EN

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Hello and thank you all for joining the RZERC monthly teleconference, held on Tuesday, the 17th of August, 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 apologies from Carlos Martinez, representing the ASO. Peter Koch, ccNSO.
PETER KOCH:	I'm sorry. I'm here.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Great. Thank you. Kaveh Ranjbar, ICANN Board.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Present.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Kim Davies, PTI.
KIM DAVIES:	Present.

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

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Tim April, IETF.

TIM APRIL: Present.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: We have apologies from Howard Eland, representing the RySG. Daniel Migault, representing the RSSAC, I think is not on the call quite yet. Duane Wessels, Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi. Duane is here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: And Geoff Huston, representing the SSAC.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yep.

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

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Danielle. So you just updated the agenda a couple minutes ago to add the topic that Daniel Migault was talking about in the list the

other day. So hopefully, he'll be able to figure out how to get in, in just a couple minutes. Anything else that people have for the agenda? Okay.

And then, if we can go to the draft minutes from the 20th. For anyone that's had a chance to review them, did you see anything that we need to change? Or take them as approved, unless anyone objects. I see no hands. Okay.

And the next item on the list was the ARR update. I think you probably have the most information on that, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. After last month, I sent in the confirmed statements of understanding and we sent in a clarifying statement on RZERC003, recommendation three. And ICANN Org has sent over a new statement of understanding. I can read it here.

The new understanding is, "ICANN Org understands this recommendation to have ICANN Org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally server root zone data."

So the action required for the RZERC is to confirm this statement of understanding or disagree with it and provide a further clarifying comment.

TIM APRIL:	That proposed text seems reasonable. Are there any changes people would like to see to it? No? All right. Not seeing anything. I guess we can answer that that is correct.

DUANE WESSELS:	I'm sorry. I'm catching up. Didn't we talk a lot about this in our last meeting?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Yes. And at the last meeting, I believe we left it as no. So we said no, we did not agree with the understanding and we provided a clarifying comment. And then, this is what they've returned back, based off that feedback.

DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. I thought that what we talked about at the last meeting was that the recommendation was to the broader software community and not really an action for ICANN itself. I'm looking at our spreadsheet. I guess I'm just trying to sync up our internal spreadsheet with what's on the screen here.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	I can just drop what put in the last month in the chat, if that's what you're looking for, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, where it says, "No further action by ICANN is envisioned by this recommendation." But on the screen before us, it says, "to have ICANN engage with software developers." So was there a disconnect or am I confused?

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't think you're confused, Duane. I remember this discussion and I seem to recall, though it was many weeks ago and memory fades, that we appreciated the reluctance of a number of software vendors to implement, if you will, draft specs. And we never really clarified in 8806—we being the broader community—what checks should be done. And this did seem like some kind of IETF action to clarify 8806. We discussed the issue that this wasn't an ICANN Board problem but it was a community problem.

                        So it's in the narrow understanding of what do you want the Board to do or ICANN Org to do? I think the answer—the understanding of the request—is correct. If the question is, is that all that needs to be done (by anybody), the answer is no.

TIM APRIL: So, Geoff, you're fine with the understanding of requests?

GEOFF HUSTON: From the perspective of the ICANN organization, yes. I am. I don't think that's the entirety of the follow-up and I think there's this dangling

someone—the proverbial someone—should update 8806 to say, "ZONEMD."

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. Okay. I guess I'm just … Again, I'm sorry. I'm confused because on the one hand, we said, "no further action." But here it sits. It's confirming that they will engage. And that's clearly taking action.

GEOFF HUSTON: I don't know where the "ICANN will engage" came from in the conversation of a month ago. I don't know where that snuck in because I was pretty sure we were having this same conversation, Duane, that it's a standard. It's a change to 8806.

The lever is actually on the standard specification and then into the vendors, then into usage. And we never, at the time, in that conversation last month … Maybe I'm giving it more credence than my memory actually has. I thought we never really thought that ICANN had much to do here. I don't think ICANN can knock on any vendor's door, saying, "Do this." The answer really is, "Show me the standard. Show me the spec. Show me the reason."

