

IETF 68 dnsop

reverse-mapping-considerations

Andrew Sullivan <andrew@ca.afilias.info>

Daniel Senie <dts@senie.com>

Closed issues as of -01

- Issues 2-4 and 9: policy items
- Issue 5: strength of recommendations
- Issues 8 & 12: use of “reverse” instead of INADDR, and considerations around IPv4 vs IPv6
- Issue 10: RFC 3330 address space

Issues not resolved and new issues in -01

- Response to issue 9 caused issue 15: note that some RIRs encourage reverse mapping
- Some comments that issue 13 was not adequately addressed by the motivation statement.
- Issue 14: complaint that phrases like “accurate reverse data” were emotionally charged
- Issue 16: phrasing of discussion of allocation of addresses on CIDR boundaries

Possible issue in -01

- Complaints that the -01 draft was ambiguous
 - no clear consensus on list
- At least one clear criticism that -01 appeared to recommend a behaviour that might not be a good idea
- Alternate text proposed
 - no statements of support
 - not included

Closed issues as of -02

- Issue 13: expanded the motivation statement from -01
- Issue 14: added definitions of existing reverse mapping and matching reverse mapping, and used them in text
- Issue 15: added text per discussion on list
- Issue 16: altered text in line with suggestion on list

Possibly controversial reaction to “ambiguity”

- Change in abstract
- Statement of non-endorsement at beginning of section 3
- Distinction between match and existence checks in anti-spam section
- Added counter-considerations in recommendations

Additional changes needed

- Still a hint of “reverse mapping is excellent; never use it.”
- Expect a -03 to address that
- Hoped to be final round
- If you have any other issues, please raise them now