draft-ietf-dnsop-private-tld

What is next?
Recap

• Draft-arends-private-tld:
  • Designate the ISO3166-1 Alpha 2 User Assigned code elements as top level domains that can be used as private space networks
  • These elements are used by other SDOs as specified
  • These elements are unlikely to be reassigned by ISO
  • These elements are unlikely to be delegated by ICANN

• Loads of discussions on the list, points of contention are:
  • private name-space is a bad idea (use a registered name instead)
  • Namespace policies are not ours to make.
The editors propose

• Refrain from discussing private namespaces as a solution for anything
  • A document that discusses the problem space, concept, need, purpose, setup, facilities and BCP around independent name spaces is a different document.

• Observe and recognise that ISO3166-1 Alpha 2 User-Assigned code elements are used as intended, in many different ways.
  • The intention being “locally defined and locally meaningful” to organisations that use them.
  • They are used as locally configured top level domains. (DNS Magnitude study)
The editors propose

- Follow the spirit of “obsoleting” a code element in any IANA registry
  - RR TYPEs 254 (MAILA), 32769 (DLV), OpCode 1 (IQuery), EDNS0 option 4
- This “spirit of obsoleting” implies that these can not be considered as potential top level domains in the root zone.
- While this is not an explicit policy we can make (barring RFC6761), it follows the ISO’s intent and the policy in RFC1591.