
PANAMA – RZERC Working Session [C]
Monday, June 25, 2018 – 15:00 to 16:30 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

MARIO: Welcome everyone. This is the RZERC working session and we have attendance from [inaudible], Jim Reed, Peter Cook, and Russ Mundy. You're welcome to start anytime.

DWAYNE: Thank you Mario. As we were just discussing before officially starting here, we're missing a couple of members who are probably going to be late. So, I'm going to rearrange the agenda just a little bit to cover some of the less interesting stuff. Number 6 on our agenda today is about reappointment of RZERC members. Right before the meeting today I was talking with the staff about... we don't really have anything to report on this, asking the staff to help build a table that we can maintain long term, which will have the dates of everyone's appointments and their terms of their appointments from their appointing organizations, so that we know, you know, which ones need to be refreshed so often. We do believe that Jim, your appointment needs to be reconfirmed and I'm happy to send out a letter I guess to your... OK. That has been communicated to us, I guess, we haven't reached out to them, they haven't reached out to us,

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.

so we just need to establish that. OK, sure. I think to the chair, I think so... yeah. It looks like we also missed Brad's reappointment from RSSAC, we should have done that a while ago, so we have to do that as well. Those are the ones that we about at this point, if anyone else knows that they need to be reappointed, please speak up. [inaudible]. OK, and you're eligible for reappointment, I assume? You are eligible for reappointment, or? Yes, OK. [inaudible], can do it for me. Could be tricky. So, anyway, we're still working on the reappointment stuff, but making progress there. Also, I'll insert under any other business, Jim, you had made a suggestion to add to our correspondent section of our website and we're working on that. Steve is going to send a request to the board, or the board staff, for a more formal letter about the KSK rollover resolution that they made requesting our input, so we'll post that there. I've done similarly for the thing from OCTO, from Ed Lewis about the RZM study, so... we'll get those posted to the correspondents section.

JIM REED:

It's OK, you got here now Carlos, thank you. I think also in this communication correspondent section, it would be like their confirmation of appointment of members of the committee. If they're formal letters coming from [inaudible] or whoever else it is, they should also be there, just as part of this public record.

DWAYNE: Yeah, I like that. That's a good idea. Welcome Carlos, we've started already a little bit without you, but just the boring stuff, so you didn't miss anything too good yet, and we're still holding out for a couple of additional late attendees, so, I guess we should do our review of the minutes from the previous meeting. I skipped over that, so, do we have the minutes from the last meeting yet? I can't remember to be honest.

MARIO: Thank you Dwayne. This is Mario for the record. Yes, in fact, I have distributed the minutes over the mailing list. I guess a couple of weeks ago. The action items aside it, they're in the previous meeting. I note there was a number one, Russ, Howard, and Peter to work together on preparing a statement for OCTO regarding the Root Zone management evolution study, which is the proposal that we have received. Staff to work on the meeting minutes. The second one is the RZERC to discuss via mailing list, the advice to the board related to the resolution on the KSK rollover, and so, we have started working on both of them, we set up actually a mailing list for Russ, Howard, and Peter. In fact, we have received one email today in the mailing list from Howard, so we could probably have a better insight or feedback and discussion when he joins the call. For the second one, there

is some discussions actually on the mailing list, so both of them have been completed, thank you. Just as a quick reminder, the conference is actually being video recorded, so if you don't mind just using the microphone when speaking. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Does anyone have questions or anything about the minutes? If not, we can take them as approved and posted to the website. Alright. So, thank you Mario for that and I'll post them as soon as possible. So, we have sort of two largish topics that we can spend time on today. One is the OCTO study and the other is the KSK rollover. I don't have a particular opinion on which one we do first, I think it would be good if Howard was here for both of them, I think he has opinions that are helpful to hear and we've heard some of his opinions, I guess via email already. Any thoughts on which one to tackle first? OK. Well, the KSK rollover request has a deadline, the other one does not have a deadline at this point. I think we should give ourselves a deadline, regardless, I don't think we should take too long on either one. The KSK rollover deadline, the board expects comments from us by August 10th, and that really gives us one more of our regular meetings to finalize anything, so we have now until our next regular meeting to put something together, we don't have any other meetings scheduled after or before... in August before that deadline, so... and my read of the email discussion about the

KSK rollover is a little bit divided. We have one against and two for, of the people that have expressed opinions so far. I guess, for my own part to be clear, I think we should, you know, respond, we can't just not respond at all, we will respond with something. The question is, to what extent do we respond, and say this is within our charter, or do we politely say thanks, but no thanks.