TIM APRIL: Yeah. I was trying to page through the transcript from last month. And it's now all coming back to, as Geoff was speaking of. It was basically try and get update to 8806, which I can go and take that to the IAB, being a

liaison to them, of, "RZERC is suggesting an update to it." It's not directly in line with the role of RZERC but it may help with this recommendation.

GEOFF HUSTON: Warren Kumari and Wes seem to have a lot of time on their hands. They should do it.

TIM APRIL: Wes it technically one of the liaison shepherds or whatever their name is.

GEOFF HUSTON: There you go.

DUANE WESSELS: That's all fine and that should happen. But I think the thing we need to settle on is whether or not this Board advice register item is—whether or not they expect ICANN to take action on this recommendation or not or if their understanding is correct. I don't mind. They can engage with software developers if they want to. But I think that, as we talked last time, we should make it clear that RZERC doesn't want that to, in any way, block the use of ZONEMD in the root zone. These things can happen separately.

TIM APRIL: So maybe it's worth just clarifying that any effort that they would exert evangelizing the use of this would be potentially helpful to the rollout of ZONEMD but it shouldn't block anything.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

TIM APRIL: That seems reasonable to me.

DUANE WESSELS: That's essentially what we had in our spreadsheet from last time, at the end, where it says, "not expected to wait for a conclusion on this recommendation to proceed with other recommendations."

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So just checking. Sorry. I had to answer a few e-mails to get Daniel into the meeting. Where are we on yes or no for this recommendation? Is it yes with some additional clarifying comments?

TIM APRIL: My understanding right now is yes with the clarification that this shouldn't block any of the other work that is recommended for ZONEMD or its deployment. Does that seem accurate?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that's accurate. I don't know if we want to come up with the exact words right here but that's the right sentiment.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: How does that look for clarifying comments? I believe that's what we said in our last clarifying comments—so just reiterating, "Great. Please don't hold up anything for the rest of the document's recommendations." Or do we want to specifically say ZONEMD?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that's okay as written. The other thing—sorry—I'm missing here is do we know what the understanding of requests looked like previously? I'm not sure what they changed from the previous version. I guess I could find it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Are you asking what the …? Oh.

DUANE WESSELS: It feels to me like it's the exact same recommendation, like there was no change, either due to a miscommunication or a copy-paste error. I'm not sure that their understanding has changed based on our last communication with them.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry. I didn't catch that, either, because they processed the rest of our … In the report, when it looked like this last month, there were a lot

more row items because there were a lot more understandings to respond to. I didn't check this against last month's and it does appear to be the exact some statement of understanding, in which case, we can just say no and include the exact same comment as last time to make sure that they process it.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. I think that's fine. Yeah. That seems to be what's happened. It just got lost somehow.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. Does everyone else agree with that approach?

TIM APRIL: That seems [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: Yep.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank you for catching that, Duane. I'm sorry I didn't catch that earlier.

DUANE WESSELS: No problem, Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: That is it for error updates. Let me get the agenda back on the screen. All righty. The next agenda item is actually a charter review update from me. So this is something that we've talked about briefly, as a matter of the RZERC chair transition. Steve and I have been meeting with several people at ICANN Org because there's a really interesting situation where, as RZREC is not part of the ICANN Bylaws, there is no Bylaws process for us to follow with the RZERC charter review as compared to other SO/ACs or other standing committees. And the RZERC charter review itself has only two sentences related to the charter review.

So our expectations right now, as support staff, is that we'll start with the RZERC self-assessment. And the RZERC will be responsible for proposing any changes and revisions. But the actual process and approval process is still being fleshed out at ICANN Org. And we'll be reviewing that with Legal before we share anything and formally kick off the process. So I think as far as timing is concerned, we're in a really good place with relation to the topic scoping exercise that RZERC is going to be talking about in a few minutes.

Unfortunately, that's all I have to share at this time. But I'm hoping to have quite a more substantial update for the September meeting. And that is it from me, unless anyone has any questions.

TIM APRIL: No question but it sounds like a good plan.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All righty. Tim and Daniel, I think the next agenda item belongs to y'all.

TIM APRIL: I was going to say, if you want to take it away, Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Can you hear me?

