DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Hello and welcome all to the RZERC Charter Review Teleconference #1 held on Tuesday, the 15th of March 2022 at 19:00 UTC. Roll call for this meeting will be taken through Zoom. Tim, would you like to go through the agenda review?

TIM APRIL: Sure. I'm trying to get the right window up. Ah, there we go. I hadn't seen the agenda before this. I didn't get a chance to look it over. The first part is just trying to pick when we're going to meet.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah, I wanted to solidify a regular meeting cadence for everyone based on the Doodle poll results.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I'm trying to pull that up now. These are the four times that work the best?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. The two times that work the best for everybody were Mondays and Tuesdays at 20:00 UTC. And then I'm recommending meeting on an every other week schedule. I know IETF is next week, so thinking about do we want to start on the last week of March or the first week of April for our next regular session?

TIM APRIL: Any of those works for me, so I'll defer to anyone else that has strong opinions about timing.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't have strong opinions. But sometimes Mondays or holidays, it seems like it might be disruptive. I don't know.

TIM APRIL: I was just about to throw out the idea of the last option there, Tuesdays starting April 5.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. It works for me.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. If there are no objections or comments, I will get that on the books and put out regular calendar invitations for the next couple of months.

All right. So for discussion items today, I kind of wanted to walk through a general review work plan based off of the process paper that we described. I added a few more things and to make sure that we're all on the same page of how we're going to proceed with the charter review. And then from there, moving on to finalizing the discussion around the topic scoping exercise. Apologies if there's any noise in the background. I've got some construction going on in my neighborhood right now.

So next we'll finalize the discussion around the topic scoping exercise, I think there's four more topics that RZERC has to discuss, and then time permitting, looking at establishing a consensus model for the charter review. One thing we included in the process paper was that the RZERC would determine a consensus model for the charter review at the beginning of the process, and then document that in any reports. So for that discussion, I've included an excerpt from the ICANN consensus playbook which has the different definitions of consensus across the ICANN community.

So first, I can just kind of walk through this general review plan. For conducting the review, the step in the process paper just stated, "Conduct a review of the RZERC charter in accordance with the elements identified above that are considered to be within the scope of the review." My vision of how this is going to take place is we'll finalize the topic scoping exercise initiated in 2021 as sort of a preliminary to the charter review. From there, we'll see what topics that could possibly prompt any revisions to the charter, have a discussion around that. Next we'll determine the consensus model for the charter review, and then review the RZERC charter by each section.

I've put the charter in a Google Doc, if you saw the background documents I sent out last week, and we can kind of go through section by section and see if there's anything that's unclear, anything that the committee proposes needs changing or elaboration, and just seeing what comes from that discussion. What this looks like. These are the four questions, kind of elements that we determined were in scope for the RZERC charter review. So we'll review each section according to

these four questions. And then from there, we'll produce an initial out report on the outcome of the repeat review.

When we get close to formalizing consensus on the initial report, I'll start working with Tim on initiating Phase 3 and looking what the feedback sessions, what each of the appointing organizations could look like, begin scheduling with all of the different supporting staff behind the scenes to make that happen. Depending on timing, these sessions could possibly take place during ICANN74, which is scheduled to take place in June. But this all depends on how long the actual review and preparation of the initial report takes place.

From there, we'll aim to incorporate any feedback from those few sessions, update the initial report, and then get it ready for public comment. We talked about having that public comment open shortly before the next ICANN meeting so the RZERC could host a public session and get feedback from the general community. Once we've gone through the public comment, incorporated all feedback from public comment, we will prepare the final report that includes any proposed changes to the RZERC charter, and send that to the ICANN Board Technical Committee.

Are there any questions on the work plan? Any suggested changes? Or does this sound like what people had in mind for this process? Yes, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Danielle. Can you scroll back down a little bit? It sounds like the Phase 3 consists of sort of two things. One is getting feedback from the

appointing organizations, and then also doing the public comment. Those would happen at the same time, I guess, in parallel, not sequentially?

