ANAME, etc.
The Problem

$TTL 3600
example.com. 1800 IN SOA ......
example.com. 86400 IN NS dns01.example.com.
dns01.example.com. 86400 IN NS dns02.example.com.
dns02.example.com. 86400 IN NS dns03.example.com.
dns03.example.com. 86400 IN NS dns04.example.com.
dns04.example.com. 3600 IN MX 10 mail.example.com.

;
mail.example.com. 3600 IN A 192.168.0.1

;
In Search of...Solutions

Willem/Ondrej have some CNAME/DNAME experiments

Ray thinks his HTTP record is the better answer

Tim feels the argument is not between the HTTP and DNS world

DNSOP is ignoring the New World Order of Elastic Compute.
ANAME draft rewritten for -02

- “Like CNAME but only for address records”
- Behaves “as if” address records copied from target to owner using DNS UPDATE
- But dynamic lookup-on-demand (like -01) is allowed by “as if” get-out clause
- Resolvers may re-do target address substitution for GeoIP
Comments wanted!

What is unclear / confusing / wrong?

Interop with existing ANAME-like implementations?

Scalability implications?

Feedback via dnsop@ietf.org or https://github.com/each/draft-aname/