

DNSOP Interim meeting on Special Use Names, RFC6761

May 12, 2015

Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- The IETF plenary session
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by [RFC 4879](#)).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and [RFC 3979](#) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Some ground rules

- A “real” IETF WG meeting: identify yourself, assume what you’re saying is public.
- We’re assuming people have read the drafts
 - We keep running out of time in f2f meetings to pursue discussion on these issues
 - No tutorials, presentations
 - If there’s no conversation that’s information too
- Any decisions moving forward will include today’s discussions, previous inputs, additional refinement on the list. Today’s goal is to get some focus.

Agenda

- Introduction, Agenda Bashing, Fake Blue Sheets, etc (10 min)
- Considerations of where we are today: IETF/ICANN MoU, RFC 6761, DNSOP charter (15 min.; clarifying questions)
- Some drafts (45 min.)
 - ◆ draft-appelbaum-dnsop-onion-tld (.onion)
 - ◆ draft-chapin-additional-reserved-tlds (home/corp/mail)
 - ◆ draft-wkumari-dnsop-alt-tld (.alt)
 - ◆ Others
- Future Direction (30 min.)

Overview: where we are

→ RFC 2860, IETF/ICANN MoU:

“4.3. Two particular assigned spaces present policy issues...the assignment of domain names, and the assignment of IP address blocks. These policy issues are outside the scope of this MOU.

Note that (a) assignments of domain names for technical uses (such as domain names for inverse DNS lookup)...are not considered to be policy issues, and shall remain subject to the provisions of this Section 4.”

→ RFC 6761

→ DNSOP charter

“Publish documents that attempt to better define the overlapping area among the public DNS root, DNS-like names as used in local or restricted naming scopes, and the 'special names' registry that IETF manages, perhaps including how they might interact.”

Areas of Concern Today

1. Operational Questions
2. Policy and Namespace Questions

Operational Considerations

- 6761 provides:
 - 7 criteria to lay out what behavior is expected
 - a couple of guidelines, such as “new functionality”, for determining that “normal” allocation process won’t do
- Do the requested names meet the RFC 6761 criteria?
- What other characteristics do they have that are relevant to operators? Adequately documented?
- Asking for a name in advance vs. asking for protection for a name later?
- Special use names are not TLDs

Policy / Namespace Questions

- Coordination is needed?
 - Does the IETF have coordination issues with other bodies too? Can we learn anything from those interactions?
 - RFC 6761: “Hence, the act of defining such a special name creates a higher-level protocol rule, above ICANN's management of allocable names on the public Internet.” Does this mean coordination is unnecessary?
- Policy goals may be distinct from technical ones
 - Promoting privacy or other key architectural principles
 - A message to ICANN about name collisions and allocating names
 - A message to the IETF about innovation and interoperability

Drafts: draft-appelbaum-dnsop-onion-tld

- “.onion” namespace used as entry point for TOR privacy services
- Widely available software, some installed base
- Looking for special use names registry entry to remain compliant with CAB Forum guidelines, so certificates can be issued for those names
- Action: adopt?

Drafts: draft-chapin-additional-reserved-tlds

- home/corp/mail documented to be at risk of “name collision” if delegated
- ICANN has said they’re “deferring indefinitely” on delegating these names
- Request is to add them to special use names registry
- Specific use not described
- Practical impact of adding to the registry?
- If the goal is to influence ICANN, other mechanisms?

Drafts: draft-wkumari-dnsop-alt-tld

- Proposed as a partial solution to demand for “names we can be sure will return NXDOMAIN”
- Sets aside .alt namespace
- Some operational questions, e.g. serve from AS112? DNSSEC?
- Might this help?

Other drafts

- grothoff-p2p-iesg-special-use-p2p-names: multiple names in one draft, WG discussion seems to want to separate them
- draft-lewis-user-assigned-tlds: sets aside quite a few 2-letter strings; “nice to have”
- draft-cheshire-homenet-dot-home: another proposal for reserving .home

Possible next steps

- We have these drafts in front of us. They're within the charter of the WG, and our AD is supportive of us addressing them.
- It seems unlikely that people will stop wanting “special use names,” especially ones that look like TLDs
- It seems unlikely that things that look like TLDs will stop having both technical and policy implications
- There's a timeliness constraint on the .onion draft
- There's a workload consideration for the WG

Possible next steps (2)

- draft-appelbaum-dnsop-onion-tld: seems straightforward; adopt?
- draft-wkumari-dnsop-alt-tld: could help with scalability
- draft-chapin-additional-reserved-tlds: support seems based on policy concerns
- Longer term
 - we need the special use names concept; how high should the bar be?
 - we have various means of influencing other groups' policies, e.g. liaisons and IAB RFCs
 - 6761 update? 6761bis?