# Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC) Meeting Minutes 16 November 2021 | 19:00 - 20:00 UTC

#### Attendance

ICANN Board Kaveh Ranjbar

PTI Kim Davies

**SSAC** Geoff Huston

**RSSAC** Daniel Migault

**ASO** Carlos Martinez

**IETF** Tim April

**GNSO RySG** Howard Eland

ccNSO Peter Koch

Verisign (RZM) Duane Wessels

Staff Steve Sheng

#### **Action Items from this Teleconference**

- ACTION ITEM: Staff to publish approved 19 October 2021 minutes on RZERC's website.
- ACTION ITEM: Staff to respond to ICANN org with updates on ARR items.

#### Call to Order

Tim April called the teleconference to order at 19:00 UTC.

## **Roll Call**

Steve Sheng conducted a roll call.

# **Agenda Review**

There were no amendments to the agenda for this meeting.

#### Administration

## **Draft Minutes from 19 October**

Tim April called for a vote on the draft minutes from the previous teleconference. There were no objections to the minutes and the minutes were approved.

 ACTION ITEM: Staff to publish approved 19 October 2021 minutes on RZERC's website.

## ARR Updates for RZERC002 and RZERC003

Steve Sheng provided an overview of recent updates on RZERC advice items in ICANN org's Action Request Register (ARR).

RZERC002 Recommendations 2A and 2B are now in *Phase 3, Deferred,* where Board consideration is deferred pending implementation of RSSAC028. The RZERC acknowledged this update and members did not provide any specific comment.

ICANN org provided an updated statement of understanding for RZERC003 Recommendation 3. Duane Wessels stated a concern that the understanding could prescribe a requirement for an update to RFC 8806. Geoff Huston responded that RFC 8806 happens to be the most appropriate place to handle the implementation of ZONEMD and either the RFC 8806 authors or implementers should be mindful of ZONEMD. Peter Koch suggested that the RZERC focus its conversation on ZONEMD rather than hyperlocal and remove any reference to RFC 8806. RZERC members agreed on a clarifying comment to respond to the ICANN org statement of understanding.

• ACTION ITEM: Staff to respond to ICANN org with updates on ARR items.

#### **Work Items**

# **Topic Scoping Exercise Results**

Tim April led a discussion on the topic scoping exercise results from the October meeting.

Unplanned KSK Rollover: Kim Davies asked what level of involvement is anticipated by the RZERC in the instance of such an unplanned operational event. Peter Koch stated his interpretation was that RZERC would not be involved in the actual operational execution of the unplanned KSK rollover but in the careful planning of a possible unplanned rollover, including precautionary measures and reviewing an emergency plan. Tim April agreed with this interpretation. Geoff Huston stated an unplanned key change of the KSK is not a roll, it is a replace, and on that basis it has some relevance to RZERC. Kim Davies asked what are the triggers that would bring these kinds of policies to the RZERC for consideration. KSK management has a policy management authority that meets at least annually that goes through these procedures in depth that reviews them and issues new policies.

Latency in root zone distribution: Peter Koch noted RZERC members indicated this topic was likely in the RZERC's scope to consider this topic and asked if this should be considered an operational issue. Duane Wessels agreed it is an operational issue. Peter Koch asked if it is not in RZERC's remit then whose remit might it be, because it is an important topic that should not fall through the cracks. Duane Wessels mentioned RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System addresses this topic. Kim Davies responded as distribution mechanisms evolve, maybe the baseline assumption that latency is controlled by a small group of actors might evolve over time and might have some architectural implications

as a result. Peter Koch stated it would be important for a registry's customer to know who to talk to if there was an issue. The assumption that there's only a small number of actors involved is no longer true, or is soon no longer true. That may have consequences for the parties involved further down the dns hierarchy.

**Transport protocols:** Daniel Migault noted his surprise that the topic transport protocols was voted as likely in scope for RZERC. Geoff Huston responded if all root server operators make a uniform change at once, then maybe it's less of an issue. If a new protocol is only partially adopted by the operators that has real implications for the service provided by the root because the client has to find a server with a supported protocol. There are implications on the stability and uniformity of the service that would be in scope as something that actually affects the service provided by the collection of name servers that are the root. Daniel Migault countered that the service is in the RSSAC's scope, especially when the stability is concerned. Geoff Huston stated he believes the issue of transport protocols is in scope as an evolutionary issue for the root zone itself.

**Root on many CPE:** Peter Koch noted this was voted as likely out of scope for the RZERC and stated there's an open question of how to organize or satisfy the distribution needs for the root zone in total. Duane Wessels responded that Peter's question is more adequately addressed in another topic, AXFR service by RSOs.

PTI & RZM Technical Checks: Kim Davies stated that the current technical checks PTI conducts were set in 2007 and he felt are a bit overdue for review and refreshing, but he is not clear what RZERC's role might be as a component of such a review and also at what phase of that process RZERC would potentially be involved. Geoff Huston asked what the PTI technical checks include. Kim Davies explained the term technical checks is shorthand for the suite of acceptance tests PTI has whenever someone submits a change request to the root zone, and if they don't pass all those checks, PTI asks the requestor to remediate the identified issue. Geoff Huston stated he thinks there's a technical check role that RZERC should think about beyond and above externally triggered change requests. Peter Koch agreed this topic should be in scope for RZERC.

### Adjournment

The RZERC concluded the teleconference without objections at 20:03 UTC.