TIM APRIL: Yep.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. So I was about to share the link but Danielle's already sharing the text. So basically, what I'm trying to do is to try to push little bit to RSSAC to provide the necessary input so that we … We have an idea of their position regarding what is being proposed in RZERC003. So I drafted some text.

And yes. I received a comment from Peter. I think I only understood the comment the right way after Tim's reply on it. So basically, what I'd like to do is to briefly go over the text and see that we have a common agreement on what should be requested to the various RSOs so that we have sufficient material to address, to be able to—so RSSAC can be able to provide a clear position toward RZERC003.

One of the comments from Peter was to update … Basically, how I proceeded, I took the four recommendations and then I tried to provide some … The RSSAC co-chair asked me to provide some questions that they can share with their HR so they can share with their organization. And I guess that the questions should be clear enough so that, given the

feedback, we're able to state a position. This is why, for each recommendation, I set a list of questions.

Item C has been updated after Peter's comment. And we also had some additional questions regarding recommendation three. But one of the comments was whether we should have some questions or have no question at all, given that recommendation three is mostly targeting the software developer or software vendors.

So when I declined the questions, I was thinking that some RSOs have their own in-house software and I was thinking that more information might better than fewer. But I'm happy to do whatever people think is best. So I will not fight if we're stating that recommendation three is out-of-scope for RSOs. I'm fine with that, too. So I think that's the question currently. What do we do with recommendation three? So, Duane, yeah. I can see your hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks, Daniel. Verisign might be the only operator that uses its own propriety software. I think that's still true. But I think that even if that's that case, I think the questions for recommendation one sufficiently cover that case. I don't think there's reasons to also include recommendation three. I would also, I guess, suggest to just delete them from the e-mails so that they don't cause any confusion, even though it says, for some of these "not applicable to RSOs," I would just say omit them from the e-mail so that they don't cause confusion to anymore.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So what I'm going to do is, typically, remove those and add "not applicable to RSOs—" something like that.

DUANE WESSELS: My point was why include the other recommendations if they're not applicable to RSOs. What's the point of including them?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. We can also remove those. Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So you had two points—basically removing recommendation three and everything that is not applicable to RSOs.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think the answers to one sufficiently address your concern about proprietary software or whatever software.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. So this is what you would like to see as a text?

DUANE WESSELS: That's my suggestion. Yeah. But I see Peter's got a hand up, too.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't see your hand. But go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thanks, Daniel. And thanks, Danielle, because, yeah. We have recommendation one on the plate. Just to clarify. And I think, Daniel, when you said that Tim's response opened your eyes for my response, I think that's a plus. What I was trying to so say here is that there are two dimensions of this thing.

One is, regardless of whether the root server operator will make use of ZONEMD, make sure that the introduction of ZONEMD into the root zone would not negatively affect the processing of the root zone by that root server operator. You could argue that the software should be code agnostic or here and there. But my assumption was, coming from the devil's advocate position, if a root server operator would, say, apply proprietary scripts for checking the integrity of the zone or do anything else, do they make sure that the ZONEMD record will not confuse their software?

Question A to recommendation one is a bit ambiguous because it says, "Is there anything that prevents you [inaudible] test the impact?" Yeah. B and C probably overlap. But the question is the introduction … What do you mean by testing the introduction? The following bullet items would go in that direction of damage control or excluding negative impact.

The other that was covered in the questions applying to recommendation three. And I would agree. It's a bit on the edge whether that is something for RZERC to ask. But of course, we could still ask because we all are friends. It could be interesting to know whether the root server operators would consider using ZONEMD but I think that is not necessarily our primary concern.

But maybe we can, just for clarity of the question, distinguish these two elements and make sure that we ask for the negative impacts. And then, as an optional response, maybe we could ask, "Are there any considerations of applying this?" But again, that is not necessarily on our plate. I hope that makes it not less clear. Thank you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, yeah. But what would you propose? I'm hearing that you would like to change the text here. Saying "introduction," to me, is that IANA is going to add … No that's the Root Zone Maintainer that's going to add the ZONEMD. So should I specify that, the "introduction in the root zone?"