RUSS MUNDY:

This is Russ for the record, and I think if folks have been following the discussion, I have stated fairly strongly this is within our charter and I think it's very important that we respond with some type of substantive comment and if this is not within our charter, honestly, I don't know what is within our charter.

DWAYNE:

Thanks Russ.

PETER COOK:

This is Peter for the record. I tend to agree with Russ on the question whether or not this is in the charter, and also from the spirit that was communicated when it came to the founding of RZERC, not playing, taking over a bit of the responsibility of NTIA, when it comes to bigger changes like this kind of approval.

However, I am also leaned toward Jim a bit, because, what Russ said... what you said Russ in your email was, if I recall correctly, that we should give the ICANN board a clear yes or no response, and I am not feeling comfortable doing that. Entering that whole thing late in the game, kind of. Maybe I misunderstood, misrepresented your submission, so I am happy to...

RUSS MUNDY:

I was not intending to say explicitly we should say yes or no about resuming the plan, but we should state an opinion, a view. It could be yes or no, it could be oh, there needs to be more done like this, or people need to... the board needs to think about these kinds of risks, or you know... but provide some type of substantive input, didn't have to be yes or no.

DWAYNE:

Alright, Carlos.

CARLOS:

This is Carlos for the record. I personally believe that key rolls in themselves are within the charter of RZERC. Not this particular , but rolls in general. How often should the key roll... what [inaudible] should be used. That seems to be definitely things that we should be thinking [inaudible]. That's my particular opinion on whether it's in the scope or not. Now this particular

roll has certain, particular characteristics, being the first and having been discussed in many many places already. So, while I believe it's within the charter, I'm also feeling a bit uneasy in the same way as Peter does. We are a late comer into the game, many of us have been discussing this same topic in other venues, so we are kind of uncomfortable having a clear cut opinion right now, within this venue. Maybe we could say something different, as Russ pointed, not necessarily a clear yes or no, but something else. A bit split here.

DWAYNE:

Yeah, thank you, I agree that it's a little bit awkward. I am not sure what we could say that hasn't already been said, that wouldn't be a grenade into the system. In that sense, it feels like, well, it feels like sort of just going through the motions. It just, formalizing and getting everyone on board. Jim go ahead.

JIM REED:

I think maybe we can find a little bit of compromise or middle ground, which could hopefully satisfy everybody in the committee here. Probably, I think the kind of response we could maybe send back to the board. First of all, we have to send a response back to the board, I think everyone is fully in agreement with that. But I think we can send back a report that says we have nothing to add to the comments already made by

other advisory bodies on this particular issue. We've got nothing more that we can add to what the discussion and advice that has been given by others. A lot of special insights, so what can we deliver that can't already be delivered by RSSAC or by SSAC, or by OCTO. I don't think we've got anything more we can really add, and I think it would be a reasonable response to say, dear ICANN board, we've talked about this issue, and we think that we as a committee have got nothing more to add to the discussion and the comments been made in other parts of the ICANN machinery. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And, do you think it's appropriate to, also, you know, say that one of the reasons is because, as Carlos said because of the timing. Because RZERC was formed about the same time this rollover stuff was happening and so, you know, we are a little bit late, we wouldn't use that word, but we're a little bit late to the party here. Is that appropriate to say in this?

JIM REED: I would be less inclined to go down that path in terms of details, because if somebody then comes back and says, well you had this committee set up for a year, that was more than enough time for you guys to sit down and discuss this. Where of course, that first year we spent sorting our own procedures and

organizing ourselves. I don't think we should get into specific details about why we deliver a particular message, whether it's a question of timing, or whether we think it's in scope or out of scope, or what the nature of that scope shall be. I think we just give something along those lines that says we got nothing more to add and leave it to that, fairly short without getting into the specifics of why we reached that conclusion, assuming that's what our conclusion or consensus viewpoint is going to be. That's my take on it.

