
STEVE SHENG: Good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Today is Tuesday, 16th of November 2021. We're having the RZERC teleconference at 19:00 UTC.

Let me first do a roll call. IETF, Tim April.

TIM APRIL: Present.

STEVE SHENG: Address Supporting Organization, Carlos. Carlos, are you there? You may be on mute if you're speaking. Let me come back.

Country Code Supporting Organization, Peter Koch.

PETER KOCH: Yes, present.

STEVE SHENG: ICANN Board, Kaveh Ranjbar?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, present.

STEVE SHENG: Public Technical Identifiers, Kim Davies?

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.

KIM DAVIES: Present.

STEVE SHENG: Registry Stakeholder Group, Howard Eland?

HOWARD ELAND: Yes, sir.

STEVE SHENG: Root Server System Advisory Committee, Daniel Migault?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

STEVE SHENG: Security and Stability Advisory Committee, Geoff Huston?

GEOFF HUSTON: Good day. I'm here.

STEVE SHENG: Verisign as the Root Zone Maintainer, Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here. Good morning.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. So let me try Carlos again. Carlos, are you able to hear us? Can you confirm you're present? Well, let me try to reach out Carlos in chat. But in the meantime, let me hand this over to you. Tim.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I'll take it from here. Good afternoon, good evening, good night, everyone. The first thing is the agenda review. Anything to add to today's agenda? Okay. Then the first item is the review of the minutes from last month. You have those, Steve. Thank you.

They were in the agenda. Anyone want to take a look? Anything that we should—any questions or comments on the agenda or taken as approved? Not seeing any hands.

Okay. The next item up there was the ARR updates. Danielle quickly discussed them but I think Steve has more of a context here.

STEVE SHENG: Yes. There are two items that the ICANN Org provided update on RZERC002 and then RZERC003. So on RZERC002 recommendation, the RZERC recommend the ICANN Org for the explore the cost benefit trade-offs and risk of signing Root Zone Name Server Data, in particular, to the risk of redirecting query traffic outweigh the risk of increased operational complexity.

So the update here is this recommendations move to a deferred phase. The reason for deferral is the RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 and 3

currently it's been implemented, and the ICANN Org has sent a request for proposals for studying what's in Recommendation 2 and 3. So that's ongoing. So the deferral reason is pending implementation based on the completion of the implementation of RSSAC028. So the suggested action is the RZERC would acknowledge the update. Are there any objections or comments? The RZERC would like to relay to the Org on this. Okay. Hearing none, let's move on to Recommendation 3 of RZERC003.

The Recommendation 3 recommends developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default when the software is configured to locally serve root zone data. ICANN provided an original statement of understanding and the RZERC didn't think that was very precise because you intend this as a recommendation to the broader community of software development, and so you provide the response. And then the ICANN based on the RZERC response, updated the understanding, is that the ICANN Org understands this recommendation is directed at a broader community of software development and no further action by ICANN Org is directly envisioned. The appropriate action is for this to be taken up as an update to the standard specification of hyperlocal. So that's the updated ICANN understanding. Does the RZERC agree with this understanding? Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. I'm sorry. That was for the previous item.

STEVE SHENG: Oh, sorry. Yeah. Okay.

PETER KOCH: But let's finish this.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Why don't we finish this, and then we go back to the previous one.

PETER KOCH: Thank you and apologies.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Steve. I think this is definitely better. I'm a little bit worried, I guess, that one way you could read this updated Statement of Understanding or our responses that somehow an update to RFC 8806 would include a recommendation to software developers to implement it. But I think I understand the gist of this based on our previous discussion is that that would sort of happen naturally and that there is no direct tie between a future RFC and a specific recommendation to the implementers community.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. So, Duane, would striking the last sentence address your concern?

DUANE WESSELS: I guess it would. Yeah. I guess the thing I'm struggling with is I'm not sure we need to mention any specific action for this particular recommendation. I think it's going to happen naturally.

STEVE SHENG: Sure. So, let's go to Daniel. Daniel first. Next, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: What I'm wondering is why the update would only concern a hyperlocal as a general way to handle zone transfer.