PETER KOCH: The difficulty I had is interpreting what kind of testing you would envision. Is like this "doesn't hurt" testing or is it, "Oh yeah. We tested it and we found ZONEMD giving the matching hash." Potentially, I believe that points A and B, with that new C, A and B might actually be redundant. Maybe C gives more clarity. But others may disagree.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. So now that I recall when I wrote them, I think A was, "Do you have a fight with the ZONEMD?" or something like that.

PETER KOCH: Sorry. Do you have A?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I was supposing that maybe they are just waiting. I don't know if there is a channel for testing from the root zone maintainer to the different RSOs. Maybe they cannot do those kind of testing. They need to have some … They can't test some independent piece of hardware. But if they want to test the full deployment, maybe that's not something that is available to them. So I think that was—

GEOFF HUSTON: I think this conversation is out-of-scope to RZERC. I don't think it's RZERC's responsibility to orchestrate the operational details of this. It seems to me to be somewhere between the IANA and the RZM to actually perform overall orchestration of the various parts of the root system and its players.

I think, in essence, we're just simply passing the ball on to somebody. And as I said, I have no idea between IANA, the PTI, and RZM as to who it might be. But what I do know is that a representative group that meets once a month is entirely the wrong person or body to oversee the operational deployment of these kinds of technologies.

So while I actually think some of these detailed questions are fine due diligence questions, they're actually better phrased to a body that's going to look after the answers. And this is, I think, a dangling reference that either PTI or the RZM should be picking up and running with in conjunction with the root zone operators, rather than trying to cast RZERC as an active role in this. I just think we've got the wrong gene pool. So I'm not dismissing the questions. I think they're great. But I wonder why the answers are necessarily, in detail, an RZERC issue.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Those questions are mostly intended for RSSAC. And my guess is that RSSAC is going to publish a statement or something like that. But what I want to make sure is that we are not missing anything that is addressing RZERC003.

GEOFF HUSTON: I appreciate that but in some ways, this is now heading deeply into operational responsibilities and roles. That's fine. But as I said, I just think that RZERC, having published 002 and 003 now has more of a watching brief over this. And the baton is hopefully and properly left to those with a direct operational involvement. As I said, I think somewhere between PTI, RZM, and the operators themselves—the RSOs—there is a necessarily operational issue around considering exactly these questions, timings, goals, how this will be done.

If anything, I think RZERC now has, if you will, a feedback from whoever is taking this on to say, "Here's where we are and here's where we plan. It's looking good," or, "Wow. We just encountered a snag. Are you really

sure about RZERC002 and 003 because …?" But I don't think it's up to us to flush those issues out, per se.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I do agree that we don't have any responsibility. And RSSAC, providing even a statement is just to ease that publication and ease the moving forward. So yeah. That's the main intent of those questions. So I do agree with what you mentioned.

GEOFF HUSTON: Peter, you had your hand up. I was waiting.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. if I may. I'm not completely sure I understood, Jeff, which of the questions you were not seeing on RZERC's desk at the moment. I would agree that orchestrating or motivating the root server operators to actually make use of ZONEMD is probably not in-scope for RZERC. On the other hand, making sure that a recommendation coming out of RZERC does not harm the root server operations and making sure that RSSAC, as one of the stakeholders there, even though people don't like the term "stakeholder," has raised their voice, it is well within our scope.

The question, "Dear RSSAC—" because we can't talk to the root operators so we have to channel it through RSSAC, I believe. "Dear operators. If the ZONEMD record was introduced in the root zone, would that negatively impact your processing of the root zone?" I think that is a legitimate and useful question.

GEOFF HUSTON: I agree Peter and I wonder … It had legitimacy and usefulness prior to the publication of RZERC003. It was, "Before we go down the step of recommending this … These are a few things that needed to be checked," and so on. If we hadn't any kind of feedback, that's maybe a ball that we've dropped in terms of consultation before creating these recommendations. That is so.

But after the event, we're trying to get down to this almost vexed question of the dance that needs to be performed before there are changes in the contents of the root zone—in other words, the dance that needs to be performed to put in a new resource record, ZONEMD.