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry. No. I see these happening sequentially. We'll do the feedback on the appointing organizations for, first, incorporate that in the initial report.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, okay.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: If that's confusing, we can separate Phase 3 into two separate phases.

DUANE WESSELS: Maybe. But I think it was my mistake because I think my font was too small and I read where it says ICANN75, I read that as 74. I thought those are the same meeting, but I see now that they're clearly different. Thanks.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Danielle. There's one thing I'm wondering whether that could be an addition to the charter or whether it would belong to a

completely different review, which is the outside perception or the outside—well, recognition is the wrong word, maybe perception that is of RZERC. We're tasked to connect and coordinate community a bit and make sure that everybody's heard, and so on and so forth. My impression is that outside a little group, very few people realize that RZERC is there and what it is there for. Maybe that's okay, but maybe that's an aspect that we might want to have, but it could also be part of an effectiveness review, which I don't think is scheduled in the first place. Just raising it here because it's the opportunity.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Duane, do you have a response for that?

DUANE WESSELS: I do. I was going to support that. I like that idea quite a bit because I think even among people that are aware of what RZERC is, they have different impressions of what its role is.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So do we want to incorporate that kind of into the Phase 1 discussions? That could be something we discussed and then either proposed an effectiveness review take place. Basically, suggest or recommend to the Board that that's a finding from the charter review, that something like that is lacking. I think we can incorporate that into the Phase 1 discussions, if that's what you all are requesting. Does that sound okay?

EN

DANIEL MIGAULT:	Is the intention to add a fifth element saying how RZERC position itself regarding other Advisory Committees?
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	I think it could be something that naturally comes up in discussion of the first element, actually. Does the charter enable the RZERC to fulfill its role and responsibilities as envisioned? That sounds sort of like a follow-on from that topic and something that comes up in the conduction of the review. Yes, Peter?
PETER KOCH:	Thanks. If I may add to that. It is maybe not the charter. Maybe we don't constrain that to the charter itself but to the way the committee is chartered, not being a bylaws committee, and therefore, not being on the radar too often. Again, this might be a feature, not necessarily a bug, but it's something to evaluate, I believe.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	Okay. I'm jotting all of these down for our Phase 1 discussions, and I think that these are things that we can review when we get to the actual discussion portion. Does that satisfy your question, Peter?
PETER KOCH:	Yeah, fine with me. Thank you.
DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:	All right. Any other questions? Daniel, is your question answered?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm not sure. To me, the concern I sort of have is to have is to clarify the cut between RZERC and maybe on other AC/SO.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Sorry. Can you repeat the question?

DANIEL MIGAULT: To me, what I wanted to achieve during this charter review is to clarify in some ways the scope of RZERC and the position of RZERC regarding the other AC/SO when needed, of course. But I have the impression this is also in the sense of what Peter was asking, but I'm not sure.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Okay. I've noted in my notes and it's something I'll keep, I'll have as discussion points of reference. I think that that's something that will kind of come up in the second criteria. Are there any aspects that are ambiguous that require amendment? Maybe how does the scope of RZERC specifically relate to other SOs and ACs? Maybe there are things that have been left ambiguous in how the scope of the RZERC is laid out in the charter, and that's something that the committee can discuss. How does that sound?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, sure. For me, it's fine.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. So it sounds like the work plan is about what we expected. I've noted a few things that we definitely want to talk about when we get to the meat of these charter review discussions. But it looks like the work plan is great. I'm working with ICANN IT to kind of get a place, maybe a wiki space where we can keep some of these documents for the charter review so that these will be accessible to everyone outside of a link in an e-mail. Okay. Next, I will turn it over to Tim and share the topic scoping exercises for the remaining topics to discuss.

TIM APRIL: Thank you, Danielle. So I think we've gone through, like Danielle said, I think we have four topics left that we had been discussing in the scope, out of scope discussion from the previous RZERC meetings. Those are even the ones that I have written down. Perfect.

