draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response

Eliot Lear

Russ Housley

CHANGES I THINK WE AGREE ON

What changes after -02?

- Add factual statement about how we use IANA.ORG
  - Proposed by John Curran
- Clarification of what is and is not overlap
  - Proposed by Andrew Sullivan
- Add WG adoption as one way we do our work
  - Proposed by Andrei Robachevsky, Suzanne Woolf
- Add earlier discussion of special use registries
  - Proposed by Andrei Robachevsky
- Clarify how long IAB members serve
  - Proposed by Andrew Sullivan
- Add mention of IETF Trust
  - Proposed by Brian Carpenter
- Coordination regarding special use of domain names
  - Proposed by Suzanne Woolf

What changes after -02?

- Add factual statement about how we use IANA.ORG
  - Proposed by John Curran
- Proposed change:

  The IETF community presently accesses the protocol parameter registries via references based on iana.org domain name, and makes use of the term "IANA" in the protocol parameter registry processes

What changes after -02?

- Clarification of what is and is not overlap
  - Proposed by Andrew Sullivan
- Proposed change:

In this context, the IETF considers "overlap" to be where there is in some way shared responsibility for a single registry across multiple organizations. In this sense, there is no overlap between organizations because responsibility for each registry is carefully delineated. There are, however, points of interaction between other organizations, and a few cases where we may further define the scope of a registry for technical purposes. This is the case with both names and numbers, as described in the paragraphs below. In all cases, the IETF coordinates with the appropriate organizations.

What changes after -02?

- Add WG adoption as one way we do our work
  - Proposed by Andrei Robachevsky, Suzanne Woolf
- Proposed change:

  If there is sufficient interest, a working group whose scope includes the proposed work may choose to adopt it, the Internet Engineering Steering Group may choose to create a working group, or an Area Director may choose to sponsor the draft

What changes after -02?

- Add earlier discussion of special use registries
  - Proposed by Andrei Robachevsky
- Proposed change:

The protocol parameters registries are the product of IETF work. These also include the top-level registry for the entire IP address space and some of its sub-registries, AS number space, and a number of special use registries with regard to domain names. For more detail please refer to the documentation in the "overlaps or interdependencies" section.

What changes after -02?

- Clarify how long IAB members serve
  - Proposed by Andrew Sullivan
- Proposed change:

  In general, members are appointed for terms of two years.

What changes after -02?

- Add mention of IETF Trust
  - Proposed by Brian Carpenter
- Proposed change:

  The members of the IAOC are also the trustees of the IETF Trust, whose main purpose is to hold certain intellectual property for the benefit of the IETF as a whole.

What changes after -02?

- Coordination regarding special use of domain names
  - Proposed by Suzanne Woolf
- Proposed change:

  The IETF has specified a number of special use registries with regard to domain names. These registries require coordination with ICANN as the policy authority for the DNS root, including community groups that are responsible for ICANN policy on domain names such as the GNSO and the ccNSO. There are already mechanisms in place to perform this coordination, and the capacity to modify them to meet new conditions as they might arise.

CHANGES THAT MAY NEED MORE DISCUSSION

Mention of .ARPA

- .ARPA top level domain is operated by ICANN on behalf of the IAB

- Used for Internet infrastructure

- Proposal:
  - Mention that this function is performed (Section I)
  - State that the administrative owner of this special domain is the IAB (also Section I)
  - State that this is acknowledged in the NTIA contract, and should be acknowledged by all parties, moving forward. (section III)

This represents status quo.

.ARPA Proposed text

- Section 1

  ICANN currently administers the .ARPA top level domain on behalf of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). This zone is used for certain Internet infrastructure services that are delegated beneath it.

- Section 2

  acknowledges that the .ARPA zone shall continue to be operated in accordance with the procedures outlined in

  RFC 3172 or its successors.

Handling of iana.org

- Issue:
  - Over 900 RFCs reference IANA.ORG
  - RFCs are immutable
  - The name is also in vendor documentation and elsewhere
- We do not want people misdirected in the unlikely event that we do change protocol registry operator
- The domain is made use of by (at least) the protocol parameters registries and numbers community

IANA.ORG continued

- Goal: stability requires continuity and resilience for the location of the protocol parameters registries, and no confusion about what the IETF believes the parameters registries contain

- Non-goal: ownership of IANA.ORG or the trademark by the IETF community, so long as the goal above is satisfied (although this might be one way to address the matter)

Proposal

1. We acknowledge the issue.

2. We state that a criteria of the transition is that the issue be satisfactorily addressed by the IAOC

3. (There is no 3)

Rationale

- This is a stability issue. The NTIA called out stability as a criteria.
- This WG is chartered to develop our component of the response to the NTIA
- The WG is not chartered to do IAOC's work for them
- The WG is chartered to make clear what the community requires for a transition successful transition

Proposed Text

To address concerns regarding appropriate contingencies to transition to another operator, the IAOC is asked to conclude a supplemental agreement that

(...)

(2) requires that the owner of any associated marks and identifiers ensure continuity and resilience of the location of the protocol parameters registries, so that there exists no confusion that the a subsequent operator is performing the service on behalf of the IETF.

WHERE DOES THIS DOCUMENT FIT?

The Role of the IAB and IAOC

- RFC 6220 explains responsibilities of the various organizations.
- The IAB has responsibility for determining terms and conditions, in order to address long term community needs.
- The IAOC has a responsibility to faithfully pursue agreements that reflect the needs of the community.
- This is separate from the RFP response.