STEVE SHENG: I think in terms of the technicalities, I think the Org was trying to rephrase this, right? Because in the RZERC response, it says the appropriate action is for this to be taken up as an update to the standard specification of hyperlocal. And here they are rephrasing this in that way. I think that's the context of how they rephrase it. I don't know there's intention to limit it in that sense. Does that answer your question?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I'm wondering, Duane. If it's an RZERC response, I'm just wondering if anyone remembers why we sort of limited that to the hyperlocal context.

STEVE SHENG: Duane, do you want to quickly respond to that?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't want to put words into Geoff's mouth because he's here, but my recollection of the discussion last time was that Geoff was saying that something we sort of missed in our original formulation of the recommendations was any follow up to RFC 8806. That was sort of one of the missing steps into getting this into broader deployment. So I think that's where that phrase came from.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: But since RZERC is by its charter focused only on the root zone, I guess that's why we see the word hyperlocal here.

STEVE SHENG: Geoff, do you want to—

GEOFF HUSTON: Look, Duane is basically correct. If you look at it, it's not an intrinsic property of zone transfer. And so there's no other place in the Internet standards where this would be relevant. But oddly enough, 8806 is actually about the root. And in terms of the panoply of DNS standards, this is the one where that hit would be best applied. And I just felt it would be useful to bookmark that. And the folks who either wrote 8806

or the folks who are implementing it should be mindful of ZONEMD, and that's just being helpful to the broader community.

So without being able to tell anyone to do anything, which is I think what's going on, it's quite okay I think to note that the appropriate action is that that standard specifications should be updated. And as a bland statement of fact, I think that's a correct statement as to who would do that, it's kind of up to folks who feel motivated to actually submit an update of 8806 and note that ZONEMD would be a good thing to do. And whether that means you, Daniel, me, Geoff, or anyone else, that's fine. I don't think RZERC can tell any of us, but it's still a good idea. That was why I thought it was useful to have it there.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Thank you. I understand then the rationale. Thank you, Geoff. Thank you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I think Kim had a good suggestion in the chat, which is change "the appropriate action" to "an appropriate action".

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm fine with that.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Are you okay with Kim's proposal?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter.

STEVE SHENG: Go ahead, Peter. Do you want to talk to this point? Go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yes. My recollection was slightly different. I think we mentioned it there, but then we didn't really talk about hyperlocal. So while "the" or "an" appropriate action, which then hangs off the sky in a way, as we just discussed, is okay. But I would be in favor of deleting this sentence until the point where RZERC actually talks about hyperlocal, which we haven't yet. My recollection is we avoided making recommendations about hyperlocal because it wasn't on our plate. ZONEMD was on our plate, and if that is a piece in the puzzle, that's fine. In that particular case, we were talking just about the effects of ZONEMD and not necessarily endorsing hyperlocal. I think there are some questions still open for hyperlocal to fly and to be recommended. And yes, I think hyperlocal is in scope for RZERC to deal with.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. Okay, so we have two proposals. One is, as Kim suggested, change the appropriate action to a potential action. The second one is to delete the sentence completely. How do we wish to proceed from this point on? Any thoughts?

GEOFF HUSTON: Let me offer the comment that whether RZERC likes it or not, 8806 has been published. It's out there. It exists. And my understanding is folks are doing this. If we change the wording from appropriate to potential action, I think it's a neutral statement that recognizes the existence of 8806 with specific reference to the root zone, and therefore, ZONEMD's relevance. And I don't think that makes a value judgment as RZERC on 8806's role or not. It just doesn't. But it does recognize that it's one of the few places where ZONEMD is referenced or referenceable in the RFC documents irrespective of RZERC's position on it. It simply acknowledges it exists. So I would defend a potential action here as being appropriate in the context of an existing IETF standard. Thanks.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Geoff.

PETER KOCH: With the softened language, I think that makes sense. Soften as in— what did you suggest, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Correct. As Kim said in the chat, a potential action, that it doesn't endorse, or otherwise, it just simply says there's an RFC, it seems relevant to this. Potentially, that standard could be updated to reflect that. Fine.