So before we were going through and trying to see if anyone had strong opinions to argue in one direction or the other, and then following that discussion, have everyone review their responses in the Google form to try and update the results here and see if it becomes more in scope or out of scope for the charter review. So like we did before, I would propose going topic by topic and having a short discussion to see if we can come to some rough consensus about if it's in or out of scope for the new charter. Do you have the link to the form, Danielle? I'm trying to find it.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I'll get that in one second.

TIM APRIL: While we're waiting on that, we can start with row number 20. Design a distribution between RZM and RSO. It looks like we were pretty much evenly split between in and out. Anyone have a strong opinion either way? Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Hi. Look, I'm kind of sitting here going, "If not us, then who?" That's some of these questions around the many folks sitting inside the ecosystem of the root zone. In essence, if you're looking at the architecture of the system, which is in theory, where RZERC tries to concentrate, then that's why I thought that this particular topic was in scope simply because, I suppose, in some ways, nobody else seemed responsible to be looking at that question in terms of the architecture of that distribution of responsibilities. I can understand this is a difficult issue, particularly with the Governance Working Group also active and, at this point, trying to figure out what it's doing. So it's not clear, but my motivation was, "If not RZERC, then who?" and I couldn't find a who. So that's why I had marked it as in scope. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Any other? I'm looking at my responses right now. I think I had the same thinking as you, Geoff. It possibly means that someone can take a look at it and I couldn't find any other SO/AC that would.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, just to clarify, are we talking about distribution between RZM and RSOs?

TIM APRIL: Yeah.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't remember what I exactly answered so I might contradict my previous answer, but I don't think I would have seen RZERC fairly in that. I think RZERC to me stops at the RZM. I would see this interconnection more related to RSSAC.

TIM APRIL: Duane has his hand up next.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Tim. I'm pretty sure that I put this. I was one of the out of scope votes on this. I agree with Daniel that RZERC's sort of scope of influence stops at the RZM, and just because there's nobody to look at a certain thing doesn't necessarily mean that it should become RZERC's thing to look at. Also, I kind of go back to what I consider sort of the genesis of RZERC was the fact that the Department of Commerce exited its role, and I don't think that that's something that the Department of Commerce would have had particularly strong opinions about back in the day. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Daniel and Duane, for those additional comments. Look, I kind of see this as almost like the root server space is this almost like a Venn diagram where a number of players sit in, RSSAC, etc., fence off various parts of this space, like a Venn diagram with sets, sometimes they intersect, sometimes they don't. But in some ways, when you take the union of all those individual charters and you look at the roles required for the entire space, who fills the gaps is kind of my question. One way of looking at this topic scoping exercise was to kind of go, "Well, we'll do what everyone else did, define a space that is narrowly scoped to a particular role, and we don't take responsibility for stuff that's outside our defined role. And if no one does it, that's not our problem."

The other way of looking at it, which is the way I was more sympathetic to when I filled out this particular survey, was taking the charter almost at face value around the architecture of the root system and the mechanisms for distribution of the root zone and saying, "Well, those mechanisms for distribution sit within the scope defined by the charter. And if no one else is doing it, we should." That was why I had kind of read the charter and those particular sentences—where is it? Scope of responsibilities? Section 2, purpose, quite literally. I'm not going to die on a hill here, hopefully. I don't feel personally invested. But I would like to explain, I think, why I had came down to in scope. Then listening to Duane and Daniel, I'm still not convinced that it shouldn't be insofar as I can't see anyone else doing it. That's the kind of, I think, guiding motivation in my head. I would hate to see us kind of leave a space on

the floor or go, "It's just not our problem. We're not going to do anything about it either." I don't think that's the right way of attacking this. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Thanks, Geoff. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks. Like Daniel, I'm not really sure which box I checked in the survey. But I looked into the charter and I think that's what Geoff already mentioned. The charter explicitly says that the mechanisms used for distribution of the DNS root zone can be understood to be in our charter.