PETER COOK:

This is Peter again for the record. Mario, I am sorry [inaudible], if you have the charter available to put there, we can do that. I can also read it from here like if you look at the scope of responsibilities of RZERC, and again, you mentioned Dwayne that yes, the KSK rollover was already under discussion, with the design team set up and so on and so forth, before RZERC was put into existence. Discover responsibilities explicitly says, the committee will not necessarily be the group that considers the details of the issues raised. So, in this particular case that was a reflect to the discussion we had on the call last time, what is exactly asked of us. The 5, 6, 7 of us, supposed to go into any technical details, probably not. The question... the scope of responsibilities includes ensuring that all the relevant bodies have had their voice and so on and so forth. But, we have not

been driving the process, that has been done by... ICANN the organization, OCTO in particular, but that doesn't make any difference, essentially by the ICANN board because they obviously gave the token to some entity within the organization, so I am really unsure what we're asked of. Then again, I rather not send a white paper response back, and what you Jim said, we have nothing to add, is almost a white paper response. It's a bit more polite, but it's still like, maybe we can find a good way, a better form to point to the scope and then say that, since we're not supposed to redo some of the work that has been done in this whole process interface. I don't want to be perceived as, as embarrassed by not being asked earlier, that was a question of timing then. Generally, we should also not have... not send the message that we would think these type of things is completely out of scope. In this particular one, and Carlos mentioned that, this particular one might be different solely based on the timing of the issue in comparison with RZERCs founding.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Those sort of like, question about if we would explain the timing issue, because I think if we want RZERC to be asked these questions then we should probably say that on our response. We appreciate being asked, please ask us again. Otherwise if we just say, we don't have anything to contribute, then we're not going to maybe be asked in the future. RZERC needs to decide, I think,

if it wants to be asked these questions or not. It sounds to me like, maybe we don't mind being asked. That's what I am hearing.

JIM REED:

I've got a couple points, one first of all is on the nature of the response, the suggestion of type of wording might be a little bit more substantive would be to say that... again, I am just throwing them out here for discussion, not necessarily saying this is what the final format would be... we have confidence in the assessments that have been made by OCTO, RSSAC, the design team and we're happy to go along with the consensus view that they have presented to the ICANN board. Something along those lines might be more in keeping with what Peter was saying before. On the bigger question of what RZERCs role in all this comes to be, a need to rely that comes from our piece of work that we do with the RSSAC review, and one of the interviews that we had with Steve [inaudible], and Steve was very very welcoming about the fact that RZERC had been set up, and he said that from his perspective, RZERC was a crucial piece of ICANN machinery, of the jigsaw that was missing because the past, whenever there were important changes to be made to the root, for example, getting the root signed, adding V6 glue for the root servers, there was no mechanism for doing that within inside the existing ICANN machinery, and that was the gap, in his

eyes, that RZERC was initially chartered, set up, fill that specific role. So if we're looking at that interpretation, which is one that I am fully sympathetic towards is, that I would then argue that things like, a KSK rollover which is a routine event, we are not changing the algorithm, we're not doing anything with the key length. That should be a routine event and treated the same way as changing the NS records, or re numbering a root server, and in that sense it would probably be out of scope. I would be prepared to back down a little bit on that because, this is the first time round, but I still don't think this is something we should go overly involved in. I think, if we say something along the lines that we're happy with the community discussions and analysis that has taken place to this date, then we can't really offer new insights, or a contrary opinions to those views that have already been expressed aboard. I think that would be perhaps a reasonable way forward, possibly. Thank you.

RUSS MUNDY:

So, a couple of comments here. First, I will say that I think it's very very important for RZERC to make sure we define a role for ourselves and that role makes sense with respect to the whole environment, and the reference you made there Jim to a fact that there really wasn't a community type entity to look at these changes previously, was a major issue, and it's been... you know, RZERC was supposed to rectify that. The point of the

architectural view is excellent, but I think there's also the impact of the actual operational things related to security and stability, and that's in the charter, and that's where we as a group think need to decide just how much and what kind of things fit into that realm. We just... I think you were in the DNS workshop this morning for most of it, Jim, and you know... the Czech Republic just did it, an algorithm roll, yay, first algorithm roll for a TLD, as far as I know anyway. This is the first KSK roll for the root and so, at least in my mind, operational potential problems for risk, that we as a group see that could affect substantially the operation of the rootzone and everything under it, that's really kind of where my strong push for... this is something that is very much a RZERC role. Now, one of the other group in ICANN that's been engaged is the SSAC. I mean, we've got multiple publications about it and some of the things that were in our earlier documents, some of us believe they haven't been as fully implemented as they should be. For instance, a monitoring system, this was recommended back in the root scaling days, which was [inaudible] 46 I think, and RSSAC also spoke about this. But in terms of published positions on the KSK rollover and DNSSEC in general, much more material has come from SSAC than from RSSAC relative to the issue, and we're working on the SSAC response at this point, and it looks like there's going to be at least 4 general areas that SSAC says something about that because the way SSAC works, I can't really say details but there's