And I think we're discovering, if you will, a process that hasn't been clearly written down as to who does what and in what order? Who takes over all responsibility? And while I think that's a fine question to ask, again, I think it's a role issue because this particular body is not operationally geared up and resourced. It's really a question for others to pick up and run with in terms of its operational implication.

In terms of a thought experiment, will this harm the root zone and the Internet? That's a great question and these are worthy folks to ask. Gee, I wish we'd asked that before we published it.

TIM APRIL: Along that line, as I was reading through that—and I had the charter open in another tab so I went and looked at it—I'm not entirely sure it's within the scope of RZERC to ask these questions directly to the RSOs or

the RSSAC. But I think they're useful questions to provide to the RSSAC for consideration about how to address this when this recommendation gets implemented—things that RZERC members were thinking about when this was written and after it was written of how we might see impact on the root zone—something that they can take internally, and discuss, and possibly create a public statement or a statement directly to RZERC.

But the two topic areas that I see the questions coming out of are … The questions in recommendation one are basically, "If we add this new record, or the RZM adds this new record to the root zone, is it going to impact the ability for the RSOs to serve the zone?" And the questions in recommendation three, I saw as, "Are you actually going to use the ZONEMD record at all to verify the zone? If so what's the rough timeline for when you expect to do that? I personally think they're all useful questions to be thought about but I don't know if we should expect an answer from RSSAC about any of that.

So let's take it this way. I am not working for RZERC when I am asking RSSAC to respond to those questions. I am purely working for RSSAC. And because there is a document, RZERC003. And just checking with RZERC. If they have all those questions responded, they will be able to provide. We are not missing anything from what RZERC is waiting for. So this is basically what I'm trying to avoid—that we come with some questions to RSSAC, make a perfect statement, and then RSSAC says, "Yeah but you don't actually respond to … We are missing that point. This was a crucial point we were expecting RSSAC to position against and this point is being missed.

So this is the kind of thing I'd like to avoid. But then, I will drop the ball to RSSAC and say that RZERC should maybe publish a statement. And maybe, as a response to RZERC, if they tell me no, there is nothing we … I will not tell them there but RZERC is waiting for that statement. So it's an internal work for RSSAC and I'd like to confirm that we're not missing a crucial point RZERC was expecting from.

TIM APRIL: Duane had his hand up next.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. I thought it would maybe talk a little bit about how I envisioned this all working when we started this process a couple years ago. My expectation was that—kind of what Geoff was saying—is that there are existing operational groups that have good working relationships—the root server operators, and IANA, and the Root Zone Maintainer. And we've already been discussing ZONEMD and the need for testing. So those discussions have already started.

My expectation was that the root server operators would discuss this in their meetings and eventually would publish a statement on the rootservers.org website, saying that they have completed testing and, yadda, yadda, yadda, confirmed that everything would be fine. However, I'm also okay if the group or if RSSAC thinks that going through an RSSAC channel is more appropriate or a better way to do it. I think that's okay as well. I don't think it's necessary but it's okay if we want to do it that way. It's okay with me, at least.

So that's just how I expected things to work at the start. I understand what your goal is in accomplishing this here. I know that you talked about it at the last RSSAC meeting as well and there seemed to be some supportive voices at that time, in that RSSAC meeting, for doing something like this. So I'm comfortable if it proceeds this way but I'm also comfortable if it proceeds without RSSAC. That's it.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Oh yeah. Sure. Me, it's the same. I don't want to take three months to send the e-mail. So I expect to send an e-mail this week to RSSAC. And then, if RSSAC decides that there is a common statement from RSSAC or that each RSO is going to do that on its own, I am not pushing in one or the other way. The reason I'm providing this e-mail and these questions is basically because the RSSAC co-chairs asked me to do so. And I think if we can have something in a short time, done in a relatively short time, it's still better than delaying that.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm still uncomfortable with this. It strikes me as a certain amount of making it up as we go along, which I think, for the root zone, is completely inappropriate. We shouldn't be making it up as we go along in any case.

I actually think that recommendation four of this document—that the PTI and the RZM should jointly develop a plan and make this plan available for review—was the substantive recommendation here. And to be perfectly frank, one, two, and three were almost subsidiary to four because it placed an onus of responsibility somewhere between two

bodies that have operational responsibility and are able to coordinate the various players in the root zone.

