RZERC Charter Review Teleconference #02

Tuesday, 19 April 2022 | 20:00-21:00 UTC

Attendance

Members: Duane Wessels, Geoff Huston, Kim Davies, Tim April, Howard Eland, Kaveh Ranjbar, Peter Koch, Carlos Martinez, Daniel Migault

Staff: Danielle Rutherford, Steve Sheng

Agenda

1. Agenda Review
2. Discussion Items
   a. Topic Scoping Exercise Results - Final Topics
      ■ **MTU, MSS:** Configuration of root servers with respect to MTU, MSS, fragmentation, and truncation
      ■ **Software to Manage RZ:** Upgrades to the software used to manage the root zone and root zone workflow
   b. Charter Review Consensus Model
      ■ [Consensus Definition Across ICANN](#)
   c. [RZERC Charter](#)
3. AOB

Action Items

● RZERC Members to check in with appointing organization on opinions for the level of consensus required for potential charter revisions

Considerations

● What level of consensus is appropriate for potential edits to the RZERC Charter?

Resources

● RZERC Charter Review [Work Plan](#)
● [Consensus Definition Across ICANN](#)

Records

● Zoom replay and auto transcript:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/tJ4UewOFNOsYQd5q5Yrrj8jdSpcXZNWE3e208idP4ebLS
YdhKP9cunNvnhcDsM_tY-RecjmOYB2RM6g0.VWQq3z_Joj809KJ7

- Auto recording only:
  https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/2_8pKTi2Y61r_zO4VA6mE3uVfFTM8p6MfhzEwB9-bgKm4rVkSfVABY6DIbUX6sVjkSSgg0AB-GmSqaMo.X3zGLFL5zNIId8SD
- Transcript:
  https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/202704253/RZERC-Charter-Review-19apr22-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1656379066000&api=v2

Readout

Topic Scoping Review Exercise Results

Tim April led a discussion on the topic scoping exercise results first shared in the RZERC's 19 October 2021 meeting.

MTU, MSS: Configuration of root servers with respect to MTU, MSS, fragmentation, and truncation. Duane Wessels stated he thought this topic is out of scope for RZERC as it is largely an operational detail, and an example of something where diversity can be beneficial. Peter Koch agreed to the extent that yes, merely operational, this topic is out of scope for RZERC. Peter Koch added that this topic in general might have bigger consequences and therefore could be in scope. Geoff Huston stated he thought this topic was in scope for RZERC. Tim April stated that he thought the topic was out of scope for RZERC, and it was not necessarily up to RZERC to comment on how the root server operators define their network and how they serve the content. Howard Eland agreed with Geoff Huston that truncating and shifting protocols in order to facilitate the use of critical records does relate to the stability of the root zone and is in the scope for RZERC under the scope of responsibilities section of the charter in the third paragraph.

Software to Manage Root Zone: Upgrades to the software used to manage the root zone and root zone workflow. Kim Davies stated that this is out of scope for RZERC because it is too broadly scoped for the remit of RZERC. Kim Davies added if there is a boundary stated that limits evaluating software as it pertains to architectural changes that may be in scope for RZERC to consider. Geoff Huston agreed with Kim Davies. Peter Koch stated he might have indicated it was in scope for RZERC but noted that it is a very broad topic and leaves much room for interpretation. Tim April stated he originally marked this topic as in scope and was considering the ZONEMD change and the RZERC's comments on that in RZERC003. Tim April added that commenting on managing the software operations is out of scope for the RZERC. Kim Davies stated there is a role for RZERC to play for certain types of changes that are more fundamental in nature and significantly alter the architecture. It's appropriate for the RZERC to review those kinds of changes, and it will be important to come up with a common definition of the scope of that architecture. Duane Wessels stated he did not see any need for changes to the RZERC charter based on this discussion as in practice, the RZERC would consider more specific situations as they are brought to the committee.

Charter Review Consensus Model

Danielle Rutherford stated that in the RZERC Charter Review Process Paper the RZERC stated it would come up with a consensus model for the review. Danielle Rutherford reviewed the consensus definitions across ICANN document.

Everyone agreed it was important to strive for full, or unanimous, consensus for all potential charter revisions. RZERC members discussed the various strengths and weaknesses of the levels of consensus required for potential charter revisions when full consensus may not be possible.

Members in favor of rough consensus stated that requiring full consensus gives everyone on the committee the power of veto, which may be an excessive amount of influence over the RZERC charter. Members that supported a rough consensus model stated it was important to include any dissenting opinions within the charter review report.

Members in favor of requiring full consensus for any potential charter revisions stated that the potential changes to the RZERC charter can be so significant that full consensus is really important to justify the revision. One of the concerns with a rough consensus model is how would the committee respond to a situation in which a revision was made that affected one of the appointing organizations of the RZERC, and the only dissenting member is the one appointed by the affected organization. Another concern is that while dissent may be documented in a report of the charter review, that dissent would not be present in the future charter and the difference of opinion would be lost.

The RZERC did not come to an agreement on the charter review consensus model. Many members stated they would need to check in with their appointing organizations before proceeding with this conversation.