I also have lots of sympathy for the argument that if not us, who else is doing it? Not necessarily because RZERC should be the kitchen thing, but this would revive a discussion that we had in our very early exercise on the scoping a couple of years ago that if all of these committees that deal with aspects of the root, the root service and everything that is SSAC, RSSAC, and us, and then PDI for the operational part, there should be nothing that falls between the cracks. So everything should be assigned to one of these entities, and that's another task that needs to be addressed jointly. But in this particular case, I think the charter suggests that it might be in scope, not necessarily with all the operational nitty-gritty but the design of the distribution, which is obviously a more abstract layer and then more abstract way of looking at it. Thanks.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. Oh, Tim.

TIM APRIL: No, go ahead. I'll go after you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Please go ahead.

TIM APRIL: Okay. I was just going to basically say much of what Peter just said. Having read the purpose section of the document, that's why I selected in the scope, I questioned if we just have a discussion with the RSSAC, whether we decide collaboratively with them where this [inaudible] lies, and which side of it we're on. Like Geoff said, I won't die on the hill if it's in or out of scope, but someone should take ownership of it in some way. I think Howard have his hand up next.

HOWARD ELAND: Thanks, Tim. So I just reviewed my responses, and I too had checked in favor of this. Probably I'm assuming it was also after that same review of the section. But now I'm a little bit concerned that we are drawing some circular conclusions here because we're in the process of doing a charter review, and so we look to see should this be in scope? And we say, "Well, it may or may not be part of the charter." But that's the reason we're doing the review, right? I think I need to tune at least my

response to be more about do I envision it being in within the scope of the charter or not? Is it in the letter of the law of the charter as it stands today? So I'm not sure. I think my delegation point is consistent with what Daniel was saying, it's RZM in back, not RSO forward. But I also admit that I need to change my thinking as to why I'm selecting the ones I am based on how I envision the charter, not how it is today. Over.

TIM APRIL: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Questioning RZERC regarding RZM and RSO, so we might have a debate because we have RSSAC at that point. But if we do consider, let's suppose, other means to distribute the zone, and I'm thinking, for example, the hyperlocal architecture somehow. In that case, RSSAC is not or maybe not be responsible for that. It might not be in scope of RSSAC. So, there is a question. So, if RZERC is limited to the root zone file, we're not editing a root zone file for that on file not to be published. So, we need an entity that is responsible or that should address and ensure that the addition of the root zone file is properly distributed among one or multiple systems. I have the impression at that point that isn't it simply the IANA which is responsible for that?

TIM APRIL: As Peter was talking, I went and looked at my notes about this section and realized that I checked the RSSAC charter. As I was trying to distance myself from the current RZERC charter and went to read the

RSSAC charter and it doesn't specifically discuss distribution, which is why I had marked it in scope. I do think someone should own it, it's just a matter of who, and I don't feel like it needs to be us. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry. I was just going to quickly respond to Daniel. His point about hyperlocal root, I think, is covered by a separate question in this topic survey, which I guess must be less contentious because it's not up for discussion today, or we already covered it. I don't remember.

TIM APRIL: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Just in response to the question about IANA's role on this specific item, I don't think we have a formal role. We're quite clearly on the production side of the root zone and the distribution side is the responsibility of the root zone maintainer. The root zone maintainer does its role under the auspices of the Root Zone Maintainer Agreement, a contract between ICANN and Verisign. Basically, IANA doesn't have a role here. But I don't think that that changes necessarily the conclusion of here, because the RZM is still under the purview of the ICANN Board and RZERC provides advice to the ICANN Board. That's not to say whether or not on this item there is a role for RZERC or not. But I think from the IANA function's perspective, there's no role. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: There have been a few points here. But I suppose the first one I thought, which was most troubling for me was actually Howard's comment. I'm sorry, Howard. It's kind of hard to look at an instantiation of a set of topics against a known charter. It's incredibly hard against a future charter that we don't quite understand yet. Because the process, the thoughts, the justification of putting something in and out of scope of the charter that doesn't exist yet is, I think, bedeviled as a group task. It's just almost impossible, because of the speculative nature. So I must admit, I aimed more in filling out the survey and my thinking in the solid ground of, what did the charter say at the moment and basing it on that?

