
KATHY SCHNITT: Welcome to the SSAC Evolution of the DNS Resolution Work Party Teleconference on Thursday, the 5th of May 2022. Barry, I believe you want Russ to take over, correct?

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, please.

KATHY SCHNITT: Okay. Russ, over to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Happy Cinco de Mayo to those people who celebrate that.

BARRY LEIBA: As Marilyn calls it, Cinco de Drinko.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I still have my hangover from the Star Wars Day.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's many holidays. Queen's birthday is different. Different holidays are excuses to imbibe. At any rate, we had two action items from last week. The first one was to look at the two documents, RSSAC026 and RFC 8499, then see if we were comfortable using their terminology. I took a look. Did anybody else? I did.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TARA WHALEN: I did.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. I did for the RFC one but not the other.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I found a section in there that basically says we tried not to duplicate in the RFC what's already in the RSSAC document. I think one term did and they referenced and said, "We say the same thing." Anyway, I was pretty comfortable with what I saw. Did anyone feel otherwise?

BARRY LEIBA: I'm taking a quick look now and I'm good with what I see.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I did not feel otherwise. I'll just point out that there was another SSAC document, the one on—I'm forgetting the number. It was a recent one. It was like 117, where we stated in the front that we would use terminology from RSSAC [262]. So there's a bit of an SSAC precedent for using that terminology at least.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I'm not hearing anyone object so—

BARRY LEIBA: Moving forward.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let's adopt that set of terminology from those two documents until it becomes an impediment, and then we'll address whatever that impediment is.

All right. The second thing that we had for homework was we started talking about not just DNS resolution a couple of places last week. We also started talking about ways that people are using the DNS differently. For example, Acme challenges so that use the DNS to prove that you have control over the domain name. We were questioning whether we should increase the scope to talk about that. I've been thinking about it. I hope others have too. I'll share my thoughts after some other people go first.

WARREN KUMARI: I'm quite concerned by how large the scope of this already is and how likely or able SSAC is to get things written and done. Traditionally, what seems like it should be a very short and simple document can take us a huge time investment to get things accomplished. So keeping the scope small seems good to me. However, based upon the audience, which I think we expect, there's a huge amount of background information which we have to provide for almost anything that we say that's technical. So it's hard to talk about stuff that is just DNS resolution

without also having to explain in fairly small baby words all of the surrounding stuff. So ideally, try and keep the scope as limited as possible would be great. But I don't know how we do that while also being able to write at a level that people will understand. But that actually answer the question in order. I just say it's complicated.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, you said some things that are consistent with what I was thinking. But I'll respond to your comments after others have had an opportunity. I see Barry's hand.

BARRY LEIBA: I started off lowering my hand when Warren said, "Yeah, the scope is already pretty broad," because that's what I was thinking. But then probably as with you, I decided there's more to say than that. So the specific example you gave of the Alto stuff I think is important to talk about.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Acme, not Alto.

BARRY LEIBA: Sorry, the Acme stuff, because it does speak to security and stability issues. The other thing that I think of is everybody putting everything into TXT records, and what that does to security and stability issues when there are a million sub records within the TXT record and that sort of thing. I think we would be remiss if we didn't talk about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I think I'm in line with the comments that have been made so far. It gets challenging to talk about some of the operational stuff that is in scope, different applications using DNS differently, etc., and how that works without at least tying it to why people are doing that. So it gets to the same point one. I'm just looking at it from a different angle, but I think that in order to provide context and a why should I care that people are doing these different things that are having an impact on how DNS resolves over time and into the future, what's the appropriate level of background context, what's the reasoning, etc., that we want to provide. I think we need to provide something. But that leads to kind of a slippery slope of getting into a whole bunch of stuff that we may not want to. So I don't know that we need to expand the charter but we do need to be thinking about how we want to talk about some of these things that are driving these different things that we're seeing and do want to talk about within the document and do it in a way that provides enough context but doesn't start getting into examining that, etc. So that's my thoughts. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Tara?

TARA WHALEN:

I'm pretty much in agreement. This document is probably going to expand as we go even with our best intentions to try to keep it narrow. So I always prefer people trying to make some decisions early on, because no matter what we're probably going to blow past our original remit, that sort of happens, things grow in the writing of them. But also, I think it's pretty similar to what Rod was saying that we are probably going to wind up if we think about, in a sense, how DNS is being used or an expansion of how it's being used, maybe that's not going to be the driver for the evolution or look at the places in which some of those uses may be making DNS resolution itself evolve rather than, in a sense, taking advantage of pre-existing functionality. So there might be some places where, I guess, we could say, "Are there pressures that are being brought to bear on the way that things operate because of some of these new and evolving uses?" So there might be some places where we can just cut that off, and then maybe there are particular ones where we say, "All right, this is significant enough to be, I guess, worth discussing because it's more of a driver."

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. I don't see any hands. My take was slightly different than what you all said but not in conflict. My take was where one of the uses is affecting resolution, we should tackle it, because then it's a pressure that's evolving it. But where you're just using like Acme, yes, there's the TXT record aspect of it but it's not affecting resolution. It's just affecting that there's more resource records. That was my reaction that we should steer away from the second where it's not affecting resolution, it's just increasing the number of records. That was my thought. Barry?

