

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [3658](#), [5155](#), [6014](#), [8624](#) (if  
approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: January 22, 2022

P. Hoffman  
ICANN  
July 21, 2021

Revised IANA Considerations for DNSSEC  
draft-ietf-dnsop-dnssec-iana-cons-01

Abstract

This document changes the review requirements needed to get some DNSSEC algorithms and resource records added to IANA registries. It updates [RFC 6014](#) to include hash algorithms for DS records and NSEC3 parameters. It also updates [RFC 5155](#) and [RFC 6014](#), which have requirements for DNSSEC algorithms. It also updates [RFC 8624](#) to say that algorithms that are described in RFCs that are not on standards track are only at the "MAY" level of implementation recommendation. The rationale for these changes is to bring the requirements for DS records and for the hash algorithms used in NSEC3 in line with the requirements for all other DNSSEC algorithms.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 22, 2022.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- [1.](#) Introduction . . . . . [2](#)
- [2.](#) Update to [RFC 6014](#) . . . . . [2](#)
- [3.](#) Update to [RFC 8624](#) . . . . . [3](#)
- [4.](#) IANA Considerations . . . . . [3](#)
- [5.](#) Security Considerations . . . . . [3](#)
- [6.](#) References . . . . . [4](#)
  - [6.1.](#) Normative References . . . . . [4](#)
  - [6.2.](#) Informative References . . . . . [4](#)
- Author's Address . . . . . [5](#)

[1.](#) Introduction

DNSSEC is primarily described in [[RFC4033](#)], [[RFC4034](#)], and [[RFC4035](#)]. DNSSEC commonly uses two resource records beyond those defined in [RFC 4034](#): DS [[RFC3658](#)] and NSEC3 [[RFC5155](#)].

[[RFC8126](#)] describes the requirements for listing in the myriad IANA registries.

[[RFC6014](#)] updated the requirements for how DNSSEC cryptographic algorithm identifiers in the IANA registries are allocated, reducing the requirements from being "Standards Action" to "RFC Required". However, the IANA registry requirements for hash algorithms for DS records and for the hash algorithms used in NSEC3 are still "Standards Action".

[2.](#) Update to [RFC 6014](#)

[Section 4](#) updates [RFC 6014](#) to bring the requirements for DS records and NSEC3 hash algorithms in line with the rest of the DNSSEC cryptographic algorithms by allowing any DS or NSEC3 hash algorithms that are fully described in an RFC to have identifiers allocated in the IANA registries. This is an addition to the IANA considerations in [RFC 6014](#).

### 3. Update to [RFC 8624](#)

This document updates [[RFC8624](#)] for all DNSKEY and DS algorithms that are not on standards track.

The second paragraph of [Section 1.2 of RFC 8624](#) currently says:

This document only provides recommendations with respect to mandatory-to-implement algorithms or algorithms so weak that they cannot be recommended. Any algorithm listed in the [DNSKEY-IANA] and [DS-IANA] registries that are not mentioned in this document MAY be implemented. For clarification and consistency, an algorithm will be specified as MAY in this document only when it has been downgraded from a MUST or a RECOMMENDED to a MAY.

That paragraph is now replaced with the following:

This document provides recommendations with respect to mandatory-to-implement algorithms, algorithms so weak that they cannot be recommended, and algorithms that are defined in RFCs that are not on standards track. Any algorithm listed in the [DNSKEY-IANA] and [DS-IANA] registries that are not mentioned in this document MAY be implemented. For clarification and consistency, an algorithm will be specified as MAY in this document only when it has been downgraded from a MUST or a RECOMMENDED to a MAY.

This update is also reflected in the IANA considerations in [Section 4](#).

### 4. IANA Considerations

In the "Domain Name System Security (DNSSEC) NextSECure3 (NSEC3) Parameters" registry, the registration procedure for "DNSSEC NSEC3 Flags", "DNSSEC NSEC3 Hash Algorithms", and "DNSSEC NSEC3PARAM Flags" are changed from "Standards Action" to "RFC Required".

In the "Delegation Signer (DS) Resource Record (RR) Type Digest Algorithms" registry, the registration procedure for "Digest Algorithms" is changed from "Standards Action" to "RFC Required".

### 5. Security Considerations

Changing the requirements for getting security algorithms added to IANA registries as described in this document will make it easier to get good algorithms added to the registries, and will make it easier to get bad algorithms added to the registries. It is impossible to weigh the security impact of those two changes.

## [6.](#) References

### [6.1.](#) Normative References

- [RFC4033] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements", [RFC 4033](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4033, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4033>>.
- [RFC4034] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Resource Records for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4034](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4034, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4034>>.
- [RFC4035] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Protocol Modifications for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4035](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4035, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4035>>.
- [RFC5155] Laurie, B., Sisson, G., Arends, R., and D. Blacka, "DNS Security (DNSSEC) Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence", [RFC 5155](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5155, March 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5155>>.
- [RFC6014] Hoffman, P., "Cryptographic Algorithm Identifier Allocation for DNSSEC", [RFC 6014](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6014, November 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6014>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.
- [RFC8624] Wouters, P. and O. Sury, "Algorithm Implementation Requirements and Usage Guidance for DNSSEC", [RFC 8624](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8624, June 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8624>>.

### [6.2.](#) Informative References

- [RFC3658] Gudmundsson, O., "Delegation Signer (DS) Resource Record (RR)", [RFC 3658](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3658, December 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3658>>.

Author's Address

Paul Hoffman  
ICANN

Email: [paul.hoffman@icann.org](mailto:paul.hoffman@icann.org)