
MARIO ALEMAN: So we can be ready to start whenever you decide.

JIM REID: Carry on without me; I'll join as quickly as I can.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, I suggest we get started. I see Jim in the Adobe Connect now. Hopefully, we'll get the last couple of [inaudible] join us.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, great.

DUANE WESSELS: Would you like to do the roll call, Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, thank you. We're having a little bit of feedback from you, Duane, I think, just in case if you have [inaudible] audio. Good morning, good afternoon and evening everyone. Welcome to the RZERC Teleconference call, 25th of September 2017. On the call we have today Duane Wessels, Kim Davis, Peter Koch, Russ Mundy and Jim Reid. We have listed apologize from Kaved, Steve and Brad. I'll be managing the call today and, Duane, it's all yours, we can please begin the call, thanks.

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.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Mario. We'll start with the review of the action items from our August meeting. Go ahead, Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Duane. Our action items from our previous meeting were the following: staff to publish the minutes, transcripts and audio recordings from 17th of July 2017. Number two, Duane and staff to poll for consensus on RZERC operation of procedures via mailing list. Number three, Duane and staff to submit a note to the mailing list to collect a list of topics for RZERC proposals and discuss during the next meeting.

Number four, Mario to share that doodle poll on the selection of the next RZERC meeting. Number five, staff to submit a request for one public session and one regular meeting during the next ICANN60. Being that said, all of these action items have been complete and we have also published the documentation online.

DUANE WESSELS: Great. Particular note that I'm very happy that we got our operational procedures published and up and running. From now on I think we should assume that we are working under those procedures as published.

Next let's move on to the minutes from the previous meeting. I assume everyone has had a chance to review those. Does anyone have comments or feedback about the August minutes? [AUDIO BREAK]

Doesn't sound like it. Would somebody be willing to make a motion to approve the August minutes?

RUSS MUNDY: This is Russ, I'll make that motion.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Russ. Second anyone?

MARIO ALEMAN: Kim does.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Kim. So we can take those minutes as approved and we'll ask staff to publish them on the websites as soon as possible.

The next topic is what we'll spend most of the time on the call today, it's discussing the topics, the topic lists for things that RZERC might be asked to consider. I apologize, there's been a little of confusion about the actual list here. Mario sent out a PDF, an email which is basically a copy of a Google Doc, which is kind of our working document where we were assembling these and it includes some discussion from the mailing lists. What I'd like to do though is to have you sort of ignore that PDF document that was sent out and instead, if you can, go to the chat in Adobe Connect and Mario has shared a URL there which will open up a Google Forms document.

This is the most up to date copy of the list and I added some text to it to expand some of these questions. I'd like to go through these one by one and my goal really today is to make sure that everyone understands the questions. I really don't want to focus on how you might answer this survey at this point, I just want to make sure that we agree on what the questions are and that the questions are clear enough that you can answer them later. Any questions about that before we start looking through them one by one? Jim, please.

JIM REID:

I just looked at the first question on the lists [inaudible] and our type, just for clarification, we're talking about adding something other than the stuff that's normally there, we're not talking about inventing a new R type that's specific to the note. Would that be correct?

DUANE WESSELS:

That's correct. I don't think we would ever -- this is just talking about an R type that's already gone through the ITF process, it's already a standardized type but it's not yet in the roots.

JIM REID:

Okay, thanks, that's all.

DUANE WESSELS:

Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Yes, thanks. So my question here is that this is not going to be a formal approval, it is looking for the best fitting examples to give to the audience in the Emirates right? Like Abu Dhabi, I should say.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thank you for that question. At this point, I consider this list of topics for internal RZERC discussion only. This is really for us, kind of a reality check if you will to see what we think RZERC's role is and to maybe focus on areas where we as committee members have differences. What I would propose is that after we agree on the questions that we fill out this survey and for things where everyone agrees, we're good, we don't really need to discuss them further, but for any of these topics where there is disagreement, RZERC needs to discuss them internally further.

