IETF 67 dnsop

reverse-mapping-considerations

Closed issues

- Issue 1: filename changed
- Issues 2 - 4: updated policy references
- Issue 6: difficulty of getting reverse mapping
  - But see IPv6 discussion later
- Issue 7: nit about RFC 2050
- Issue 11: normative language
  - To be fixed in -01

Open issues

- Issue 4: strength of recommendations
- Issue 8: terminology (IN-ADDR question)
- Issue 9: confusing discussion of RIPE policy
- Issue 10: IANA considerations and RFC 3330 (RFC 1918) space
- Issue 12: IPv4 vs IPv6 considerations
- Issue 13: Motivation statement

Issue 4

- Problem now that request to "require" reverse mappings by RIRs relies on authority they don't actually have

- Proposal to change "require" to "encourage"

- Dependent on resolution of motivation statement (Issue 13).

Issue 8

- Remaining IN-ADDR terminology suggests that IPv6 is not covered

- Proposal to define reverse mapping more formally at the beginning of the document, and use that terminology wherever the generic is correct

Issue 10

- Do the reverse mapping issues apply in RFC 3330 (more specifically, RFC 1918) space?

- Specific question about what definition of "assigned" is in section 4.1 para 3.

- Proposal to note that the intent of the document is to do with interoperation between sites, so RFC 1918 space should not really be an area of consideration.

Issue 12

- There are significant operational differences between the administration of IPv4 address space and IPv6 address space

- These differences make reverse mapping somewhat more difficult in IPv6 space

- Worth noting that some tools need to be improved to make IPv6 reverse mapping successful

- Refer to discussion in RFC 4472

Issue 13

- The motivation for reverse mapping needs to be made clearer

- Mention SSHP (RFC 4255), IPSECKEY (RFC 4025), and Opportunistic Encryption (RFC 4322).

- Discussion of DNSSEC, ENUM?