AXFR "Clarify"

http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-dnsext-axfr-clarify-07.txt

AXFR over UDP

http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-lewis-axfr-over-udp-00.txt

IETF 71

DNSEXT WG meeting

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)
  - "Updating" 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