going to be an answer of some substance from SSAC that we will get out the door and back to the board in the timeframe, and one of the... sort of behind the scenes discussions that occurred prior to this tasking coming out from the board, and it was especially pointed at SSAC, was that there would not be an answer from SSAC, any definitive statement of yes or no, you should resume the roll. OK. If SSAC decides to make such a statement, which I personally I doubt that they will, but if they did, they still could, but the board basically was told beforehand that you won't get SSAC to do your job for you, is kind of what the position was, so I think it's important that RZERC say something of substance and go forward from there. Because if it becomes in the future to bothersome, we get asked too many questions, that's a much worse problem than not being asked things that we should be asked.

JIM REED:

Just a question, you were saying there that the SSAC, you are not going to do the ICANN boards job for them, to paraphrase the comment you just made, do you think it would be appropriate for RZERC to essentially convey the same message back to the board? That RZERC is not going to do the boards job for them either?

RUSS MUNDY: That was why I wanted to make the small corrections to Peter's interpretation to my email earlier. I was not saying that we, RZERC, should say yes or no. OK. I just believe RZERC should say something of substance, whatever is appropriate from the RZERCs point of view.

PETER COOK: Peter again for the record. So, I agree that we should say something of substance, maybe not necessarily on the technical, operational details of the question before us. I think there's lots of interesting questions of governance and decision making in this process, that may be relevant to other future decisions of changes to very central infrastructure. The question of, how many people can we leave behind, which is, what is the risk of who and how many do we lose on the way, and what is the pain, in quotes, that they are going to experience. This is the decision that can be made implicitly or explicitly, we had the unfortunate situation that the breaks were pulled and then because it was felt something was going on with the signal and noise and it would hurt too many without having determined, can we have a threshold and what could this threshold be. Of course, making the judgement now afterwards is extremely difficult and these things might have to be taken into account for any future decision that may or may not be a KSK rollover or anything else. Maybe on the KSK roll, we know and we've been talking about

the KSK roll having been scheduled in the very beginning because it's said then, I guess 2010 ish, that within 5 years there should be a KSK roll and 5011 and so on and so forth. 5011 wasn't cast in stone but it was on the plate. However, we are probably not... we probably cannot be sure that the environment... the operational environment of today reflects the visions and the status of course, of the operational environment back then. We have all these automated systems and so on and so forth, that kind of collide with 5011's idea of being able to replace configuration in place, and so on and so forth. That's another aspect. My third aspect is that somebody said that, yeah we're happy with the conversation and the feedback and so on and so forth. I must say personally, I am not. That is not to blame on the people doing the outreach, there were so many calls for input and so on and so forth, and you probably, probably everybody in this room if we put together the names of the people that actually responded, we know them all. It's a very inner circle response, and that is a concern. Which is something we can raise but not necessarily have a solution to. Again, it is nobody's fault, it is not the fault of somebody raising the flag, Peter pointing to Dwayne, and it's also not the fault of OCTO, but it's a general concern that I like to voice at some point. Thank you.

DWAYNE: Alright thanks. Kim I figure you gathered what we're talking about. I don't know if you have any... you might be a little conflicted on this, but if you have an opinion you are definitely welcome to express it at this time. Just in case it's not clear, right before you came in, I think there was a proposal from Jim kind of, just our response to the board on this issue would be something like, you know, RZERC feels this is being well handled by other organizations, naming those organizations, and that we don't have anything of substance to really to say at this point in time, but please ask us again in the future. Something like that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think my quick take is, as a threshold issue, I do think it's in scope for RZERC, if that was in question, but I'm not sure that this group has any particular value adds that haven't been well and truly covered by other groups within ICANN, so it sounds to [inaudible] with that advice. Yeah, I think this committee has a particular role to evaluating certain issues that would escape the attention of other parts of ICANN, but key rollover seems clearly to not be one of them. So, if we didn't feel we had any particular insight to convey, I don't think we should feel obligated, but certainly to convey that message nonetheless.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I am getting the general sense that we do think we should say something of substance back, but one of the questions I want to ask is if our members have looked at SSAC63 a set of recommendations that are in there, because we want to move on to try to get a sense of what things we might want to say. I'll suggest that as at least a point to start from, because this was something... I mean it's 5 years old, but it does enumerate a set of things that the SSAC said you all ought to think about and look at and do some of these things, and might provide. I know there's a [inaudible] from two things I heard Peter say, to what was in SSAC63, that's maybe worth looking at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Russ, are you maybe suggesting that our response to the board could reference particular item in SSAC 63, or...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that is a possibility, it is a document that's been published. It has words, if we like what's there we don't have to write as much, kind of thing.

