


IANA Stewardship Transition at the IETF

Jari Arkko, May 19, 2015

IETF



- “Make the Internet work better”
- A standards organisation that works on core Internet technology — TCP/IP, HTTP, VoIP, ...
- Openness — anyone can participate, much of the work is done over the net
- Decisions based on community rough consensus
- Participants are individuals, not organisations

Protocol Parameters

- Some IETF standards need a registry of port numbers and other similar values
- Similar to how, say, IEEE registers their values
- Example: HTTP error codes

Registries and (some) values are specified in RFCs

Thousands of registries


No direct operational Internet impact — all effects take place through vendors and implementors

Value	Description	Reference
400	Bad Request	RFC 7231
401	Unauthorized	RFC 7235
402	Payment Required	RFC 7231
403	Forbidden	RFC 7231
404	Not Found	RFC 7231

IETF and IANA


Division of Labour

- Policy decisions for these allocations are at the IETF
 - IAB provides oversight
 - IETF contracts with the IANA service operator for implementation of the registry
- IANA arrangements have matured over time
- 35+ years of good experience from the basic setups



How Do IETF and IANA Work Together?

- Agreements specify roles
- Problems within IETF are subject to usual IETF processes
- Problems between IETF and IANA are subject to agreement processes



- Oversight provided by the IAB
- Yearly improvements are made when needs/issues arise
- There is no operational USG involvement, nor has there been


What Is Oversight?

- Ensuring that the arrangements continue to match current needs
- Revision and maintenance of relevant processes and contracts on a periodic basis
- Ensuring that the IETF has an IANA service operator that fulfils the community's needs
 - And we do, ICANN has served us well
- Acting as a final arbiter in disputes

IANA Stewardship Transition for the Protocol Parameters

- IETF discussions took place at the IANAPLAN working group in 2014, resulting in a proposal (draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response)
- After analysis, the IETF community determined that the protocol parameters are best served with the current operational model:
 - No change to roles of organisations
 - No new organisation needed
 - IANA (protocol parameters part) continues to be directed by the IETF community
 - While no change to overall arrangements, some fine-tuning in details

Transition




The USG stepping away from its stewardship role over the IANA functions does not affect protocol parameters given their "limited to no" role historically

Does Anything Change?

- The IETF is a part of the transition discussion because we want the whole system to transition
- While the overall arrangements do not change, some fine-tuning happens in the details, in a manner similar to the yearly updates of IETF-IANA agreements
- See the IETF transition proposal, [draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response](#), for the details.

Accountability in the IETF and IANA Relationship


- Daily operations involve discussions at the staff and participant level
- Unresolved policy issues or other conflicts can be brought to the IETF steering group (IESG)
- Existing agreements (RFC 2860) give IAB final say in disputes
- Contract termination could be used to move to a new service provider — we think this is very unlikely, but we are prepared for any eventuality



Accountability at IETF

Oversight of the IETF bodies is important

- Far more so than the oversight of clerical functions
- Nominations committee (Nomcom), appeals, and board recall mechanisms have existed in the IETF for decades
- Nomcom mechanisms make it hard to take over IETF boards



Next Steps

- We are in a good position
- Clear community plan
- Well-working IANA operator, no issues
- Ready to implement when the rest of the system catches up

Advice for Getting to Completion

- Continuity
- Simplicity
- Incremental improvement
- Make a plan, start executing