PETER KOCH: Okay, fine. I'll not die over this. Thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. All right. Sounds good. Let's go back to RZERC002 Recommendation 2. Peter, you have a comment regarding this.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. And apologies. I didn't get my hand raised quick enough when we were at that point. I'm just wondering, the action required, since we didn't have any comments, this is just the confirmation of the understanding. Is that what we've just agreed on? This whole postponement got me a bit confused. Apologies for that.

STEVE SHENG: Essentially, we acknowledge the update. They provide updates saying this is the deferred phase. We acknowledge it.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Fine with me. Sorry for my confusion.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Sounds good.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Maybe related to that comment, I'm wondering, are we involved in some ways into these studies? Or is it something just handled between ICANN Org and a third party?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. I think ICANN have an RFP open. There RSSAC028 is issued by RSSAC and I don't think RSSAC have expressed any interest to be involved in that RFP. So similarly, I'm not sure RZERC wants to involve in the RFP process. But if their individual members are interested to review the results, even to bid on the work, I don't see there's reason but there's no reason for RZERC as a whole to get involved in that. So that's my read.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Yeah, this is also my understanding.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. With that, I think I'll amend the response and send it back to the ARR and work with Danielle in getting back to the ICANN Org. So finish this item and back to you.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, Steve. The next item we had was picking back up the topic, the scoping exercise that we were talking about last week. Do you have this sheet that Danielle was sharing last week, Steve? There it is. All right, last month. I can't remember if everyone was here last month or not. So we started going down this sheet of we had all of the items that were on the questionnaire and we had gone through and sorted out the ones that had either strong support or seemed to be clearly out of scope. And then there were a handful in the middle that were hard to determine whether or not the collective decision was that they would be in scope or not. I guess the first thing to ask would be, does anyone

see anything that was labeled as either likely in scope or in scope? And then out of scope or likely out of scope that should be either discussed further or think it's in the wrong place. Then if we don't have anything that's there, we can continue the discussion about the things that are in the Discuss column. And then the thought was that after we finished going through the items, have everyone go back to the form and modify their responses, if they decided to change their opinion about it. And then we can pull the data again before the next call and see if that sways anyone's opinions one way or another. Is that a new hand, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: My apologies. Old hand.

STEVE SHENG: Tim, perhaps this is a little bit difficult to read. Perhaps let's just do one at a time.

TIM APRIL: Sure.

STEVE SHENG: So let's do in scope, likely in scope, and see if anybody have any issues with that.

TIM APRIL: Okay, sure. So I guess the question here is—

GEOFF HUSTON: Could you please share a reference to that so I can put it up on my window, my screen? It's not easy to see the spreadsheet correctly.

STEVE SHENG: Yes. Let me send a spreadsheet out.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Hold on a second. In the meantime, let's make it bigger so that you can see it. Let me work to send it out.

TIM APRIL: I had it in Google Docs from when I was modifying it.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you.

TIM APRIL: I think that's the data. In my view, it says Sheet 1, I believe. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think, given the number of people that have quantified this as out of scope, I think there is room for discussion for a number of these. With

that said, I mean, there's a couple here to me, personally, that are more of interest than others. And maybe they hinge on definitional issues but the one that really jumps out to me is next unplanned KSK rollover. I think, by definition, unplanned KSK rollover is unplanned. And I'm curious to hear the level of involvement that is anticipated by RZERC given its operational event that is unplanned so that we can be on the same page with regard to that.

TIM APRIL: I'm trying to find the topics that we have. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks. I had a very similar impression before responding to this. My interpretation was that RZERC would not be involved in the actual operational execution of the unplanned KSK rollover but in the careful planning of the unplanned rollover as in what's the scenario and the precautionary measures, and so on and so forth, looking at that emergency plan, so to speak, rather than blessing the execution of that one. I hope that clarifies the positive [fold].

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think that's a good perspective and I definitely agree that makes more sense. It does lead to a subsequent question which is that for this—and I think for a couple of other things on this list—we already have existing

operational procedures. So absent a trigger to change the underlying procedures, I mean, as of right now we have contingency plans, we have a written up in our DPS what would happen, etc., would RZERC see itself having a role in reviewing the existing procedures that extend prior to RZERC existing, or would just be in deltas to the existing procedures?

TIM APRIL: Is that an old hand, Peter?

