

# QNAME minimisation, the next (last?) steps

Stéphane Bortzmeyer - AFNIC

IETF 92 - Dallas

Three small questions

# Negative consequences

- Some people [http://blogs.verisigninc.com/blog/entry/minimum\\_disclosure\\_what\\_information\\_does](http://blogs.verisigninc.com/blog/entry/minimum_disclosure_what_information_does) says that qname minimisation minimises the amount of data sent (yes, that's the goal).
- Privacy, like every security feature, is always a compromise.
- **The negative consequences are today presented at the beginning of section 3 of the draft -02. Is this mention sufficient or should we add something?**

# Hiding the qtype? Issue #9, from Shumon Huque

- Current text in -02 hides the qtype being a generic QTYPE=NS (or A as a fallback for some broken boxes).
- Auth. name servers can no longer see (DSC) and publish data about qtypes (AAAA/A, prevalence of SRV...)
- Should we preserve the original qtype?

# Keep optimisations?

- Draft -02 mentions two algorithms, an aggressive one (never send full qnames) and a lazy one (underspecified, leaks more data).
- Should we keep both? Or just the aggressive one?
- Same thing for other possible optimisations like treating the root and the TLDs in a special way?
- Is it even necessary since a resolver can optimise at will (unilateral decision)?