

Guidelines for Use of the Special Use Names Registry

(draft-stw-6761ext)

Suzanne Woolf

IETF 104

DNSOP

29 March 2019

Prague

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?