You mentioned Abu Dhabi and the public meeting, I think at some point after we've gone through this if we decide that we want to share some of these discussions with the community, then that's perfectly fine too, but at this point for me it's internal.

Jim? Jim, you have your hand up. You're muted if you're speaking, we don't hear you. [AUDIO BREAK]

Jim, did you have something you wanted to say? Alright, I'm going to assume either not, or Jim is having audio problems.

MARIO ALEMAN: This is Mario, Jim's typing his question.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, he's going to disconnect, I guess, okay. I'm going to go through these questions, try to get through them today. We already talked about question number one which is about RR types and I'm going to assume that we're good on that.

Number two it's about changes to Route Zone TPL's and this is something that's already been a topic of discussion within RZERC. Does anyone need clarification on the questions for number two? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, number three [CROSSTALK]. Oh, yes.

RUSS MUNDY: Sorry, I didn't get my hand button pushed. On number two, is the intent that that would be any change whatsoever to TPL's? Bigger, smaller?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I guess so. I would have to think that if anybody is going to go to the trouble of proposing TPL changes, it's going to be a significant change; it's not going to be going from 48 hours to 47 hours or something like that.

RUSS MUNDY: Right, I mean I think it's good that we at least come to an agreement on what we mean and we would not -- at least I wouldn't expect anybody

to make or suggest a trivial change, but you never know, that's why I asked. So any change at all, yeah, I'm good with that, absolutely.

DUANE WESSELS: Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: In going to that same direction I guess, I'm missing the "it depends" responses because it might depend on the severity of the change or the context, and so on and so forth. More importantly though, it is fine for us to say yes, no or discuss, but in the end for the community they would probably be looking for some entity to raises these issues to, and if RZERC is upfront saying that, "Oh, that is not in our ballpark," what is our contribution to finding the right place for everybody?

Or we can postpone this discussion, but I was just going to make sure that by saying "not our ballpark" or "not our part here", we don't retract from the whole debate where it should be discussed as a better venue.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think that's fair. The charter does I believe provide some direction along those lines. It says something like, "RZERC may not always be the forum in which these problems get resolved but we're willing to provide direction." I think even though we don't -- here if you say "out of scope", for RZERC it doesn't mean that we don't have any input.

Okay, shall we move on to the next one? Number three is a new round of gTLD's, expected to increase the root zone by say another 1,000 top level domains. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, I think this number three also is a very good example of what -- at least from my hearing, Peter was maybe suggesting that we have a fourth answer to all of these things that we come up with and that fourth answer might be RZERC input appropriate but it's not the decision making body, or something like that, as opposed to not our [inaudible] kind of answer. Was I hearing that correctly, Peter, that you were kind of suggesting a fourth answer for all of these?

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Russ, and hi by the way. Yeah, almost, I think. It goes in the right direction. My issue was like two fold; one is that the first comment would be it depends, if it's just another 1,000 we may, we may not be in charge or have to deal with this. If the 1,000 implies that there is a say visible change to the provisioning system pinpointing to specific [inaudible] in our charter, that might be a different issue.

The other one that you mention is like, okay so maybe we're not the decision making but we might want to give input anyway to some other body that would be even beyond that. But for the purpose of getting focus and make the community understand what we are dealing with, maybe we don't want to end up with too many columns there, that's already confusing for me and maybe for others who don't follow that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Did you want to respond, Russ, or is your hand up from before?

RUSS MUNDY: It's up from before. I could go either way with it, but I really like the point that Peter made, so yes, I'm fine. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: I suggest let's save the question of any additional answers or what those additional options might look like until the end, maybe we'll have some inspiration or maybe some of the later questions will help us think of what other choice might look like.

Question number four is a change in the DNSSEC key size for the KSK and change in size only. Any questions about algorithms are a separate question, and this is only about the KSK. The change in key size for the ZSK is a separate question, which is number five.

