

CDNI Redirection Interface

draft-ietf-cdni-redirection-13

IETF 94
Yokohama

Ben Niven-Jenkins
Ray van Brandenburg

Update since Prague

- 2 new versions (-11 posted earlier today)
- Included new approach to MIME Types
 - Typo in section 4.3 (thanks Rob!) will be fixed in -14
- Added section that explicitly calls out security concerns with DNS Redirection (see next slides)

DNSSEC & DNS vs HTTP redirection - 1

- Triggered by a comment from Jon at IETF 93
- Authors added some text to -13 but it didn't cover Jon's comment 😞
- Discussion on mailing list clarified scenario:
 - DNSSEC enables DNS responses to be authenticated & therefore User Agents can distinguish between genuine redirection responses & malicious redirection responses

DNSSEC & DNS vs HTTP redirection - 2

- Authors' have proposed new text:
The redirection interface defined in this document enables a uCDN to return a DNS response on behalf of a dCDN. If DNSSEC is deployed User Agents can authenticate the DNS responses they receive, enabling them to distinguish between genuine responses (redirections) and malicious responses (redirections). Without DNSSEC a User Agent is unable to detect a malicious DNS redirect. HTTPS redirection provides an additional layer of authentication via TLS because in order for the TLS handshake to complete, the server the User Agent connects to must authenticate itself to the User Agent.
- Does this adequately address the original comment?
 - If not, can you suggest text that would?

IPR Disclosure

- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/ipr/2657/> :
- "Juniper Networks, Inc.'s Statement about IPR related to draft-ietf-cdni-redirection"

Licensing information, comments, notes, or URL for further information See Text Below for Licensing Declaration

If technology in this document is included in a standard adopted by IETF and any claims of any Juniper patents are necessary for practicing the standard, any party will have the right to use any such patent claims under reasonable, non-discriminatory terms, with reciprocity, to implement and fully comply with the standard.

The reasonable non-discriminatory terms are:

If this standard is adopted, Juniper will not assert any patents owned or controlled by Juniper against any party for making, using, selling, importing or offering for sale a product that implements the standard, provided, however that Juniper retains the right to assert its patents (including the right to claim past royalties) against any party that asserts a patent it owns or controls (either directly or indirectly) against Juniper or any of Juniper's affiliates or successors in title or against any products of Juniper or any products of any of Juniper's affiliates either alone or in combination with other products; and Juniper retains the right to assert its patents against any product or portion thereof that is not necessary for compliance with the standard.

Royalty-bearing licenses will be available to anyone who prefers that option.

WG decision re IPR disclosure

Brought up on the list:

<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/cdni/current/msg02270.html>

- Option 1: consider that the licensing terms are acceptable and continue with current plan
- Option 2: change our plan somehow

Next steps

- Finalise text for DNS redirection issue
- Submit to IESG