

Sao Paulo IANA WG Report, 6/12/2006

Olivier Guillard

About the IANA WG

- 10 ccs are members (2 per region) + IANA Staff (Kim Davies is the dedicated entry point)
- Exchange/work through mailing list
- Tel conf every month (organized by IANA staff)
- Minutes, paper, ongoing projects are recorded on a "wiki white board", part of this documentation is publicly available: <http://ianawg.ccnso.org>

Work Plan

The scope of the working group is defined in the IANA WG charter;
The list of cc concerns with IANA (see IANA WG paper: cc0000);

IANA WG scope

From scope:

- Review of IANA procedures for ccTLD zone file changes (excluding redelegations);
- Recommendation to IANA of improvements to IANA procedures for ccTLD zone file changes (excluding redelegations);

Done:

- ➔ IANA high level process flow (see IANA WG paper: cc0005)
- ➔ Ticketing system has been discussed and reviewed (see IANA WG paper: cc0011)
- ➔ Technical requirements for cc zones and cc NS published in the root zone file has been discussed (you probably have seen the related ICANN/IANA consultation, see cc0012 paper, it was adopted by the ccnso)

On Track issues/identified but not yet addressed in the IANA WG:

- ❖ Authentication mechanism to interact with IANA for root zone changes
- ❖ Automation procedure (no information about it in the working group)
- ❖ Access to internal ticket status

From scope:

- Review of the mechanisms for interaction between ccTLDs and IANA;
- Recommendation to IANA of improvements to the mechanisms for interaction between ccTLDs and IANA;
- Review of the documentation provided by IANA to the ccTLDs;
- Recommendation to IANA of improvements to the documentation provided by IANA to the ccTLDs;

Done:

- ➔ IANA WG is publishing IANA related information on its web site (IANA organization chart: cc0002, resource list for ccs: cc0009, emergency phone number);
- ➔ IANA WG encourages and supports IANA consultations and provides information to the ccs (the new IANA web site has been reviewed: cc0010, involvement in discussions related to cc technical requirements: cc0012);

Issues:

- IANA WG doesn't always know about IANA schedule, IANA plans or priorities that could impact services provided to ccs: it can therefore be difficult to support, IANA efforts.
- The IANA WG is not able to respond to all demands (IANA has asked us to provide input about redelegation issue, issue of consistency between iso3166 and cc list): the group has not been able to provide input;
- Some documents are circulating in the group and have stayed "under internal consideration" for quite a while;

On track/On going issue:

- ❖ Schedule for automation of IANA procedures
- ❖ Discussion related to authentication mechanisms
- ❖ Interface that would allow access to real time information about internal status of individual requests;

From scope:

- Review of the metrics used to monitor IANA service performance;
- Recommendation to IANA of improvements to the metrics used to monitor IANA service performance and development, acceptance and implementation of a web-based open source monitoring tool for use by registries;

As I will say in the last part of this report, there is a clear feeling that IANA management has improved over the past months. It's quite frustrating that we have not been able to progress with the IANA monitoring as such a mechanism would provide a more concrete view of IANA performances, and would therefore give more visibility to IANA progresses.

See hereafter presentation by Stephane Bortzmeyer for a quick overview about IANA monitoring issue.

Monitoring would also encourage discussions about IANA and would help to address more efficiently the last IANA WG objective in scope: "- Recommendation to IANA of improvements to the service provided by IANA to ccTLDs;"

Future of the IANA WG (the following are personal views and experience sharing):

To conclude this report, we had positive input about the IANA WG the outcome seems to be appreciated by the community.

IANA WG home page is viewed 150 times every month.

It also appears quite clearly that the IANA management is not perceived as an issue that needs to be addressed today by the group. The community seems to be quite confident in the capacity of the IANA team to manage appropriately cc services: IANA WG members have explicitly confirmed through a recent internal survey, we have not heard any recent complains from ccs about IANA.

However, there are pending issues, things that have not been addressed yet and that were planned to be: although there is a lot to do, and there is a kernel of active participants in the group, members have their day to day activities, it's difficult to ask for more involvement from people.

IANA has sought the group for guidance on certain issues such as redelegations or consistency between iso3166 and ccTLD list, papers were proposed for some issues: we have not always been able to provide clear input to IANA (some issues have also been readdressed to the ccNSO without more success).

Although IANA staff stays quite available to facilitate the work of the group, it's not always possible to obtain simple information about IANA plans, timelines or priorities related services provided to ccs.

Last thing that should be highlighted: there is a clear and strong demand from the community to have readability with regard to the IANA service provided to ccs as well as there is still a demand for even more interaction with IANA.

At this stage, I see three main needs that would need to be addressed:

- ✚ To provide an efficient identified channel allowing the community to exchange about IANA matters;
- ✚ To provide a clear mechanism to relay formally and efficiently to IANA cc concerns and expectations with regard to IANA service;
- ✚ To support and assist IANA in dealing with cc management issues: to provide input to IANA on specific issues, etc.;

Coordination with IANA is one of the core benefit that ccs are expecting from the ccNSO: the IANA WG provides a good kernel, but the WG structure and processes might need now to be reviewed to address new faced challenges (such as mechanisms to regularly review the cc concerns list, mechanism to raise them to IANA more formally -more efficiently-, mechanisms and tools to improve information sharing and transparency about IANA developments, IANA WG should be identified as a clear channel to exchange about IANA issues, and communication to encourage more participation from ccs in IANA issues) ;