



SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #23 2000 UTC 05 February 2018

Agenda

1

Welcome, Opening
Remarks and
SOI updates

2

Comments on
Evaluation

3

Comments on Root
Zone Scaling

4

AOB and closing

1. Welcome, Opening Remarks and SOI updates

2. Comments on Evaluation

Responses from Technical Services

- “ICANN's recommendations for updating Registry System Testing [i.e., Pre-Delegation Testing (PDT) and Registry Service Provider (RSP) Change Testing] based on issues or breaches seen by the SLA Monitoring(SLAM) system, as well as ICANN's recommendations generally for improving testing and technical evaluations.”
- Got 8 recommendations regarding RST (Registry System Testing) and 3 regarding Application Evaluation
- Accepting or not RST recommendations mostly linked to RSP program; will sync with WT1 and/or Full WG on this and other RSP matters
- One of Application Evaluation recommendations also linked to RSP
- One of Application Evaluation recommendations about using RSEP for Registry Services Evaluation and will be discussed within that context
- Remaining Application Evaluation recommendation about 0-1 scoring instead of 0-1-2 was from PIRR and already accepted by WT4.

Responses from Operations

- WT4 asked full text of CQs and answers for the questions with published answers, and counts of CQs and answers for questions without published answers
- First Ops response was:
 - “As it was not foreseen that this information would be published as part of the application process, there may be sensitive data included in the CQ responses or attachments. To address this, we are planning to inform applicants that these materials will be published and shared with WT4, and we will take their feedback into account before publishing the responses. We anticipate this communication going out in the next week.”
- While factually wrong, conversations with Ops led to a compromise solution that was eventually found to be expensive.

Responses from Operations (cont.)

- Eventually Ops answered with their current view on alternatives
 1. Compile existing info regarding questions and CQs
 - Essentially what has already been done for PIRR and was found insufficient by WT4
 2. Org staff perform review of CQs
 3. 3rd party review of CQ process
 - Two options above are basically the same, changing only who would perform the review
 4. Solicit recommendations from evaluators
 5. Survey of applicants
 - Considering the long time after evaluation, likely to not have much effectiveness as most people either are not in the orgs anymore or have no incentives to dedicate time and effort

Possible ways forward

- Insist on initial request, only allowing for redaction of content that was “cross-border” in nature (mixing public and private responses). It would require less skilled staff than a substance review, but would put the analysis burden on community when ready.
- Pick either option 2(staff review) or 3(3rd party review) as a requirement prior to implementation of SubPro policy
- (insert your combination of options here)
- Note that CQs and answer contents do not prevent working on known issues like 0-1-2 scoring, Q30b (Security Policy) and Financial Evaluation (where a complete overhaul seems to be preferred)

3. Comments on Root Zone Scaling

- Mostly discussed application processing limits, not root zone scaling
- Mentioned a relevant change: the increasing use of root zone replication to resolvers (RFC 7706)
 - Although not mentioned, also applies to RFC 7816 (DNS query minimization)
- Says determining scaling capacity would require significant effort that might not be worthwhile since application processing limitations will likely be reached before any limitation becomes an issue
- No response to root zone size question

- “ICANN should continue developing the monitoring and early warning capability with respect to root zone scaling.”
- “ICANN should focus on the rate of change for the root zone, rather than the total number of delegated strings for a given calendar year. “
- “ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registries so that it can delay their addition to the root zone in case of DNS service instabilities.”
- “ICANN should investigate and catalog the long term obligations of maintaining a larger root zone.”
 - “ The ongoing management of these activities should be investigated prior to increasing the number of delegations in the root zone. “

- Confirmed deployment of root zone system monitoring
- Suggested adopting a monthly thinking instead of per annum
- Recommended 5% per month growth rate (target, not ceiling)
- Strong recommendation on keeping allowed DNS records at root zone to a minimum (not related to TLD zone contents)
- Suggests possibility of delaying or removing delegations
- On zone size, is more concerned of possible TLDs becoming as popular as .com/.net/.org than zone size, although unsure of effects of flattening DNS namespace
- 3 non-technical questions referred to full WG and/or other WTs

Recommendations not incompatible with GNSO policy or each other

- Monitoring and early warning of the root zone system (SSAC and RSSAC)
- Delaying or removing delegations that cause instability (SSAC and RSSAC)
- More focus on change rate over smaller time periods than annual figures (SSAC and RSSAC)
- 5% monthly growth rate target (RSSAC)
- Maintain conservative approach to DNS records in the root zone (RSSAC)
- Any disagreements with WT4 on these ?

Recommendations incompatible with GNSO policy or each other

- Application processing limitations will already avoid issues (ICANN Org x SSAC and RSSAC)
 - Which one to pick: having or not a delegation rate criteria ?
- Investigate long term obligations of a larger root zone prior to new delegations (SSAC x SubPro “There should be new gTLDs”, GNSO Principle A and SubPro “Predictability”)
 - Which one to pick: create such additional requirement for SubPro or not establish such requirement ?

4. AOB and closing

AOB and closing

- Yesterday board decision on .corp, .home and .mail
- AOB ?
- Which pending topics require calls and which can be dealt through mailing-list and surveys ?