JIM REED: Russ, I think that's a good idea but I would like to sort of, tease it back a little back, and maybe in part of our response, we should say to the ICANN board is, we welcome some direction from the

board for items for RZERC to consider for future key rollovers. There's probably very little we can do at this stage now to influence the current key rollover plan and the intentions to go ahead with this rollover in October. So, to that extent the ship has sailed, and I don't think we can do much to really influence it one way or the other. So what we should say is, again, potentially as part of our response back to the board is say well, we've got not much to say at this particular stage, but for future key rollover events, please give us some guidance, as the board, to the sort of things you would like RZERC to give advice back to the board on about future rollovers, in specific reference to, for example, documents such as SSAC 63, or whatever else they think might be appropriate to [inaudible] or whenever the next key rollover is going to be scheduled. Leave the door open for future guidance but I think we still need to get some clarity from the board about what it is they really expect us to do in the future.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As a matter of practicality I mean, the board members themselves are unlikely to have a particular insight on that, but that request is going to be funneled to staff and probably me. So, I'm just not sure how actionable going back with that kind of message is.

PETER COOK:

Again, Peter for the record. While I understand Jim's suggestion and asking for guidance is always also sending a signal. I'm not sure that I would agree in this particular case, because RZERC unlike others are not a board committee, we are weird in the sense that the entity that brought us into existence no longer exists, or it only exists in... and are we getting political, is probably the empowered community is probably the successor of the whatever entity that brought RZERC into existence, so this is really weird. There should be a... because the guidance would also, ultimately end up in maybe charter changes or something, so there should be some wisdom how the charter could be changed, and maybe that's with the board again, but I'd rather not ask the board to take over the steering wheel of this committee which is actually installed to be a bit of a balance, somehow.

JIM REED:

Suggesting that they would become a steering wheel or anything like that, but if they're going to give us... asking us to do specific things, I think that a bit more clarity is required about what specific things they'd want to do. Say for example, for the next time there's a key rollover, I would expect that would be something that gets dumped, or becomes our responsibility and

primarily our responsibility as opposed to setting up a design team, because that was the mechanism that had to be used to get around that. The fact that there wasn't an RZERC type thing to deal with that particular task, so the next time round RZERC would presumably take over the role that was filled by that design team this time around. That's the kind of thing I was meaning by the type of advice, not looking to have the board come back and tell us how we should go about doing things. I respect what Kim says, the board's maybe not got a lot of the technical expertise that's required to go specific details, but I do think they need to be a bit clearer about what sort of things they'd like RZERC to do, on things like a key rollover in the future.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: One past passed through my mind, thinking about your suggestion Jim, for asking the board for more clarification, also according to our charter, any of the members, or the members organizations, or the CSC can also task RZERC. So perhaps if we want to include something of that nature, a way to phrase it would be something like, if the board had put other inside of other potential things they would like advice for, that would be helpful in the future, or something like that. Because, as Kim said, we're not going to get anything direct from them, but leaving the door open for them if they want to say a general, we

expect to see these kinds of things happening and hear from you with time, because there was at least one of the actions that was involved, RSSAC and SSAC earlier and didn't even think of RZERC, and I forgotten exactly what it was, but Dwayne I talked about that. Yeah, label generation rules. Yeah. So, it's to an extent to get the board to continue to engage with RZERC because we're a tool for them and others in our community.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Alright. It sounds to me like we have a start here on a response and the next step is to start putting words to editors, I guess. Would anyone like to join me and the staff in a Google Doc and maybe start writing this? Maybe one or two volunteers and we can put a draft out this week or so? OK. Russ and Jim. So, if you guys will start up a Google Doc for us, we will start typing away. As I said before, I think we need to iterate on this pretty quickly because we have an August deadline so we should, you know, we should have something that we can reach consensus on, at our next call which would be mid July-ish.