Alright, number six is the question of changing the DNSSEC algorithm for the root zone which obviously implies an algorithm rollover; it's not a trivial exercise by any means.

Number seven is a question also about DNSSEC but it's about more mundane parameters such as signature ability period and use of [inaudible] N, whatever comes later. I would note that the signature ability has changed in the recent years in response to an RZERC application. You might wonder if RZERC had existed at the time, would RZERC have played a role in that change.

Number eight is a change in supported algorithms and IGF types for ES records in the root zones. Who just joined us? Is that Jim or somebody else?

JIM REID: It's me, Duane, I've come back on the phone.

DUANE WESSELS: Ah, you probably have lots of questions to ask cause we've kind of moved on in your absence a little bit. We're on number eight. Do you have any questions about the previous topics?

JIM REID: No, just carry on.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, alright thanks. Is number eight clear enough for everyone at this point?

Number nine is about the next KSK rollover. Thinking about after the first KSK rollover is done and that at some point in the future maybe one, two, three, five years, whatever it is, the KSK is rollovered again, ignoring algorithm change, would RZERC have any input into that? Kim, go ahead.

KIM DAVIES: I think someone else had made the comment that if it was an emergency change there might be a roll for RZERC without commenting on the distinction too much; is that a distinction that should be in the survey?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, that's a good point. We should maybe break this up into planned rollover versus emergency rollover.

Number ten, the topic is the location of key management facilities. I suppose you've all heard the proposal by now that people feel there should probably be a management facility outside of the United States. This is something that we might encounter in the future.

Number eleven is about label generation rules which is something that ICANN has been doing and conducting for a number of years without RZERC's help, I guess. I thought I would include this just because it's relevant to the root zoon and I expect there will continue to be work in this area.

Number twelve goes in a sort of different direction; this is about removal of an existing root server operator. I assume that an existing operator is to be removed either voluntarily or involuntarily thereby reducing the total number of operators.

Question thirteen is the counter to that, which is --

JIM REID: Duane, sorry, I've got a question on twelve.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, go ahead.

JIM REID: Who would make the decision about the removal? So what would RZERC be saying is, "We want to get rid of let's say for argument's sake Verisign as a root server operator," or it would be somebody else that makes that decision and then comes to RZERC and says, "Hey, we're thinking about removing Verisign as a root server operator, what do you RZERC think about that?"

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks for the clarification. I'm not suggesting here that RZERC is the one to make the decision. We could assume that that decision is made elsewhere, but the RZERC is being asked to provide input or make a --

JIM REID: Okay, if your position is for let's say consumption, we better make it clear that that distinction is being made.

DUANE WESSELS: At this point none of this is for outside consumption.

JIM REID:

I was trying to make that point earlier on when the audio was just killed but when you have this public meeting in Abu Dhabi, I'm pretty certain people are going to ask questions about what sort of things do you think are in scope for RZERC and you'll need to have some answer for them.

It doesn't necessarily have to be a complete list and there might be things which we don't necessarily all have to have complete consensus on within RZERC, but I do think we need to be able to say to people, do you have a rough idea about the sorts of things we think we might be doing?

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Anything that we present publically of course will be vetted by the entire committee. Thanks for that.

Twelve was about removal, thirteen is about addition of a new operator, assuming that a new organization is to be designated, possibly increasing the total number of operators.

RUSS MUNDY:

Duane, this is Russ. My general thought on those two questions is especially since I think the intent is that RZERC would not be the maker of the decision, adding or subtracting, perhaps it'd be better to combine them into something like, "Does RZERC have a role in changing the number of existing root server operators, either up or down?" Just adding a question, if we think we have a roll.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, that's a good suggestion, thank you. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks. I think I understand the efficiency argument here and combining them. Having the issues listed as topical issues rather than asking is the full organization the right place, might help in compiling a list of responses, as referring to my earlier topic, if we have agreement that we won't be the one doing it, some part of the community would have to find out who's going to do it.