I think RZERC's role, which is basically policy and non-operational matters of almost strategic futures, is not well-served by getting involved in these kinds of questions. And I think RSSAC, the RSOs, the PTI, and the RZM need to understand processes here to make this happen. An I'm not sure we're helping by directly posing operationally-oriented questions into this because this is not, if you will, just merely fishing for information. This is setting an agenda about deploying this in the root zone.

And I don't think it's operationally inside our responsibilities, nor do I think we should make up procedures to bring that into effect. I think that would be inappropriate for an ecosystem that is very deliberately structured with particular roles and responsibilities. So while RSSAC can ask itself these kinds of questions and feed itself these answers, yay, RSSAC and good on it. But I don't think RZERC should be the agent asking the questions of RSSAC, nor should it be the entity that pulls together what the answers might be, etc. I actually think that is more operationally-focused.

So as I said, my concern is without a procedural handbook to follow in making changes to the root zone, I think we should progress cautiously. We should ensure that the folk with operational responsibilities in such coordination are empowered and given clear direction to say, "Go and do your things. And this kind of, "Well, what does it mean in detail?" is actually up to those operational bodies. So I would argue strongly that somewhere between PTI and RZM—and I don't think it's my job to

figure out who and how in that space—should really take this on and progress this, rather than us getting involved in posing questions and answers into RSSAC. Thanks.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. So I've taken note of your comment. I think it's useful. And I will try to at least provide RSSAC with that point of view. What I intend to do is basically to respond to RSSAC with the text on recommendation one and making optional the questions on recommendation three. And I will point out that it has been also clarified that it's a very operational discussion that may be done outside of RZERC between the RZM, and the PTI, and the various RSOs, which I would say root ops, which I am not part of. And then I will let the RSSAC co-chair to decide how to proceed. Does anyone think it's a bad way to move on?

GEOFF HUSTON: I didn't quite catch, from your summary here Daniel, if you were saying, "These questions come from RZERC." And I was trying to make clear that it would be appropriate to make sure that these questions do not come from RZERC. It is an RSSAC initiative. And I applaud RSSAC for taking an initiative here but it is an RSSAC initiative and that's all it is.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. That's clearly. It's not from RZERC.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Sure. Okay. So thank you for your help and I will move on that to RSSAC. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Thank you, Daniel. The last topic that was on the agenda for this month was the topic scoping exercise. I sent an e-mail about it a couple weeks ago. If I recall, the only response for new topics to add to the survey were from Geoff and they're up on the screen now. One, is there any other topics that we want to include? If so, if you want to throw them in the chat so we can just copy and paste them into the document or drop them directly in the spreadsheet. And any other things to try and cover quickly?

The format for the questionnaire, where it was going to be three questions for each of these topics, the first one being in light of the current charter for the RZERC, is this in-scope, out-of-scope, or the responder doesn't know. The next question was should this be in scope of a revised charter? Same answers of in-scope, out-of-scope, or don't know. And then, just a field to catch what other interested parties this may be relevant to—so whether it's a topic for IANA, PTI, RSSAC, SSAC, something like that.

And to go forward from there, my current strawman of a proposal to roll this out would be to try and get the survey with any additional topics put together and shipped out to all of us by the end of this week. And then, try and have the results due back the Thursday before our next meeting which, if my calendar math is right, that's Thursday, September

16th. And then, go over the results of that survey on the next call to try and incorporate with—hopefully update on the charter review process from Danielle so that we can start the discussion of whether or not we need to make changes to our charter and proceed from there.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So one question. Did we agree that those topics were not so confidential or can we share that with our respective groups?

TIM APRIL: That was going to be my next question as well.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Right.

TIM APRIL: Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know if you want this now but looking at the new topics list, I would like to discuss some of these to clarify more details about what those mean. But if that's a discussion for later, that's fine also.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think I had some topics regarding the unsigned delegation.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Maybe I missed that.

