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Quick recap

• RFC 6761 “Special Use Names”
  • Description required, but only of how the name interacts with the DNS
  • Registry policy includes IESG judgment (“Standards Action and IESG Approval”)

• Lots of special use name activity in DNSOP (2014-2018)
  • RFC 8244 (“Special-Use Domain Names Problem Statement”)
  • RFC 7686 (“The ‘.onion’ Special-Use Domain Name”)
  • Liaison implications? Home/corp/mail
  • DNSOP asked for next steps from IESG: what do you need from us?
How should the IESG & the IETF apply RFC 6761?

• IETF WGs sometimes need special use names in their protocols
  • How to specify?
  • How to pick a string?

• RFC 6761 allows for uses outside of the IETF standards process

• Likely need to coordinate certain cases with ICANN
  • String may have to be delegated as a TLD for the protocol to work properly
  • Assurance may be required that the string will not be delegated as a TLD for the protocol to work properly
Advice for Specifying Special Use Domain Names (so far)

• Try not to “need” a TLD
  • Names elsewhere in the tree “work”
  • Special use may require something to exist in the DNS
  • Special use may just require collision avoidance (assurance it *won’t* be in the DNS)

• Think about what characteristics names need to have, e.g. will they be human-visible?

• Think about whether a special use name actually helps; avoiding it may actually be better protocol design

• Try not to “need” a TLD!
Process

• IESG requested guidance document
  • Should have IETF consensus
  • Should provide guidance for IETF WGs and non-IETF proponents
• Second-order goal: avoid each request going to DNSOP for ad hoc review
  • Not necessarily experts on protocols that created the requirement for a special use name, or the characteristics of its use
  • Requests can be controversial
  • Reuse experience, please!
• IAB administers .arpa (RFC 3172)
  • delegated home.arpa for homenet
  • Standards action and specific review of IANA Considerations required
  • RFC 3172 might need to be updated to allow the IAB to act in a slightly wider set of cases, e.g. where the requested item is not defined in an IETF protocol
Next steps

• Review: What considerations are missing? (Surely there’s more advice we can give....)

• Should -02 update RFC 3172 to match the scope of RFC 6761?
  • Currently IETF standards-track RFC required for the IAB to act
  • Should “onion.arpa” still be possible? (No IETF standard)

• What about “.alt”?  
  • Should there be a reserved name sandbox?  
  • Should it be designated by the IETF?

• Do we need to propose some new mechanism for coordination with ICANN? (probably not, but...)

• Adoption?