PETER KOCH: It is, but I could also respond unless anybody else goes first.

TIM APRIL: Go ahead.

PETER KOCH: So without having recently looked at these procedures, I believe there's some time passed since they were designed and our understanding of what the installed base is and the reactions, and so on and so forth, might differ. So independent of who is actually doing that review, RZERC could try to trigger that review rather than doing it ourselves. And trigger means that we suggest that a study be conducted or the constituencies that are represented in RZERC go back and have a look at that as one example. But that's only a rough idea off the top of my head.

TIM APRIL:

I had a similar thought as that as well of when I pulled up the scoping definitions that we had created. My understanding of this particular item was that it would be proposed changes to how an unplanned KSK rollover would occur. So if there were changes that happened to the current plan, that might be something that RZERC would need to review. It's still within the scope of the RZERC charter that if any of the members wanted to have something reviewed, they could bring it forward and just look at how things are going right now. And if they wanted to trigger a review of that, they can bring it forward as item on the agenda, and that can be a work item that the RZERC could accept or not.

Then another thing, is it possible to hide columns C, D, and E in your view, Steve, because I think the next three columns are the ones what the committee believes should be in scope or not, rather than what they believe the charter limits it to, I think. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thank you. Look, I'm just very quickly looking through this, Kim. I think what you're referring to is around the area in the DPS of 4.5.3.2 where old can't sign new. And there's only a certain window of opportunity when all these unobtainable, lost, gone, unusable, and therefore, cannot sign new and you've got to restore. I think it's worth reviewing this DPS at some point in the light of experience. And the whole idea that the Internet will shift gears with 30 days notice to add a new trust anchor seems to be a statement of wild optimism but I'm not sure what alternatives exist. But it seems an unrealistic opinion in that DPS. Given that, it certainly has a role, I think, in RZERC to assess the DPS to the

degree of which it expresses a reasonable reality as distinct from wishful thinking. And on that basis, I would say that the unplanned key change of the KSK, the next time planned key rollover, and it's not a role. In that case, it's not a role, it is a replace. And so on that basis, I'd say it has some relevance to RZERC. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. To be very clear, I'm very happy to have RZERC weigh in on some of these matters. I think additional review to our practices is helpful. I'm trying to sort of ask the meta question about what are the triggers that would bring these kinds of items to RZERC to make sure there's alignment there and there's no expectations not being met in terms of when we bring things forward or when there's an expectation that we would bring things forward. To focus on the key ceremonies and KSK management specifically, we have a number of controls there, including that there is a policy management authority that meets at least annually that goes through these procedures in depth that reviews them and issues new policies. I just pasted the URL of one such policy. There's about a dozen. This one is specific to the emergency rollover of the KSK. That was last adopted as recently as September. So that's reviewed at least annually. You know, there's rarely any significant updates. I think it is appropriate that there'd be some more significant substantial community review, possibly periodically. I will say that the trusted community representatives that are directly involved in key ceremonies

are usually much more directly involved in this. But to me, this is more about just getting an understanding of when to bring things to RZERC, when it's appropriate to bring things to your attention, or what the triggering event is to get these on RZERC's radar. At the other extreme, every time we do a read on these documents, dumping the 15 revised documents that we send to our PMA to RZERC is probably a waste of RZERC's time as well. So striking that balance and finding the appropriate process will be part of my thinking as we go through this list.

TIM APRIL: Is the view you're showing, Steve, just the in and likely in scope?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, that's correct.

TIM APRIL: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Should I move on to another status?

TIM APRIL: Did anyone else want more time to review that list? Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks. It just caught my eye that the latency in root zone distribution was likely in scope. I'm not sure what that means, whether that is not an operational issue or why colleagues think that it should be in scope.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry. That's a good catch, Peter, because I wonder the same thing. In my mind, this is definitely more of a day-to-day operational thing. And I'm surprised that it's so highly rated in scope.

PETER KOCH: The question, of course, is if it's not RZERC, who else is in charge? That's also a question that goes back to the very early scoping exercise. Let's make sure that things do not fall between the cracks. If it's not RZERC or any other natural organization, maybe the community wants to find out who is in charge of that. I was thinking of the CSC, but on second thought, that's probably not their business. But I'm not sure.