In some cases this committee or group might already be fixed and by agreement people could go and say, "Well this is RZERC, this is the ICANN board, this is some random multi-stakeholder group, blah, blah." But I'd stick with the topical lists so we can add stackies or stackie groups to those topics later.

DUANE WESSELS: Thank you, Peter. I'll move onto number fourteen which is change in "ownership of the roots of our operator" which is to say an existing operator undergoes something like an acquisition or wants to transfer its root server operations to some other organization.

Number 15 is --

RUSS MUNDY: On thirteen, I think even for our internal purposes I think we need to get a little crisper clarification of what that means. When you say

ownership, is it the entity that physically owns the responsibility to do this or are we thinking more the actual operation itself?

In other words, are you describing the same situation if for instance VeriSign were to be purchased by Sysco and be still functionally within, or the situation where VeriSign might determine that for whatever reason, all of their operational activities, so VeriSign would retain ownership, all their operationally activities would be provided to them by a [inaudible] operational unit, even though they wouldn't be giving up ownership. To me those tend to be rather different, those two scenarios.

DUANE WESSELS:

I'm thinking of definitely the first case. I'm thinking of when Cogent acquired PSI and Cogent took over C root. When L root was transferred from ISI to ICANN and when VeriSign acquired Network Solutions; those are three examples in recent memory that I think relate to number fourteen. I'm not talking about the other case where sort of operation is outsourced or something like that.

RUSS MUNDY:

Right, because as far as I know, at least in my memory, there hasn't been an instance of an outsourcing of operation, but the closest we've come is how some of the arrangements for the Anycast Notes end up getting put in place with the various activities providing the physical space and connectivity. I don't know how much we need to separate those things, but it seems like they are all at least potential areas where RZERC might feel that we should have a say.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I don't have any questions in the survey about outsourcing, but I can add one if you think it's appropriate. I'm happy to do that.

RUSS MUNDY: I think it would be appropriate to have at least one question about outsourcing. But we don't have an example but that doesn't mean somebody might not decide to do it.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah okay, that's good, thanks. I'll make a note of that.

Moving on. Number fifteen is about the location of root server instances, so any cast instances, either geographical or apological. If someone thinks that maybe those should be two separate questions, happy to do that also.

Number sixteen, the topic is the prolonged inability of a root server operator to meet service level expectations, where service level expectations maybe needs to be in air quotes at this point. The idea is that RZERC is sort of working slowly towards this direction where there's more accountability and more well defined expectations. It's possible at some point in the future that an operator may not be able to meet those expectations.

Number seventeen is change to the naming scheme of root servers which is the topic of RZERC's 028 publication. Although I will note that in that publication RZERC recommended no change at the current time

but it's still a topic of discussion within RZERC to change the naming scheme for the root servers.

Number eighteen is a little bit related because in RZERC 028 they discuss both the naming scheme and the DNSSEC status of the names, but here it's a separate question to the change in DNSSEC status or parameters of the zone that names the root servers, i.e. today rootservers.net

Number nineteen, the topic is change in frequency of publishing the root zone. Today the root zone in practice it's published twice a day, maybe sometimes three times a day. There is a requirement that it be published once a day but in practice it's twice a day, and I have heard people suggest that it could be published and updated more frequently than that.

Number twenty, the topic is latency in root zone distribution.

RUSS MUNDY:

Duane, before we get onto there, could I ask one more that sort of ties into this space of questions?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yes, please.

RUSS MUNDY: And that is, do we think RZERC should have a roll in any decision relating to responses to prime inquires being DNSSEC signed or not? I mean there aren't today but the prime inquire question, DNSSEC --

DUANE WESSELS: I think that's kind of covered by number eighteen, that's kind of what I was getting at. As you said today, the rootserver.net zone is not signed, there are discussions about whether or not it should be signed, and if it were that would lead to assigned priming response, right?