JIM REED:

One other small point is that, I did get feedback from the [inaudible] on the KSK rollover, so it would be nice if there was some way of incorporating some of those words into the final response, just because the [inaudible] has said something, albeit

it wasn't very much. I think it would be important that message gets conveyed, but of course we need to then go back and ask the [inaudible] if they're happy with what's being presented, potentially to the board, is their perspective on this, even though it's been channeled through RZERC.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that's reasonable. I think any appointing organization that wanted to have specific language in there, should be allowed to do that, I think.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: One thing, is that RSSAC is about to try to spin up a similar type of activity and I've no idea how quickly it will come about. I understand that a draft is [inaudible] to the RSSAC caucus and as I look around, I think all of our RZERC members, except for maybe Kim, are you a member of the caucus?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I am a member but... the meetings are always scheduled against something else for me, unfortunately.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, in fact... all of our members may actually be members of the RSSAC caucus, so we will have insight into what RSSAC is saying also. Our organizations are so weird...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It will be an interesting race to see who can finish theirs first right?

RUSS MUNDY: So, if anyone... it's Russ for the record. Anyone was watching [inaudible] presentation in the DNSSEC workshop this morning, you will notice he was urging that this is too soon, too fast. So, we'll see if something of a nature of somewhat negative, in terms of proceeding on the plan because that's really the question that's been asked, do we resume the plan as it's currently looked at being resumed, and I don't know what's going to happen from the RSSAC side.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alright, so thanks. Let's close out that topic and the other one we need to discuss today is the request for feedback on the study, the root zone management evolution study. This is the one where there was a little work party, and a mailing list created, I'm trying to stay out of it as much as possible because I work for one of the parties that would be under study, so we had

some... the only input we had on this so far is from Howard. Howard sent a pretty nice message, which maybe Howard's message sort of becomes the basis of our response to OCTO. I forget who also is exactly on that group... yeah. So, as we said before, this one doesn't have a strict deadline but I do know that OCTO is eager to get a response from us, they have been asking me me if, you know, what's the status. Is this something you guys are willing and ready to talk about now, or do we take it back to the mailing list, what do you think?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As one of the not very active participants in our group, I would really like to hear if other RZERC members had look, thought, and had comments that they want us to look at, think about, as we try to put this thing together.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just to be clear, I don't think the other members have seen Howard's email yet, it's just the work party group has just... I'm on there as observer, as the chair, and it's the three of you. I mean, maybe I can read what... a little bit of what Howard wrote.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't even remember seeing the original document from OCTO about this, was this circulated to RZERC?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It was circulated, I actually checked earlier this week, it's on our list archive. If you go to the mailing list archive, it's linked there as a PDF. Did you remember the gist of the study, were you on the call?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I missed the call but I vaguely remember seeing an e-document but I didn't think that was the one. I remember seeing there was a PDF, but it wasn't very specific in the details of what the actual project was going to be, if I remember correctly. I was wondering if there was maybe a further document.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That document is what we have from OCTO at this point, it's... this is a... it's almost a... what we have is almost a proposal for a proposal. It's not an RFP at this point, but it's a proposal to have an RFP to hire someone to do this work. Right, yeah. So, I'll read a little bit of what Howard said on the work party list. So, he asked his constituents, the registries stakeholders group for input and didn't get any, so he says that this is, I guess his own personal views. He's in favor of some sort of risk analysis and

study that covers multiple facets of root zone management. If for no other reason than there has never been on before. But he has a number of point for improvement in the proposal. In general it's too vague, he would like to see more particulars around the risk analysis process, and the criteria used to determine the area's they have identified, such as accidental or malicious changes out of policy changes, communication errors, and so on. He notes that he feels the proposal is backwards, I guess it's written backwards. First they came up with recommendations, then they talk about the risk analysis on those recommendations. He says the study should perform a risk analysis on the current processes, determine threats, vulnerabilities, and then and only then suggest mitigations. Something we talked about, I remember on our last call is, there's a little phrase in this document that talks about costs, and things which would caused significant outlay of capital to fix, and Howard says recommendations should not be exclusive of those which would incur a significant cost. If it's a problem, it's a problem. Even if the answer is a redesign from scratch. Should the execution of the study include examination of code, configuration, ect... such to verify the interviews of key personnel. I guess that's a questions, not a statement. So, that was Howard's input. I think based on our last call, there was some rough consensus from the group that our response to this would be, you know, please provide more details, I don't think

