

RSSAC Caucus: Packet Sizes WP Meeting

July 19 | 17:00-18:00 UTC

Attendance: Duane Wessels, John Bond, George Michaelson, Geoff Huston, Kevin Wright, Robert Story, Andrew McConachie, Mario Aleman

Action Items:

Andrew to resend Google doc link to list

Staff to schedule a regular call every month starting roughly in one month

Notes:

George: Last time we met was a small truncated conf call and we had a review of the code and a sense that we need to talk about where we're going. What kind of document can we produce? Are providing answers or questions? There are a small number of questions that fairly characterize what an operator is doing. We believe that a short questionnaire that we can gather this stuff with, but it will be a partial answer. I believe John said it would be a real stretch to get RSOs to run code, especially if it requires root permissions. Duane made an observation that we should get somewhere and maybe it's possible to close up shop instead of pressing on.

Duane: Nothing has changed, I haven't heard anyone say something either way. Either say this is important, or people should stop. Same situation we were in before.

George: I think Robert took the flag bit to start trying to write something.

John B: I just want to clarify. From my point of view, should we continue or stop it. Personally I struggle to see value in this document, but am happy to continue working on it.

Geoff: The strength of the RSS now is that by accident most of these root server families behave uniquely with respect to the others. The pathological situations of ICMP loss and packet loss, IPv6 in particular. Some recursives can't reach some roots. But that's entirely different from you can't get the root. There is enough variance that some roots will service you anyway. If we're talking about a situation where a client would be denied to all root servers. The variance tends to suggest I find it difficult for no root server to respond to you.

George: Irrespective of protocol, IPv4 and IPv6.

Geoff: You would need to really barricade yourself to not get any response.

George: I see myself as having a functional role. We have had 3-4 rounds around what could be done. It is a little unsettling that we don't have a formalism around what can be said, but we could

always write down whatever the situation is, write it down and move on. If there is nothing to be done then we move on.

John B: I guess this is a question Duane. IMO point of view if we managed to discuss what were the issues around the root servers that gave a good picture of what's going on. I'm aware that this does not answer the initial question of the Caucus.

Duane: That is a reasonable question. The question is one thing, and at the end of the WP the answer doesn't match. I think that's OK. I think whatever this WP comes up with the wider Caucus has a chance to comment on it. I don't think we should let that stop us at this point.

Duane: Question for Geoff. We've had large packets at the root for a while now. There is an opportunity to get bigger during a revocation.

Geoff: Revocation at 1424. There is not much, there is no functional boundary between those 10 bytes. A and J are already truncating that answer and pushing to TCP. F is delivering the entirety of the answer unfragmented. We are already exhibiting a noticeable loss if they were the only root. I believe what we are seeing now is that some resolvers are flicking to different roots or flicking to v4. Is there more traffic? I don't know. Have we heard any reports of not being able to access root servers, No. Although I do believe some resolver clients are unable to get answers from some protocols from some root servers, I don't think there is any client that will be blocked in all circumstances. I think we're fine.

George: So we had an RSSAC Caucus this week and I stood up and said we're heading to documentation phase. And I think that's true. I think we're heading to document a state of affairs with observations. I implied we might have something by Bangkok IETF. That gives us 3 months. I would like to see people write some words.

Robert S: I volunteered last time, but will do better this time. I will try and make some words.

George: Guys I think our job here is probably done.

Duane: There is already a Google doc.

Andrew: I will resend it to the list.

George: When should we talk again? We should probably talk again within a month. I would prefer a monthly teleconference list.

Andrew: We'll send a Doodle around for people to choose a time every month. A time that is good for people every month. Starting approximately 1 month from now.