RUSS MUNDY: Right, and so maybe we could just get a little more specific in eighteen, the wording of eighteen then. That would be great.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. In number twenty, today, even part two of RZERC 002, most root server operators publish distribute legacy for their operations. I've heard people say that, you know, are these numbers accurate, is it really like this, and so I think that in the future there may be some pressure to reduce those numbers, to get those numbers down. Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: I think that this question itself could use some clarification. If the concern is related to when the output is reported, if the values that get reported are satisfactory or not satisfactory, or if it's a question more that they aren't the right values that are being reported, different

values or different assemblages of values, I think the wording of twenty does not make it clear what this question is really asking about.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I was going for what you said first which is -- I'll insert the word "satisfactory" in there cause that's sort of where I was heading with this question.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. And it might be a separate question as to whether or not RZERC would have a roll in evaluating if the current RZERC 002 numbers are the correct or sufficient numbers or more different ones are needed.

DUANE WESSELS: You mean if we're measuring the right things or not?

RUSS MUNDY: Correct.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I'm just taking a note here.

Question twenty is about transport protocols supported by root servers. Obviously we have today UDP and TCP, but there are other protocols on the horizon.

Number twenty is about AXFR service and today we have the situation where some operators voluntarily provide AXFR, some consider it sort

of, you know, a best effort and there may be the case that in the future there is increased demand for AXFR service of the root zone. This topic, should it be something that RZERC is [inaudible] on whether it's voluntary or not.

Number twenty three is something that's a hot topic right now, which is configuration of root servers with respect to MTU and MSS fragmentation size and point of truncation. I would note that today there's a lot of diversity in how the operators are configured with respect to these parameters.

Number twenty four, the topic is significant changes to the KSK operator DNSSEC practice statement. I think this is discussed on the mailing list already and one of the reasons also that it's included here is this is an area where NCAA was providing some oversight in the past.

Number twenty five is the same question but for the CSK operator DNSSEC practice statement.

Topic twenty six is revisions to PTI's authentication mechanisms for TLD managers.

Twenty seven is changes to the technical checks performed by PTI. So that's technical checks on TLD data submitted to them.

Number twenty eight is very similar, it's changes in technical checks performed by the root zone maintainer.

Twenty nine is upgrades to the software used to manage the root zone and root zone workflow.

Number thirty is applications for RC 6761 special use TLD's, such as [inaudible] and .local.

RUSS MUNDY: In the section that we just went through, it's clearly focused on the technical changes and checks and so forth, but do we want to have a question, again, just for our internal RZERC discussion that addresses the re-delegation of a TLD? Is there a role for RZERC there?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so re-delegation from one [CROSSTALK] to another -- okay, I'm happy to add that. Is there a reason not to from anyone?

PETER KOCH: I was wondering what type of TLD are you thinking about?

RUSS MUNDY: I'm thinking about any TLD actually, and is there a role for RZERC with respect to that action? If we want to divide it into the two major groups, that's fine, but the reason I [inaudible] is general is that I have hope that the answer will come out in a particular way, but I think we need to have the discussion and have RZERC determining what our view on that is.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, fair enough.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. I'll go back to number thirty which was special use of TLD's, any questions about that question?

So at the end here, these sort of lose their focus and wonder around from topic to topic, but I'll continue on, we're almost done here.

Number thirty one is a proposal to serve the root zone from many, meaning thousands or hundreds of thousands or millions of CPE devices.

Number thirty two is a review of root zone maintainer transition plans. In case anyone doesn't know, as a part of the RZMA, the root zone maintainer agreement, we are finalizing a document which is a transition plan. There's actually a couple, there's a well thought-out transition and then there's an emergency transition. This question is about whether RZERC would review those plans or those documents.

Now separately from that, number thirty three is about an actual transition. If one of those plans were to be implemented and the root zone maintainer function was transitioning from one organization to another, is that in scope or out of scope for RZERC.

Number thirty four is about zones other than the root zone that are served by the root servers. Today that means HARPA and rootservers.net. It's possible there could be others in the future, there could be fewer or more.

With thirty five is about the design and distribution system between the root zone maintainer and the root zone operators.