we were ready to give any other feedback on what we have at this point. We did talk a lot about risk analysis last time, and what the nature of that might be. I don't know... this seems like a reasonable start to me, as a response that we can send back. I don't know if you guys have anything other specific to have.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it's a good point to start from, one of the things that I think would be useful to know because I am not aware if anything of that nature exists. Howard made the comment in there that there hasn't been a risk assessment for the overall system at all, and if such a thing has been done, I would think Kim would know about it. Has there ever been? I know the DNSSEC process gets audited, but except for that, I don't know if anything that's close to it, is there anything?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I am not aware of any assessment that pertains to like the ecosystem, like certainly we do our own risk analysis internally, but not something that was more generic or broad that would cover this scope.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think Verisign and ICANN had a little tabletop exercise a few years ago, we sort of covered some of this area a little bit, but that was... ever made... I don't remember.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, we're mandated annually I think, to conduct risk analysis exercises, but then NTI waived that requirement at their request most years, but several have been done over the years. I think the outcomes and remediations were confidential though. That being said, I'm certainly happy to go back into my archives and see if there's, you know, areas of study that might want to be discussed. I think, coming back to the real exercise, I really that the scope is quite vague deliberately, which is that this is an open invitation at the request of the CWG to study the whole eco-system, as deemed appropriate by those involved in the study. I don't think, I'd be looking for it to be overly prescriptive about you must look at various specific things.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ for the record again. One of the things that I wanted to just mention here since we had discussed a lot the risks aspects when we talked about it on a conference call, after... well at the last meeting in Puerto Rico, I think that's where we were, where the Adobe Connect problem came up and it was identified as a serious security thing and they shut it down. At the... I think it

was the DEG RRSAC RZERC board OCTON, this sort of cocktail informal thing. This occurred after this had happened, and I was engaged by a couple of board members in a discussion about the risk assessment kinds of things, and was I aware of any work that had ever been done for ICANN to even think about what are their mission critical system, and one board member in particular, the first word out of his mouth was this one... so, I don't know if this is something that's floating around, doing a risk assessment for this... you know... this system as a issue that ICANN will raise, or if there is maybe hints of that in here, but I just wanted... this is a closed meeting, yes it's recorded, but you know that's something that I'd rather folks not pass on. It is, at least in the minds of some board members.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Unfortunately, Howard is not able to join us yet to add to this discussion. I don't know... do we keep this on our little work party list for now, and try to have more discussion there and make progress on writing a response. Our next regular meeting in July... well the default date would be July 16th, which I would not be able to make that date, by the way. Well, I'm not going to be at the IATF, I am going to be on vacation. I guess we need to decide how aggressively we want to tackle this right now, or kick it down the road a little bit.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: A question I have for Dwayne is, how quickly does OCTO expect a response from this?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They didn't give us a deadline, but, you know, since our last meeting they've just informally asked if we're discussing it so...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Does the work party that's been looking at this thing within our little group, are they happy with what's produced so far, is it ready for circulation with the rest of the committee, or do they still want to work on it further?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think there's not much so far on the work party, it's very preliminary. It's not ready for circulation, I don't think. It needs more input and more words around it. It needs to be beefed up a little bit, I think, but it's a start.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Peter, let me just add that, now we have something to work from or chew on, I am confirmed that we are making progress and should have something, not necessarily the final version, because that would be pre-empting the input from the rest of

the committee, but something to present at the next code of call, assuming that is around the 16th of July.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If our committee's view remains that we want to ask for additional details or clarification from OCTO, I think that it's real important for the work party to get themselves together and at least have a draft of, for the whole committee to review. Not necessarily it's final, but at least to see that we're creating something that reflects the general sense of the committee. Especially, since we're asking for, tell us more about what you want us to do. Then we can decide when we want to finalize, but I say we should shoot for prior to our next meeting, like two weeks or three weeks after, whenever our call is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry Russ, I disagree. I think the immediate priority we need to sort out is the response for the ICANN board. I think we need to get that done and dusted as we've got a clear deadline for that which is August 10th, which means we have to have a meeting call to finalize that response in July and I think that has to be our number one priority and this OCTO study stuff should be punted until such time till we get that ICANN board response agreed and out the door. From a timing point of view, we've not got much window for that in July, and I think if we're going to have to

discuss that, we're going to have to discuss it in the week, probably of July 9th, because the week starting the 16th is the IATF meeting and I imagine quite a few of us are going to be fully committed with that. Aside from the fact that Dwayne is not available that week anyway, we've got large numbers of the people on this committee locked up at the IATF meeting too, so that's going to make it quite difficult to try and do anything that particular week, so I think we should maybe try to aim to do something with the ICANN board response in the week of July 9th, or the week of the 23rd at the outside, but that doesn't leave us much time to... dot the I's, cross the T's and get a response out to the board in time for that 10th deadline. I would like to try and see us do something in the week of July 9th on the ICANN board response and leave the OCTO stuff until that's well out the way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have no problems pleading capacity issues, especially with the OCTO study since it was delayed for 2 years because of various [inaudible] things. I just, perhaps our chair could convey informally to OCTO that yes, we are still working on it, but the board request, taking that as a higher priority we're tasking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: OK, sure yeah.

