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Draft data

• DNS Zone Transfer Protocol (AXFR)
  — draft-ietf-dnsext-axfr-clarify-07

• Revision history
  -00 dated March 2000 ...
  -05 dated November 2002
  -06 dated January 2008 (~6 years later)

• Name changed between -05 and -06
Why the sudden interest?

• Commercial concerns are requesting DNS operations access "via AXFR"
• Lack of a clear definition leads to interoperability faults
• The 5 year hold up was over procedural matters, not technical
  – But the -05 document needed a refresh anyway
What was the issue?

• One person claimed process violations in the handling of his comments on the early versions of the draft
• Looking at the substance of the objections, most were already positively addressed by -05
• Today there seems to be no obstacle to finishing this off
But changes abound

• From -05 to -06 a complete rewrite
  – New title as this isn't "just" a clarification but a thickening of the specification
  – From experience in writing the Wild Card RFC (4592)
  – "Updation" style of specifying the protocol
-07 comments

• One item on list
  – It might be useful to explicitly state the requirement that an AXFR client sending an AXFR query with EDNS0 *MUST* be able to receive multiple records per response message

• I'm sure there will be more
  – It's been a few weeks since I've worked on it
My concerns about the road ahead

• I would like to hear from more implementers (than I have already heard from) about the "reality" of AXFR details
  – This makes this a true interoperability document, not the codification of "one school of thought"

• As editor I plan to individually bug implementers for comments if I don't hear sooner
I'm done talking about...

• "DNS Zone Transfer Protocol (AXFR)"

• Discussion time is up to the meeting chair

• Follow up discussion on namedroppers

• The next slides in my deck are about AXFR over UDP, a later agenda item
AXFR over UDP

• During the discussion it was noticed that AXFR is only defined on TCP and really, really relies on the use of a reliable transport layer
• There was some support for defining AXFR over UDP
Why?

• UDP is lightweight
• There are lots of little zones out there
• If the zone fits in one DNS message, it would be "cool."
Why not?

• There is a "work-wise" equivalent means to do this via IXFR
• Adding AXFR over UDP is another code path
Why did I still submit AXFR/UDP?

• Just because the code writers don't want to do it doesn't mean there's no call for it
• If a customer wants AXFR access to a small zone, IXFR may not be what they want to pay for
  – OTOH, maybe the customer can be convinced IXFR is good enough
• So I'm (just) proposing it in draft form
I'm done talking about...

• AXFR over UDP

• Discussion time is up to the meeting chair
• Follow ups to namedroppers
• Not a WG item, let me, err, the WG chair know if you think it should be