I find it difficult for this group to say to RSSAC or anyone else, "That's your job," when they've got their own charter and their own charter processes. And we can't just hurl topics around so informally. It just isn't possible in this structure where particular groups are clearly charted and scoped, and to try and reassign roles and responsibilities is, I think, a massively difficult problem inside a space that is populated by so many players. So my erring is on the side of the existing charter, which in my understanding has been taken into account by the other groups as they had formed their charters. For us to say, "Well, okay, the charter might say mechanisms used in the distribution of the root zone," but we're not going to do that. It's difficult for everyone else, too.

So for those reasons, I'm still not swayed that this is out of scope. I think the current charter places it in scope by simply that reference there. And in some ways, casting that off for whatever reason, to my view, would be not responsible unless there was a clear understanding that it was a handover and not a discard. The mechanisms for simultaneously revising a number of charters of a number of groups might well be beyond our hand's capabilities. I really don't know. But it isn't a difficult question. My view is still work with what I have in doing the topic scoping, which is the existing charter as being a concrete specification, that not only RZERC but all the other players are counting on. If we're going to substantially alter some of those responsibilities, I don't think it can be done unilaterally, unfortunately. I'm still not swayed to change what I said is, I suppose, where I'm leading to on the basis of this discussion. I respect the points that folks have made, but I think it would be irresponsible in some ways of us to leave this as a dangling role that we don't think is in our scope but no one else's got it in theirs either. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Howard?

GEOFF HUSTON: Howard has his hand up there, Tim.

TIM APRIL: I think I was muted.

HOWARD ELAND: Thank you. Geoff, first of all, sorry, what I was trying to allude to without saying was that I was a little bit concerned that we are putting cart before a horse here with some of these scoping exercises that do insofar as should we not be saying, "Based on a review of the charter, this is how the charter should look." And then based on how the charter should look, then we further the scoping exercise. But I also understand that deciding how the charter should look can be difficult if you don't know where you're trying to start from. I realized we have a circular reference there that's really hard to break. I too, I'm not trying to actually steer one way or the other for inclusion or not on this particular item. I'm just saying I need to potentially reassess the way I was looking at it. Over.

TIM APRIL: I'm putting my hand up again. That trend of discussion makes me wonder if it would make sense to, in the charter revision, outline a couple of things that we think should move out of scope, but to basically own it until someone else picks it up and just say these are the things we're handling until a better home is found or taken over or something like that. That way, we can get away from having to do the dual charter revision at the same time. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I have a lot of sympathy for that view. If I look at the composition of RZERC, it is almost like a peak body of other bodies. All the stakeholders get to nominate an individual to serve in this group. In so many ways, we are intended to be color representatives, I suppose, in some ways,

and we bring the interests of the body that has nominated us here, which makes some of these topics difficult for this group to do on their own. That's true. Flagging that this thing is in our charter but maybe that's not the best place for it but we'll leave it in until we understand it's handed over properly to one of the other bodies that is willing to take this on might be a very, very good way of doing this. Like I said, I just don't like the idea of going, "Well, we have unilaterally changed our charter." "Oops, sorry. Some things are on the floor. We hope someone picks them up." I think it would be much better to structure what we believe our tasks and roles that might well be in our current scope, and I think this one is in terms of the reading of the current charter but is perhaps best handled elsewhere as a two-step process. Flag it as you suggest, and then, if you will, see from the other groups where that someone else is willing to take that role on inside their charter and scope. I agree with what you propose there, Tim. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: This is also something we can flag as topics of conversation for those feedback sessions with those appointing organizations, if we come up with a certain list of topics you want to discuss with them.

TIM APRIL: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I kind of agree with Geoff's proposal. I think by redefining the charter, it's nice if you can narrow the scope or define more precisely what we

really think RZERC should be dedicated on. Rather than adding things that we don't think is being fulfilled by other entities, we should rather raise the flag as he mentioned and say, "Well, maybe there is another home more appropriate to that for this aspect." We can hold them in RZERC until we decide otherwise. And instead of have having the IANA—well, I was suggesting the IANA to have this kind of oversight role. It might be the Board deciding, "This aspect that has been raised by this charter review. It might be better addressed by, let's say, SSAC or another AC." So I like the proposal by Geoff. I was about to suggest the same, actually.