PETER COOK: Peter for the record. Just as a formality so to speak, I think we haven't formally adopted the question and we were still in the phase where we asked for more input to understand what the question actually is, so, the question of the study is something that is not an evolution that we see, or has been formally brought in front of the committee by one of its members, is that perception correct or shared by other members of the committee?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You're saying we haven't committed to answering the question yet because...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think the signal we've been sending to ourselves is that we don't really fully understand what the question actually is, so we see that somebody is planning a study to do an RFP and maybe we have just asked for more input. Do we want something to be added to this study, and we've discussed the constraints for the recommendations last time, but those constraints, obviously, wouldn't bind us but the outside entity that is taking over the responsibility for the study, so we shouldn't be constrained by that, but on the other hand, what is coming out of the study is

probably initiating some change revolutionary, or evolutionary, and at that point we, might have to be involved anyway so I consider this as a polite hint that this is going to happen, and we of course should respond in a way, but echoing Jim, probably not the top priority and some back channel to OCTO would be helpful. Just making sure, I am not sure whether we do have deadlines for things that we adopt but, this is not really a formal question to us. So, we can focus on the KSK thing.

JIM REED:

One other point Peter is, we've got this little working party that's looking at the OCTO document, if there are questions for clarification, maybe the working party could be the ones that talk to OCTO first about that and then come back with something more [inaudible] for the rest of the committee to look at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So, Peter I want to follow up with what you said, I guess. I feel like we have been formally asked for our input on this study. I don't know if we have formally respond said that we would respond, you know, committed to making a thoughtful response, maybe we need to do that. But, I do believe that we have been... in OCTO's eyes, we have been asked to provide input and we should. So, the discussion of priorities of work and

deadlines... I guess I am wondering, if in your mind... are we prioritizing the simple question of going to them and saying please provide more information, or are we prioritizing the harder part of making the official response to this study?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: From my perspective it's the latter, the informal thing should happen as they go and can happen this week. The members of the working party present in the room, were present in the [inaudible] probably take care of that, like the two of us, Russ and myself.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, can I make a proposal that, this working party come up with a initial response to OCTO, and present that to RZERC at its next call, and shortly after RZERCs next call, we can deliver that to OCTO. The request for additional information, and then after that we can take on the larger work of a more thoughtful response, does that sound OK. I don't think our first response to them for more information needs to be too formalized, or you know, well worded. I think Howard's got a good start, maybe iterate on that a couple of times and we can say, please give us more information. I guess I would hate to be in the position where we took 2 to 3 months to respond to them saying, please tell us more. That seems very inefficient to me, so... I think that

wraps up that topic, and we have on the agenda, any other business and one of those will be the discussion of the next meeting date. Is there any other business that people would like to bring up before we do that? OK. So, the default date for the next RZERC regular meeting would be July 16th, I heard a proposal from Jim for the week before July 9th, which is certainly fine with me, that gets us done before IATF, I don't know if people have a preference for getting RZERC out of the way before IATF or after IATF, I can do either. I think in terms of our deliverables on it, it doesn't matter a lot. But, does the 9th look reasonable to people? Only two weeks away, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, we're talking about the 9th and not the week of the 9th? I can do the 9th, but I can't do the rest of the week, so 9th would be fine.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: July 9th is two weeks from today, yeah. Is that enough time to iterate on these, or would you rather have a full month?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'd rather have a full month, if people are available.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm inclined to agree, so that would put us at July 23rd, a week after IATF, you're not good that day?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry Dwayne, I can't do the 23rd or the 24th.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well let's go to our old friend Doodle then and find a date after IATF that will work. OK.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let's start like the 25th of July to accommodate Jim, I think start with that and if we don't get a big group for the 25th after then maybe we'll look earlier, but let's start with the 25th.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In all fairness then we should probably still start at the 23rd and see how many people will join. We won't find a date where everybody will join. Sorry Jim, but...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: OK, I think that wraps us up for today, so thank you everyone for the good discussion and we'll see you in a month.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you everyone, this meeting has been adjourned.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is a regular RZERC meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]