DUANE WESSELS: I can speak a little bit to this, as could Daniel, I suppose. Within RSSAC, there is a published document that pretty directly addresses this. It's RSSAC047, which is some metrics on the root server system and root server operators. One of the metrics is publication latency. So that's definitely something another group is already working on.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Thinking about this, one thing that comes to mind is as like distribution mechanisms evolve, hyperlocal, and so forth, maybe these kind of baseline assumptions that latency is controlled by a small group of actors might evolve over time and might have some architectural implications as a result. I'm still not sure if it's in scope as a consequence of that, but I think it's perhaps potentially a broader question than just root server operators when it comes to this aspect.

PETER KOCH: This is Peter, if I may. As a customer of that service, TLD registry, it would be of course important to know who to talk to if there was an issue. Also, when it comes to planning, you just mentioned that the assumption that there's only a small number of actors is involved is no longer true or soon no longer true, what consequences does that have for the parties involved further down the tree, as in the top level. The more I think about this, the more different I would answer my own question now, I think.

TIM APRIL: Any other comments on the topics of in or likely in scope?

DANIEL MIGAULT: If I may, I'm also surprised about the transport protocols, how it concerns RZERC.

GEOFF HUSTON: If I may, I think there's two ways of looking at that, Daniel. One is if all the existing current root server operators make a uniform change so that all the root server operators effectively have an equivalent face to the external set of clients, that's one thing. But if one or two operators or, I suppose, I'm not sure what the current terms are, I meant to mean one or two letters, introduces a transport protocol that the others don't support, that has actually real implications for the service provided by the root because the client then has to thrash to find a server with a supported protocol, and that becomes a real issue. I suppose it's sort of the question behind the question. If they all lockstep at once, then maybe it's less of an issue. If it's only partially adopted, there are some real implications on the stability and uniformity of the service that I would say would be in scope as something that actually affects the service provided by the collection of name servers that are the root. And so that would be my argument to say I think it's in scope.

I'm trying to see if the selection, particularly QUIC, would have a bearing here. I'm finding it hard to answer that question myself. I don't really know. What's going on at the moment is the UDP parameters, in particular, the MTU size, the truncation point, do vary amongst the letters. And on the whole, I don't think that's a big issue for RZERC, I just don't. I'm not sure about the QUIC parameters. In particular, QUIC can't fragment. And if root server operators had different QUIC passage, a QUIC maximum packet size parameters, that would make some root

server letters invisible to some clients, and that might be an issue. There's a bunch there that say, "Someone should have this in scope." And whether it's RZERC or someone else, I don't know. But it seems to be a relevant topic.

DANIEL MIGAULT: My thought would be it would be maybe in scope of RZERC if we're discussing about introducing a new SVC be [RSET], for example, or keys somehow. But generally, the transport, I would say, is more in scope of RSSAC, and especially when the stability is concerned. But that's my personal thoughts. I'm happy to be told wrong.

GEOFF HUSTON: Could I just quickly follow up to your question? In the hypothetical situation, what if letter X supported QUIC but no other letters? And so it would immediately make an issue for clients who are trying to connect using letter X because there's no SVC records or anything else flying around for one transport protocol to use for the root. Would that impact the service if only one letter did it? My answer I think would be yes, but I'm interested in yours.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I would say it would impact a service. But I think it would be more to RSSAC to deal with that than RZERC because the changes would be minor, the changes to the root zone, for example.

GEOFF HUSTON: There's no change to the root zone. It's just a change—sorry, Tim. You're hand is up.

TIM APRIL: I was just reading through the charter again, trying to answer this question for myself. I think the sticking point where—I think I'm the one that's not sure here. The sticking point that caught me with this was in the charter there's the phrase "or the mechanism used for distribution of the DNS root zone." The word lawyer in me wants that to be the tools that are used to distribute the zone from RZM to the RSOs. But the other half of the lawyer is saying that's also how the RSOs are distributing the contents of the zone through queries to the end users or the resolvers that are involved here. I don't know if that's wordsmithing that we would need to do in a charter review to say distribution from the RZM to authoritative name servers, to restrict that further or if that changes our scope more than it should.

