

DNS Resolver Information Key for DNSSEC Validation

Stéphane Bortzmeyer
bortzmeyer+ietf@nic.fr

IETF 121, Dublin, november 2024

Reminder

- ▶ RFC 9606 specifies a DNS resource record type RESINFO,

Reminder

- ▶ RFC 9606 specifies a DNS resource record type RESINFO,
- ▶ Example for the DNS4ALL public resolver: `qnamemin
infourl=https://dns4all.eu`

Reminder

- ▶ RFC 9606 specifies a DNS resource record type RESINFO,
- ▶ Example for the DNS4ALL public resolver: `qnamemin
infourl=https://dns4all.eu`
- ▶ New keys can be added to the IANA registry. Policy:
“Specification Required”

Reminder

- ▶ RFC 9606 specifies a DNS resource record type RESINFO,
- ▶ Example for the DNS4ALL public resolver: `qnamemin
infourl=https://dns4all.eu`
- ▶ New keys can be added to the IANA registry. Policy:
“Specification Required”
- ▶ No key added yet.

The proposal

- ▶ `draft-bortzmeyer-resinfo-dnssecval`

The proposal

- ▶ `draft-bortzmeyer-resinfo-dnssecval`
- ▶ Add a key `dnssecval`,

The proposal

- ▶ `draft-bortzmeyer-resinfo-dnssecval`
- ▶ Add a key `dnssecval`,
- ▶ To indicate that the resolver does DNSSEC validation,

The proposal

- ▶ `draft-bortzmeyer-resinfo-dnssecval`
- ▶ Add a key `dnssecval`,
- ▶ To indicate that the resolver does DNSSEC validation,
- ▶ No issue raised.

A question of process

- ▶ “Specification Required”? What sort of specification?

A question of process

- ▶ “Specification Required”? What sort of specification?
- ▶ Does an Internet-Draft suffice?

A question of process

- ▶ “Specification Required”? What sort of specification?
- ▶ Does an Internet-Draft suffice?
- ▶ If not, is it better to use an individual RFC or to have this WG adopt the draft?

A question of process

- ▶ “Specification Required”? What sort of specification?
- ▶ Does an Internet-Draft suffice?
- ▶ If not, is it better to use an individual RFC or to have this WG adopt the draft?
- ▶ BCP 26 is not crystal-clear here. IANA does not seem to have a strong opinion on that.