GEOFF HUSTON: Tim, I would be reluctant to share this outside this group at this point. I think in time, in this sort of exercise, we are going through phase one, which is the brainstorming approach, where, without any critical judgment, we're just putting a list of topics on the wall. Some of them might be obviously rubbish, some might be subtly rubbish, and some might be useful. But there is no judgment here at this point. It's just a list of topics. And the next phase, which is our job as RZERC, is to actually apply the first sift of critical evaluation. It's got to pass a few tests about relevance, scope, etc.

But to make sure, I think, we're thinking broadly enough, the first phase needs to be uncritical. And for that to work, this is not a publicly-shared thing. It can't be because as soon as you do that, I think we all apply the blinkers—our own blinkers—about, "Well, I have this idea but it's crazy. Therefore, I'm not going to share it," whereas, I think at this point, we actually just want ideas put forward that we can all apply some critical thinking to.

So I think necessarily, this is an exercise within this group, Daniel, rather than sharing it around right now. We then need to apply the sift of sanity to see what's actually appropriate that we think is in some scope for RZERC. Thanks.

TIM APRIL:

I agree that the first stage is brainstorming of potential topics that may be in-scope for RZERC. The thing that I'm marginally interested in sharing—I don't know if this is the same for Daniel or not—is when we go to actually complete the survey, I would be interested in sharing the results of my feedback on the survey with the liaison managers within at least the IAB—so basically, the people that appointed me to RZERC—as a second set of eyes to review my thoughts on the different topics.

So that's where I'm applying some sort of thinking about, "Is this in-scope or out-of-scope," and then potentially, "Here's why," for someone else—my second set of eyes—before then submitting it to the review process internally. I don't know if we want to go through a weeding-out process ahead of that of trying to find things that we all believe are clearly out-of-scope and restricting it that way. Or are you thinking once we get through the first round of reviewing, then potentially having an output from that, which we'd then do another round on.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I think as soon as we start sharing it, it gives it an authority that may or may not be warranted. But it does give it an authority. And it sends the signal that RZERC is considering taking on … And that might not be the case. It might be completely nonsense. Until we ourselves, I think, have at least judged, in some pass, of who, why, what, and how on these things, we really should do that work ourselves as part of due diligence.

Once we've worked that out, I think then it's appropriate to say, "We're circling around the following," and, "This isn't frivolous anymore. We're circling around the following. What is your view?" is probably a good

time if we are going to have consultation with the various folk who have sent us here for the broader views on this topic.

But I think, with some uncertainty as to our charter, and our role, and some uncertainty as to the topic list, I wonder and worry that we're just adding to confusion if we circulate this early, rather than providing clarity.

TIM APRIL: Okay. Being cognizant of time, the second proposal I will put forward is to take any additional questions about either the new topics or the existing topics or potential new topics to e-mail. Try and finish that, either by the end of this week or mid-next week and then do the first round of the survey internally, without sharing to the different groups. And then, on the next call, we review the results of that. And then, we proceed from there of whether or not we are reaching some sort of level of consensus within how we rank things or if we need to have more discussions about specific topics. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Just a reminder that whatever we discuss on the list is public. So if we want to keep the topics private then we need to be careful there.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm not suggesting private, Duane. Let me make that absolutely clear. But once we start referring things outward deliberately, I think we're giving them some authority. I think it's quite well-understood from everyone that within this scope of this discussion, it is just throwing mud

at the wall and that's okay. The mud doesn't have authority because it's clearly just throwing mud at the wall.

But at some point, when we're trying to say—we're sifting sanity and trying to understand what's the right thing here, at that point, I think it becomes an issue. So I'm not suggesting the conversation should be distinctly private. Absolutely not. But I think there is an effort to clearly delineate what is brainstorming versus what is sifting and sanity.

TIM APRIL: Okay. So does that approach work for everyone? Any changes we should make? We'll go with that and play it by ear.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. That's fine. I also agree that if we have something we absolutely know it's not going to be in-scope, we should not try to raise some discussions because it can be hours of discussion for something we know is going to be a no at the end.

TIM APRIL: Yeah. Okay. So keep an eye out for extra topics on the list and I'll ask that we try and get that done by the end of the week so that we can prepare the first round of the survey starting next week and review it on the next call. Does anyone have anything else? I think we can call it.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, team, Danielle.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]