GEOFF HUSTON: There's delicate tension going on here between the degree of autonomy with individual RSOs—and this I will be talking about—and the autonomy given to RSOs collectively and the balance of roles between the root system and the clients of the root system. I certainly see RZERC sitting in the middle of the latter issue of that sort of balance between the root server system and the clients. The lawyer in me—there is none, I'm more of an economist and a mathematician—says mechanisms go all the way out to the query response protocol. Because that's the root zone as everyone sees. It doesn't see the zone, it sees the contents of

the zone by incremental query. This issue of transport protocols, I believe, is in scope as an evolutionary issue for the root zone itself. My balance of view says I think it's in scope. I can understand it's not black and white.

DANIEL MIGAULT: No, but thank you. At least I understand why it has a lot of review as in scope. So thanks for the clarification.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Any other? Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Let's move on to—

TIM APRIL: So this is the inverse of that. So this is everything that the majority of people said was out of scope or not sure about. Expect similar discussions.

STEVE SHENG: There's more at the top of the spreadsheet that we're not seeing here? It's no longer a list, right? This is the full list? Okay.

TIM APRIL: Out of scope is smaller.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Wow. Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So there is a different treatment, whether we remove or we add another.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah. If we look at the second item, root on many CPE—do I read that correctly? That that is another phrase for hyperlocal or something similar?

DUANE WESSELS: I can speak to that, Peter, because I think this very brief forward topic was copied from the exercise that we did four years ago. I don't even know if people were saying hyperlocal back then. So yeah, it's the same.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I wonder why this—it's not really clear cut. It's in scope but not sure versus five. But still ... The mechanism is described in an IETF

document so that didn't need any involvement by RZERC. But I think there's one or two open questions to that, one being how to organize or satisfy the distribution needs for the root zone in total. My current understanding is that the document refers to some current sources, but of course with more hyperlocal, the number of sources or the availability of the sources, and so on and so forth, needs to be maintained. And the question is by who? That, I think, is a question that RZERC should have a look at. Again, always under the mission to make sure that everybody's concerns have been addressed, not to actually tell anybody else how to run their systems. Just in case that there was an endorsement of hyperlocal by whatever entity.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: To respond to Peter a little bit, again, I think we're suffering from evolving terminology in the time between these surveys. There is another topic which is something like AXFR service from RSOs, which, again, four years ago was probably intended to cover the thing you were just talking about. I believe that one, well, it's not—

TIM APRIL: That's on the to discuss session.

DUANE WESSELS: That's on the to discuss, so it's in the middle.

TIM APRIL: Yeah.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, fine. Thanks, Duane.

TIM APRIL: Any other topics to discuss here? We jump back to the discussion section. Trying to find my notes of what we discussed last month. So we had a discussion about the 1000 TLDs, AXFR by RSO and actual RZM transition. So my recollection of how we were approaching this was basically that we were going item by item and discussing why we felt that was either in scope or out of scope, and then moving on to the next one. And then after this call is done, sometime between now and the next call, we can send out the survey and you can revise your responses from the last time. We can review the data at the end to see if it that helps or if we come into alignment more readily with any of this. So any comments for row 27? Does anyone have any of the items below 27 that they would argue for or against being in scope? Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Perhaps not argue for or against, but I think a quick discussion on 28 and 29 would be useful, particularly because it's actually on our roadmap to revise these soon or at least start contemplating it. Just for context, the technical checks that we conduct currently were set in 2007 and we feel that they're a bit overdue for some review and refreshing. But to be honest, it's not particularly clear to me what

RZERC's role might be as a component of that, obviously. Prior, when they were last revised, RZERC wasn't around at that time. It was essentially a public comment period that we conducted and that was largely what informed the revisions we made at that time. Generally speaking, the root zone maintainer replicates PTI's technical checks. They effectively act as a second implementation to validate the same requirements that are being adhered to more or less. So I kind of look at them in tandem in that respect. But I'm actually quite curious to hear what others feel RZERC's role would be with respect to technical checks. And also at what phase of that process RZERC would potentially be involved? Is that once the IANA functions operator has a proposed new suite or modified suite of checks after it's done public consultation, after it's done engagement, then we bring them to RZERC? Or is there some other approach to it? So I'm curious to hear what others think on this one. Thanks.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I'm a little bit unsure, Kim, what you're referring to when you say technical check. I suppose what I'm saying is, you do a check and it either passes or it fails in a binary sense. What do you do if it fails? Here's this technical check, it failed. When I say "it" I mean some entries in the root zone.

