Centralised DNS over HTTPS (DoH) Implementation Issues and Risks

DNS over HTTPS (DoH) Considerations for Operator Networks

draft-livingood-doh-implementation-risks-issues

DOH Working Group

draft-reid-doh-operator

- IETF 104
- March 2019



draft-livingood-doh-implementation-risksissues

- One key point is consolidation/centralisation issues
 - Stability, security, and privacy
 - Impact on DNS software diversity & related risks
- Does the IETF want to discuss this?
 - If so, where? Is it in-charter for the DoH WG?

draft-livingood-doh-implementation-risksissues

- The other key point are the operational issues arising from DoH:
 - Effects on security threat visibility, parental controls, content controls, split DNS, enterprise data leaks, nation-level legal mandates, captive portals
 - · Performance, scaling, and troubleshooting issues
- Does the IETF want to discuss this?
 - If so, where? Is it in-charter for the DoH WG?

draft-reid-doh-operator

- Intent is simply to document the problems/issues in operator networks once DoH is widely used
 - It's NOT about DNS blocking
- Does the IETF want to help define a problem statement, document use cases, etc?
 - If so, where? Is it in-charter for the DoH WG?

Privacy Aspects

- Key privacy issue in the drafts is common to both documents
 - DoH queries going to third-party DoH resolvers with unknown/unclear privacy policies
- Does the IETF want to discuss this?
 - If so, where? It's in-charter for the DoH WG.

Open Questions for WG

- Are the issues listed in the two drafts valid/reasonable and in scope for the WG?
- Does the WG want to work on them?
 - If yes, further work or major surgery may be needed
 - If no, what, if anything, needs to be done to make the I-D WG compatible?
- Should some topics go to another WG? Which one(s)?

DoH WG Future

- Two drafts explore potential operational issues
- Maybe inappropriate for an ART area WG
 - Move WG to OPS area?
 - Recharter?
 - New WG?
 - Have an existing WG pick up the work?