

Audio Conf: friday 7th december 5 p.m GMT

Present:
^^^^^^

Lesley Cowley, Shinta Sato, Oscar Moreno, Olivier Guillard, Richard Lamb, Kim Davies, Bart Boswinkel

IANA dnssec update:
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

- Richard Lamb updated about IANA DNSSEC activities and progresses:

1/ TEST BED:

signed root zone is published on ns.iana.org
dnssec status here: <https://ns.iana.org/dnssec/status.html>
Richard indicated that IANA used a Hardware Security Module (HSM) to manage keys.
He indicated that IANA is ready to sign the root zone, the issue now is political.
Responding to questions, he indicated that if IANA was asked to implement DNSSEC it would take around 60 days for IANA to coordinate with the current IANA operational activities and add this service. He also precised that not the whole IANA operational chain may be "DNSSEC compliant" at the begining (integration with EPP interface to provide the signed root zone to verisign ? Interface provided to ccTLD "e-iana" and DS record collection ?) but none of those would be critical to start to sign the root zone and provide DNSSEC quickly.

2/ .arpa

IAB has asked ICANN to sign .arpa .
There are still some issues to fix but this should be done quickly.
(Kim Davies indicated later that the transition plan for .arpa includes actions to change the .arpa zone authoritative servers so that .arpa is not served by root servers anymore).

Richard Lamb also indicated that he was involved with different other internal IANA projects such as e-iana deployment.

IANA WG DNSsec paper:
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

- question asked to IANA WG by the ccNSO is:

"what concerns there are in respect to signing the root zone".

- ripe asked the root to be sign
- IANA DNSSEC paper is for cc managers
- The general idea is to try repond to this providing some sort of general summary about DNSSEC management issues, with a specific focus on root zone signing.
- It was highlighted that the IANA WG has not a lot of ressources: we must beaware not to be too ambitious (the paper must stay high level). We can't and don't want to go into too much detail;
- there is no point to be too technical, since many detailed technical and operational description are already available;
- the paper should stress on benefits of having the root zone signed and identify risks of signing or, on the contrary, not signing the root.

- SCHEDULE:

Objective:

- Drafty paper ready for the next conf call (mid january);
- Between mid january and New Dehli: consultation of relevant people;

TODO: OG: Move forward from the summary paper proposed by OG the 5th of december;
Call for volunteer to writte certain sections, including IANA for sections related to IANA activities;
OG: to ask the techwg for status about tech wg paper

* e-iana
^v^v^v^v

Kim davies updated about e-iana developpments:

It was asked to KD about e-iana schedule and e-iana accounts for testers.

KD reminded that the current DOC-VRSN-IANA workflow will be replaced with an EPP based workflow in conjunction with the other workflow steps.

KD said that VeriSign has indicated their Operational Test Environment will not be operational over a few weeks during Christmas, which would impact testing.

IANA will alter its platform so this does not affect the testers.

It was reminded to KD that some ccs had asked for accounts to test the platform since IANA offered this possibility over the two last public meetings. KD indicated that due to the Verisign problem, issue credentials will be issued once IANA will have alter its test platform adequately.

* IANA WG Charter:

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

- Council asked the IANA WG to review work items and to propose a relevant scope and work items for the WG, if any.

- A paper was send before last LA meeting to the council. This was a consolidation of three other papers used by the IANA WG (visible here: <http://ianawg.ccnso.org>):

- * IANA WG Charter ;
- * IANA WG membership protocol ;
- * IANA WG list of ccTLD concerns ;

- this paper can be a good start to draft IANA WG charter;

- we start by reviewing the goal of the working group;

TODO: OG send the LA paper and includes a redraft of the IANA WG goal for discussion;

* IANA operations: Scheduling Time

^^

- IANA send at the end of each IANA request a detailed summary that indicates the processing time to manage the requests;

- Some IANA WG members observed that the time spend to actually process is demand around two week (fifteen days) if the ccTLD is reactive to confirm back immediatly.

- It's noticed that out of those fifteen days, ten are necessary for VGRS to proceed;

- KD indicated that the processing time can and normally is less than fifteen days ;

- He also indicated that the ten days of delay are necessary for Verisign to manage the requests due to its internal operational chain to manage them ;
- KD reminded that IANA has no contract with Verisign, so IANA can't ask for information about the Verisign processing time;
- It was proposed that the IANA WG report this to the ccNSO;

TODO: to report to the ccNSO about processing time

- OG indicated that he was aware about other kind of problems for specific requests that could produce longer processing time than 15 days sometimes. He indicated that he was aware of certain recent requests from ccs that were not fulfilled without IANA explanation from IANA for several months. KD indicated that he could not provide private information about specific demands.

* NEW DEHLI:

^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^

a proposal for a IANA WG meeting at the begining of the ICANN meeting (sunday the 10th), at the end of afternoon but this may clash with another meeting.

To Be Confirmed.