

Update on  
**draft-ietf-dnsop-private-use-tld-01**

Potential Next Steps

DNSOP

29 July 2021

# Brief History: Where did we come from?

- Draft introduced late 2019, adopted mid-2020
  - Basic idea: acknowledge use of “private TLDs” outside of the public DNS
  - Minimize damage by indicating strings that seem safe to use for this purpose
- Proposes to add ~40 “user-assigned” alpha-2 codes to special use names registry
  - ISO-3166-1 is maintained by another SDO, ISO TC46
  - DNSOP sought guidance on whether the “user-assigned” list was stable enough and otherwise suitable for this use
- The IAB administers liaison relationships on behalf of the IETF, including ISO TC46
  - Question was composed and liaison manager asked to follow up (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/1720/>)
  - Liaison manager has offered written advice to the WG, including an assessment of why we should not expect formal response and why we should not use the proposed strings as “private TLDs”

# Where are we now?

- No decision has been made on how to proceed. No decision will be made without input from the WG.
- Unknown what alternatives we might have to accepting this advice
  - John Klensin was the liaison manager that handled the communication
  - The reason given for why there isn't more of an answer sounds structural, not circumstantial or procedural, and unlikely to change
- This is well within the prerogatives of any Standards Development Organization regarding a standard they maintain, including (as John's letter notes) the IETF itself
  - The IETF has no way to answer such a question besides publishing a new RFC
  - It's very difficult to assure anyone that \*anything\* in the digital world is guaranteed to be stable indefinitely

# Implications of the advice

- If we take the advice we have at face value, what does it mean for the WG and the draft?
  - As unlikely as it might be to change we can't depend on those strings to remain "user-assigned" forever
  - The lack of a clear answer itself promotes uncertainty, particularly for a standards-track RFC and IANA actions.
  - Reserving the strings in the Special Use Names registry may be unproductive for the ISO/IETF relationship, which affects more than DNSOP
- This implies we should look elsewhere for strings to reserve for the private TLD purpose

# Options for the WG for next steps

- Possible ways forward for the draft
  - Proceed with the draft as currently written
  - Rewrite the draft to reserve different strings formally in the special-use names registry
  - Rewrite the draft to provide procedural advice on picking a string to use in a private DNS context, but not recommending specific strings (and perhaps advising against the practice generally)
- Abandon the draft and figure we'll work on the technical issues when acceptable strings can be agreed upon or the question can be safely avoided
- Come up with a way to get further advice (could involve our AD or the IAB)
- ???