

Doc	Rec Number	Description (text from RZERC document)	ICANN org's Understanding of Request	Approve Understanding?  If NO, provide clarifying comments for ICANN org in the column to the right	Clarifying Comments
RZERC002	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1A)	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data.	<p>ICANN org understands this to be a request to revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data called for in RSSAC028, specifically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify acceptable response size (beyond the default UDP packet size) for priming queries. ICANN org understands “acceptable” in this context to mean “with minimal risk of IP fragmentation”;</li> <li>• Document how different resolver software responds when answers contain a reduced set of glue records. ICANN org understands “different resolver software” to mean all supported-by-the vendor versions of BIND, Unbound, Power DNS Resolver, Knot Resolver, Microsoft DNS, and dnsmasq. ICANN org understands “a reduced set of glue records” to mean from one glue record to the full set of glue records;</li> <li>• How current resolver implementations behave if they set the “DNSSEC OK” (DO) bit to 1 in their priming queries, such as if they validate the response and, if so, how they handle a bogus response. ICANN org understands “current resolver implementations” to be the same set as “different resolver software”;</li> <li>• How search lists being used by resolvers might be relevant; and</li> <li>• Research practical obstacles faced by signing root zone name server data as input into the development of a proposed transition plan.</li> </ul>	No	In RZERC002, the RZERC was acknowledging that the work requested in RSSAC028 has not been completed and that the RZERC believes that the results of the work requested in RSSAC028 would be helpful in informing changes recommended to the Root Zone. As such, the RZERC would defer questions about terminology to the RSSAC.

RZERC002	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1B)	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response. Would this result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?	ICANN org understands this to be a request to identify the authoritative DNS software (vendor and version) currently in use by RSOs, then research how this set of software would be affected by each proposal for signing the root zone nameservers. Such research would cover the size of responses to priming queries coming from each type of authoritative server software when the query has the DO bit set. ICANN org requests clarification from RZERC on how likelihood of UDP fragmentation should be measured and what RZERC would consider “a lot” and “significant”.	No	In RZERC002, the RZERC was acknowledging that the work requested in RSSAC028 has not been completed and that the RZERC believes that the results of the work requested in RSSAC028 would be helpful in informing changes recommended to the Root Zone. As such, the RZERC would defer questions about terminology to the RSSAC.
RZERC002	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1C)	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data? What fraction of priming queries today have the DO bit set?	ICANN org understands this to be a request to research how the recursive resolvers in the testbed act in the face of responses to priming queries, particularly in the case that those queries had the DO bit set. This research should test both responses that are DNSSEC valid and those that are not. In addition, there is a request to determine an approximation of the fraction of queries to the RSS that have the DO bit set today. ICANN understands “current” to reflect the date immediately prior to publication of the research. ICANN understands “recursive resolvers” to mean all supported-by-the-vendor versions of BIND, Unbound, Power DNS Resolver, Knot Resolver, Microsoft DNS, and dnsmasq.	No	In RZERC002, the RZERC was acknowledging that the work requested in RSSAC028 has not been completed and that the RZERC believes that the results of the work requested in RSSAC028 would be helpful in informing changes recommended to the Root Zone. As such, the RZERC would defer questions about terminology to the RSSAC.
RZERC002	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-2A)	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org further explore the cost / benefit tradeoffs and risks of signed root zone name server data.	ICANN org understands this to be a request to explore the cost / benefit tradeoffs and risks of signed root zone name server data, looking at each of the proposed signing mechanisms in RSSAC028. ICANN org understands that this is a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences seen in the RSS since the time that RSSAC028 was published.	Yes	

RZERC002	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-2B)	Do the risks of redirected query traffic outweigh the risks of increased operational complexity?	Clarifying Question: ICANN org requests clarification from RZERC as to who the appropriate body should be for this question.	N/A	This is a request to ICANN org to include risks of operational complexity in its analysis of the previous recommendation (R2-A).
----------	--	--	--	-----	--