TIM APRIL: Any other discussion on this topic? I think the quick summary is—my understanding of it, the way this discussion went, was leave it in scope but mark it as something that should probably move out of scope and try and incorporate that into the review and discussions with the different organizations. Does that match? Yes, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Tim. I think that makes sense. I just wanted to add that my impression is that whenever there is a competition, as in competing about formal competence, between RZERC and SSAC or RSSAC, then maybe we have viewing of things from not completely the right angle, given that SSAC and RSSAC are supposed to work on more technical details. RZERC is supposed to make sure that all the relevant stakeholders have been heard or have contributed. So that whole set of issues that might be in scope can likely still have an overlap but the

different committees would have to look at different things. But again, that's something to discuss during the first phase maybe.

TIM APRIL: Anything else for topic 19? Okay. My guess is we'll have enough time to quickly discuss topic 22, how many RSOs. Let's open it up for anyone that has a comment. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: There is this kind of almost unstated thing that's hovering in the background here that the current root service system is anycast DNS as we know and love it and the root zone is the answer of the queries for discovery, blah, blah, blah, and local host comes along. And all of a sudden, what we thought about the architecture of the root system and every RSO is a clone of every other RSO, and so on and so forth, actually gets thrown in the air. The topic of how many RSOs is conflated in my mind with the topic of whether each RSO is an exact clone of every other RSO, or whether as the root service distribution function evolves into a number of ways of doing it, whether every RSO isn't necessarily a clone of every other. And in working through that system, how does the evolution of the root zone actually operate and who's looking out for that?

So I had conflated that large sentence into how many RSOs and said, "Yeah, that's in scope." And it's not another letter in the current anycast distribution scheme per se. To my mind, it's a discussion over to one side about, "Well, what if all the letters aren't clones of all the other letters? What if it's a different kind of function? What if we had some

other mechanism of caching distribution of that information that is entirely separate to the current query response mechanisms we use? How would, architecturally, that process be overseen? How do we look at that?" And that was where I thought this seemed to be inside the evolution of the root zone quite squarely.

So maybe I'm just conflating the question. And if it was a much more mundane question about we're up to K, L, M, N, or O, or going through the alphabet, how many more can we add? I'm not sure that's an evolutionary question, to tell you the truth. But I had read this question at a much deeper level around the whole approach of many clones of one service. And if that's the case, the real question is, should the RSOs all do the same thing? What's the distribution then? How many RSOs ties into that? That was why I found that in scope. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I guess I took this exactly opposite from what Geoff just described. I took it as the mundane, Geoff, diversity and action here, I guess. To me, the question of how many RSOs, maybe even the mundane version or the deeper version, I think I would put as out of scope for RZERC. I think that this is really going to lie with the new governance once that gets figured out. So at this point, you could probably argue there's a gap, because that governance structure doesn't exist yet. But I think it's clearly heading in that direction where it will be within their purview. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: I think I was in the same boat as Duane in my reading of the—putting the conversation about whether or not it should be in scope, whether or not we should keep the current purpose statement from the charter now, where right now it ends at the distribution system. And that made sense to me if I didn't think that it mattered to us how many RSOs there were, especially with hyperlocal root coming online. I'd seen the division being drawn at once the zone is distributed or available for distribution, and I figured that was where RZERC's boundary ended and RSSAC or whoever else began. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think I agree with Duane and Tim on that. Of course, it has an impact on the root zone, because if we have 26, we will have 26 address or 52. I would not consider that enough to be in scope of RZERC.