KIM DAVIES:

Right.

GEOFF HUSTON: What then?

KIM DAVIES: That's a great question. Apologies for assuming that was the common knowledge. I think when we use technical checks, that's shorthand for the suite of acceptance tests we have whenever you submit a change request to the root zone. So the TLD operator will submit revised [NSED, BSED] or the like. We will perform a set of checks against that request. And if they don't pass all those checks, we will ask them to remediate it. Either they will or we do have a provision that if they feel that there is a compelling reason that they don't need to or shouldn't, or if some other mitigating circumstances, this is an urgent change despite those issues, then they can ask us to waive those technical checks on an individual change request. But broadly speaking, in terms of the current model, at least, these are tests that we conduct as part of reviewing a change request and we would only normally proceed with implementing a change request in the root zone once those technical checks are passed and satisfied. These are things like checking for lame name servers, checking that the DS record matches the DNSKEY, things like that.

GEOFF HUSTON: So the important distinction is, this is triggered by the external party. If the delegation goes lame and there's no change for an update, nothing happens. It just goes lame is my inference from what you've said. And I'm not value judging it. I'm just—

KIM DAVIES: That's the current model. But to be honest, that is a perfect example something that I think is worth a reevaluation, like should IANA be more proactive. I think these are areas of discussion as we move forward.

GEOFF HUSTON: When I said it was in scope, that was why I thought it was in scope, because I was aware of this as part of the SSR2 review that there was a very limited scope of these technical checks and they were triggered by, if you will, delegated party. They weren't triggered by the state of the DNS and the root zone can go rotten. And if no one is requesting an update, the root zone stays rotten. I think there's a technical check role that RZERC should think about beyond and above externally triggered change requests, which is why I was arguing it's in scope. But I'm sure there are others here, at least four, who say this topic is out of scope. And I'd be keen to understand. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks. I am confident, I checked the in scope in this case for the mere fact that the public consultation that we can refer to in 2006 or 2007 or whatever. I'm just not sure what the foundation for that is and where the decision making is under the assumption that the IANA should not set policy and that these technical checks can be viewed as policy or as a policy for the technical checks, especially when it comes to determining what action happens or doesn't happen after failing or

passing. That needs a policy hook and a process that should be in place and not just be viewed as an operational issue by IANA or PTI in that particular case, and on RZM that more or less follows, except that I wasn't—I had assumed that the RZM would duplicate at least part of the checks but that is more or less one basket from my perspective. So I'm, again, confident I put them in the same category. Just as a clarification. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Howard?

HOWARD ELAND: As someone who uses the RZM tool probably way more than people would like, I can say that from a perspective of what checks are done at the time of a request is made, I do feel like that can be—it is of similar vein to what we have for some of the DPS stuff, right? And maybe a review every so often would be in order. But other than that, I don't think I see much value every time a particular check might change.

But to Geoff's point, I do think that maybe perhaps we—and I hate to add more items—but potentially to split this to be between the ongoing operations, the technical check as part of an ongoing operation versus just when a RZM request is made. However, I will also note that some of these things do go on in form of the ICANN SLA notifications and such. So whether that is a one-to-one correspondence, I'm not sure. But if it's not, then maybe that might be something that someone would want to review. But I will note that those things do occur. So the note about something going lame after the fact, that usually rings all kinds of bells

and horns and whistles, both ICANN and at the registry operators [inaudible].

TIM APRIL:

Apologies, I just noticed the time it's after 3:00 or after the top of the hour. Let's call it here. We can pick this back up next month. Between now and then, I was going to talk with Danielle about trying to send out a reminder to review the items we've discussed and update answers, and we can try and refresh the spreadsheet before the next call and get a better idea of where we stand. So unless there's anything else, thank you, everyone, for your time and talk to you next month.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]