26th rssac meeting - 05nov2006
San Diego, prior to IETF67

        Minutes from George Michaelson,
                    Rob Austein,
                    Suzanne Woolf,
                    and Bill Manning

Agenda:

icann report
signed arpa
principles document
ssac
ipv6 transport glue
IDN process/impact
anycast status
measurement simulation activities
rssac admin
AOB
next meeting in Prague 18mar2007 — details sent to the list

) icann report - will be sent to list due to illness on the part of our liaison

) Readiness for signed .ARPA.

        IANA-GM requested input from individual root operators. 11 of 12
responded. The IANA-GM understands that the IAB wants the zones it is
administrative contact for and IANA is the technical contact for signed by the
end of the year. Only one server operator has been non-responsive. Of the ones
that have responded, some said "yes we'll be ready to serve signed .ARPA by end
of year", some waffled, some qualified, but most said "will be ready to serve
by end of year". One is willing but not on the same IP address as at present.
The IANA-GM provided no detailed list.

        Verisign requires explicit statement from DoC to NOT run .arpa, The DoC
hasn't yet provided sufficient data to initiate the transition. Verisign
appears to be waiting on DOC for authorization to make the change to IANA from
versisign. Legal teams are working on this.

        the IANA-GM has interpreted an IAB statement
<http://www.iab.org/documents/correspondence/2006-05-15-IAB-request-to-IANA-to-
sign-DNSSEC-zones.html> as authorization to apply DNSSEC to IANA and IANA-run
subdomains of ARPA, not in-addr, but IRIS, URI, and IP6 delegations under ARPA.

        the IANA-GM provided this clarification: "At the request of the IAB, IANA
has accepted the responsibility to sign all the zones under .ARPA for which it

is the registrant. This includes in-addr.arpa. However, as IANA is not currently the technical administrator of in-addr.arpa, we're deferring signing that pending a transition from ARIN."

the question was raised, if not all operators are ready by the IANA preferred date, will the IANA still release the zone publicly? The IANA-GM replied, yes.

an additional question was raised regarding the authority for this proposed change, is it being done under the existing ICANN/DoC/Verisign contracts? The IANA-GM indicates that Verisign says it is unless DoC will say otherwise. So far DoC has declined to say.

) Principles Document — discussion to the list

) SSAC
      what is the status of support for a signed root zone?

            A yes by eoy
            B yes by eoy
            C need software upgrade but yes hoping by eoy; asking to be asked
            D not present
            E not present
            F ready needs enabling
            G ready
            H not present
            I ready needs enabling
            J yes end of year
            K yes needs enabling
            L not ready. in burn-in by end of year
            M ready

      Root server operators point out that they have not yet been asked to do this, and that they would need a formal request from the zone administrator with a date on which they will be expected to serve a signed zone.

      there are concerns regarding discussions of signed .arpa since it is not the root, .arpa discussion should be somewhere else. the zone owner should include the root ops in any discussion of planning, not just dates when they think they might be ready. Actual target dates would be very helpful, preferably with at least 30 days notice.

      the root servers AAAA rr glue

            SSAC has a draft report written. RSSAC invited to dinner meeting wedensday evening to discuss, explore issues, reach settlement where possible.

The expected output would be guidance to IANA with credible text, sufficient to move forward with adding AAAA glue to the root zone for the root servers.

        Draft report goals:
            id issues / questions
            settle if possible
            define testing, study, etc for the rest
            way forward

) IPv6 transport for root servers

        more than half are ready now, some announcing IPv6 reachability, some with prefixes but not yet with production quality connectivity. They are, B, F, H, I, J, L and M. Root Ops need to know what is the process for formally requesting the addition of IPv6 glue to host records? IANA-GM: will have to get back to the rssac list on that.

) IDN

Test: lab test of punycode strings. Is resolution process OK. Autonomica is running the test, small group has been discussing, different sizes and based on different scripts. Server side should not be an issue, resolver side is open ended.

Assuming that goes OK, root test needs a process for going forward. Strings suggested so far are "example.test" in multiple scripts and languages. Questions of numbers of test strings, sizes. Does RSSAC have opinions?

A Meta question was raised; validating a process to run experiments in the production root seems dangerous. Shakedown in non-production environment is preferable. Otherwise this is a risky precedent, especially without constraints as to what's a valid experiment in the production zone

For RSSAC and SSAC, precedent is a valid question but a higher level concern, shares it, but this may not be the time. We want a clear justification for why in the live root. What we want to hear: if policy process finds it a good idea, there needs to be a valid test plan that tells RSSAC and SSAC exactly what you want to do so it can be evaluated. Also make clear what is expected of the root servers:
    what does the zone look like?
    does it pose risks?
    what diagnostics are expected?
    what effects do you expect?
    what measurements do you want from the servers? E.g. how much does the
    size and other attributes of the zone change?
The proposed changes are adding additional labels of the form xn--{string}, DNAME is precluded.

More discussion of risks, process for proceeding forward is unclear. It is clear that concrete questions will generate concrete answers. The ICANN forum for technical discussion is the ICANN IDN-PAC.

) Anycast:
    Individual operators updates may be provided via the webpage; http://www.root-servers.org The IANA-GM would like more detailed information on topological placement of instances. IANA is collecting SOA data on each instance it knows about.

) Measurement
    http://www.caida.org/projects/ditl/ ... CAIDA shows the "two days of anycast root service"
    http://www.caida.org/research/dns/dns-itr/influence-map/ is the map.
    Local instances show diurnal patterns, global don't. Some global nodes are bigger than others. (see slide pack)
    Discussion of how to present data more clearly. It was noted this tells a good story of equalizing service delivery with anycast.

    09-10jan2007 UTC next data collection event. CAIDA will coordinate
    data collection

) RSSAC administration

    RSSAC is not growing. Should we open RSSAC meetings to public? ICANN CTO: it's not practical to make it public. Has always been limited, by design, to do specific work. We do publish minutes. RSSAC Chair: we will retain existing status on meetings and ensure the minutes are posted. Guests are invited to specific meetings, not a standing invitation.

) AOB — none

EOF