TIM APRIL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: There's an interesting conflation there, Tim. The local root actually brings this forward. Local root is, at this point, I suppose informally handled. As long as a handful of resolvers run local root, the informal arrangements appear to work just fine, although the evidence is apocryphal. If every single recursive resolver ran local root and distribution systems would likely, at this point, not scale and they would fail, whose responsibility is that? How do we understand the scaling

properties of this? And it certainly is an evolutionary issue. Do we just need more are RSOs doing local root AXFR serving? Is this the way we're going to scale? Or is there a different problem going on? Now, those are, to my mind, architectural questions around the evolution of the root, and if this committee is expected to review these proposed architectural changes to the contents of the root zone and its distribution review—not proposed, review—then to my mind, that's it squarely inside this topic. If it's to review adding another letter to the existing anycast DNS query response name set, I agree that's happening the RSS GWG is going to spend a lot of time and effort on is going to go elsewhere. I would be less concerned if we simply said it's not in scope. A tight reading of the charter would actually say it was never in scope. But a looser reading that kind of goes if we think about local root and we think about where that's heading, then this is an architectural change to the content of the root zone, including its distribution. And that puts us squarely in scope again. It really depends on how you want to read that question. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: So maybe to possibly revise this a little bit. One of the topic areas, which I'm starting to think may be carved out, we'll hold this until someone else picks it up is the distribution mechanisms to the root zone. So once the RZM finishes with it, how does it get to the root server operators and anyone else running local root? I think the distribution scaling problem may bucket into topic 19. So put those two together and wrap that up. Someone should really do this. We don't think we're the right group for this but we'll do it until someone picks it up and possibly nudge the RSS GWG. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Tim. I'm absolutely with Geoff here. When it comes to this architectural issue, that's definitely in scope. Not only is it in scope for the review purpose, I also think that the committee should start to address this because there's likely no plan that we can review because of this whole distributed not really existing overall responsibility for this. So that is something that we need to put on our agenda on top of acknowledging that it is in scope of the charter.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'd like to follow on here, Tim. Because I think there is a massive difference between devise and review. At no point, I think, is this committee ever expected to devise, develop, invent, whatever changes to the root zone. It's not its job. But it's certainly meant to look at the work of others in the context of the root zone review proposed architectural changes. If our job is to orchestrate that review and commentary, to use the bodies which we represent here and use their efforts and use this as a synthesizing body to create reviews as a single review, this is what we feel collectively on these proposed changes, this is our consideration of the architecture at scaling properties, etc., this is what we feel is good, bad, risky, whatever, I think that's certainly an essential role of us. This issue of the architecture of distribution, which then comes down into the subtopics of the interaction between the RZMs and the RSOs, how many RSOs in terms of should they all clone each other? Should they have particular roles? Is there a diversity of doing this? How should that be accommodated in the system? I think we have a role in reviewing proposals along those lines. I definitely

don't think we should be inventing them. But we should be reviewing them.

I think our review is actually important—important to inform others, including the Board of ICANN—as to the risks and wisdom of going down various paths. Therefore, I think that, as Peter Koch has just said in comments, there's no proposing solutions here. But there is certainly looking at the work of others, placing it into context, and adding a commentary on our view of, if you will, prospects of such changes and the wisdom or otherwise of actually doing them. Thank you.

TIM APRIL: Any other comments? Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Tim. I think what Geoff mentioned is a very important point. The committee name is Evolution Review Committee. So in other words, the committee is not proposing solutions, it's merely reviewing proposals. So in that regard, I think that's useful to capture whether in the charter review or in the effectiveness review, that the committee's meant to be more reactive majors. Now, going out to look for different solutions to change, but really to provide a review if there's proposal come about.

Second is where I heard carefully for the conversation is the architectural nature. I think that there needs to be—also emphasize a bit in the review process. There's day-to-day operations, there's incremental changes. Those do not come to the purview of RZERC. But

it's really these architectures that major changes that are within RZERC's review purview. Thanks.

TIM APRIL: Any other comments? Noting that we have 30 seconds left. Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands. That's the standard thing of if people can go back and review their answers for the two topics discussed today. At the next call, I think we're probably going to discuss 26 and 42. Then hopefully try and migrate down towards the Phase 1 actions for the review. Any final things for today? All right. Thank you all and talk to you in a few weeks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]