The final topic is a change in the root zone SLA serial format. Currently it's a year-month-day number, I guess this sort of ties into an earlier question about change in the frequency of publishing the root zone. If the root zone were to need to be published much more frequently, it may be necessary to change the serial format, although you could consider changing it regardless.

So we made it to the end of the list and we've only got about 10 minutes left and we have one more topic. I'd like to hear from people their thoughts on -- it sounds like the questions are pretty good. Maybe we need to talk about if the choices are the right choices. Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

I think that I want to withdraw my suggestion for more answers. If we're just treating it in-house, I think it would be okay to just make extensive use of the "not sure" or when we say "topic in scope", that does not mean that RZERC should necessarily be the decision maker on the question, but that it was something that's appropriate for RZERC to be discussing and contributing to. I think I want to withdraw my suggestion for more answers unless somebody else thinks that that's a good idea.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. First of all, it's a good list, I don't think I have anything to add, it's really good work, all [inaudible], great and small, everything in there; really, really appreciate that. The responses maybe add the opportunity to comment or clarify, like if I have a "not sure" marked, if I can write in 10 words that might help the thing. If you only want to work on the yes, no, don't know, that's fine with me as well. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Alright, thank you. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I think almost exactly what Peter just said. I feel like if it said yes, or if it said no to some of them, if I could just narrow down the scenario a little bit, perhaps by adding a comment, whereas as is I think I'd be saying not sure to a lot of them. I don't know if that's an easy thing to add for Mario, is to add a comment field for each of the questions and then it allow the RZERC members to add comments if they see fit.

DUANE WESSLES: Okay, I think that should be possible, we'll investigate what that takes.

Okay, thank you everyone. Look for an email from us regarding an updated version of the survey and maybe we'll ask you to take it before the next meeting. Mario, let's move on to the next topic which is ICANN60 agenda and whatnot I guess. [AUDIO BREAK]

Mario, are you still with us?

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, yes Duane, I'm here; sorry, I was muted. So we had requested a couple sessions, one for a private meeting on Sunday and that might take place at 9 o'clock am in the morning. It's on Sunday, October 29th. For the public meeting we have requested a session on Wednesday, November 1st, it's going to be at 2pm local time.

So I just want to give you an update on this and that we'll be receiving the confirmation shortly. We haven't sent a calendar invite yet, but just basically I wanted to share this, to have it as a "save the date", and I would like to know actually if we have any confirmation or if anyone here is planning to attend? That would be great, just because of the room setup and the rest of the things.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. Mario, let's send out an email on the lists asking for people to say whether or not they'll be attending in person and then you can plan around that. Our next regularly scheduled meeting would be held on October 16th and if people are okay, what I would suggest is for us to maybe try to complete this survey in the next couple of weeks and have our October 16th meeting, discuss the server results and then we'll have another chance to discuss and prepare for the public meeting once we get to Abu Dhabi, once we have our meeting in Abu Dhabi.

Is that reasonable? The alternative would be to cancel our October 16th meeting and just have it on, you said Sunday the 29th, Mario, is our timeslot for the private meeting?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, Sunday the 29th , at 9 o'clock.

DUANE WESSELS: Does anyone have preferences one way or the other to have one or two meetings in October, I guess, is the question?

RUSS MUNDY: Duane, I think it would be much better for us to try to just have our telecon meeting before the ICANN meeting because we'll have a much better sense of not only the kinds of things that we think makes sense for RZERC to be dealing with but also a better sense of how much disagreement we may have or agreement amongst the committee itself for which things are right for RZERC and which things aren't. I vote for the meeting on the 16th.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thank you. Alright, so we'll plan on having the meeting on the 16th at this point. Look for emails from Mario and perhaps myself regarding the survey before then.

Any other business before we wrap up?

Alright, doesn't sound like it. We'll call this meeting adjourned and I thank you for your time today.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Duane, thank you, everyone.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks everybody, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]