoc basis, perhaps. That way, we don't have to—we're not committed. They're not committing resources and we're not asking for a commitment on [inaudible] basis. Thank you.
TIM APRIL:	Okay. Thanks, Howard. Any other comments on that? I don't know if you were about to say something, Danielle. All right. I hadn't thought all the way through it. I just wanted to bring it up because it seems like it would have been useful for today. It seems like the general thought here is to think about it between now and the next meeting and we can have another discussion later on, and potentially bring in someone from OCTO at the next meeting anyway to go over the advice register from before.

It looks like we're just at the end of the time. I just wanted to bring up quickly about the second point. Within the year—I think it's August of this year—we need to begin the process of reviewing the charter because we have to do it every five years according to our charter. To precede that, we discussed I think either on the last call or the call before potentially redoing the scoping exercise. I'll try and prepare a little bit more for that and hopefully we'll have some time to discuss it at the last call. So, just something to think about of what's in scope for RZERC specifically. Just reading Peter's comment.

Any other business before we break?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So do we expect to get a clear feedback on whether we need to add another OCTO member into RZERC and come back next meeting with—

TIM APRIL: I was thinking that we'd probably just take between now and the next meeting to think about it and discuss it in more depth at the next one, if that works for everyone else.

Thank you all for your time. We'll talk next month.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right. Thanks, Tim.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Tim.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]