BARRY LEIBA: It strikes me that as we are using DNS more and more as part of the security mechanism except it certainly comes under SSAC's remit to talk about those aspects, and that's sort of what I was getting at.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, but as a part of this document is what I was getting at.

BARRY LEIBA: I can go either way with that. But yeah, you're right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It certainly is. But actually, the case that brought this question up, the Acme one, is not causing an evolution of the way that the resolution is handled but it is affecting what people consider to be adequate proof that you are a owner of a domain. Now, that topic maybe is a separate thing to write about, but I don't think there's pressure to evolve resolution.

BARRY LEIBA: I think you're convincing me of that. The other thing that I will note is we said at the beginning, and it's probably in the charter, that we may wind up writing more than one document if that's the way it looks like is the best way to organize the information. So perhaps we want to consider a second document that talks about other uses of DNS that were not originally intended.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm fine with taking that and shoving it to the backburner.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Then we find out whether we have enough energy left to bring it forward after we get this document done. Does that make sense?

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, full agreement from here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone not see it that way? All right, cool. Well, those are the two—go ahead.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Just to clarify. It sounds like the topics that were under Section 2.5 on the draft working document had been ruled out of scope.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is correct.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll record that as a decision. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know if anyone put comments in the document this week since our two actions had nothing to do with the document, but we should look.

WARREN KUMARI: Actually, a quick question. We've been talking about scope and stuff. How long are we expecting this thing to all take?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I hope that it's not crazy that we make steady progress. I don't know how else to ... Being my first SSAC Work Party, you probably know better than I do.

BARRY LEIBA: I was hoping that we could get it done this year.

WARREN KUMARI: How long did you think the Routing Security one would take us?

BARRY LEIBA: I think I'm going to mute again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Clearly, it's taken longer than you thought.

BARRY LEIBA: Oh yeah.

WARREN KUMARI: But my point is I think that all SSAC work parties seem to take five or six times as long as we would expect that they would take when we stop them at least. I thought the Routing Security one should have been like three meetings and we would have been done.

BARRY LEIBA: One of the things is that we're more used to in the IETF that a couple, three people go off and write the document, and we debate the technical points in the document but we don't agonize over every line. And here, we seem to agonize over every line. Then when it comes out of the work party, we get comments from SSAC as a whole that agonize over every line so we go back and do it again.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes. I should point out that there is a whole work party doing on consensus and how SSAC could work better.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wait a minute, that's a separate topic that Rod put a Doodle out for. Let's not explore that rat hole here and there.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. It's just exactly what Barry said. It should be good input for that.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, yes. Anyway, Warren, that still answers your question of what kind of timeframe we're talking about. I would like to see this proceed a pace and not take forever. Let's see what we can do to make that happen.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I think Warren just argued for was when you have a complete draft, send it to all of SSAC so you can find out what are your corrections and alignment.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. I think it may be a little difficult to get people to take a review seriously when we're saying it's still a work in progress, but we can try.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. But also, I think that my main point was, try and keep the scope as narrow as we possibly can because even simple things end up taking a massive time. So a massive thing is going to take a massive time as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think we made a decision consistent with that.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Andrew, do you want to bring—go ahead.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. I just had a question in this. While we're talking about scope, we have all these things currently in the working document. Do we want to go through like a culling exercise of those items to narrow the scope further? I just say that because I'm also looking at everything in Section 3 and Section 4, and that's a lot. That's a lot of stuff we have there. It could be now that we've listed all of those things. There might be a little bit of duplication and that's easy to deal with, but there might also be things that now that we look at them again, we're like, "We don't really have to talk about that," or "That's not as important as these other things." So, before we even put pen to paper, do we want to narrow the scope further?

BARRY LEIBA: My vision of it was that we would narrow the scope as we started fleshing it out. But maybe trying to do it first is a better idea. I don't know. What I thought is people would start putting in some text. And as that progressed, we would say, "Okay, this section can be merged with that section. This section doesn't really say anything that we need to say here and that sort of stuff."

RUSS HOUSLEY: It does kind of make sense to take an action item for the group to go through it and identify things that they think are not like the others to use Sesame Street.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. I think that's a fine idea, especially using Sesame Street, especially this group.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Andrew, does that make sense?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It does. Yeah, I'll record that action item.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So what we had been doing is trying to find a section of the document that we wanted to focus people's attention on for the week. We didn't do that last week because we had those two action items that seemed sufficient for the week. But if you could bring up the document, I think it'd be good to pick a section or a couple of bullets in the section to help people look at this week. My memory is the last time we did it, it was kind of toward the bottom of Section 3. Or was it 4? I guess we accepted all the six people put in there.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. Section four is where we want to put a bit of effort in at this point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think so, too. Okay. So we kind of did it toward the bottom last time. Maybe we can take maybe the first five bullets or so, top-level bullets, and ask people to start putting their thoughts in here, including whether it's a candidate for just make it go away. Anyone want to talk about one of those now just to get the creative juices going?

WARREN KUMARI: Apparently not.

BARRY LEIBA: I'll just note that the last bullet on page six and its sub bullets are examples of the stuff we just—or at least a lot—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, exactly.

BARRY LEIBA: We said we were going to put on the backburner for a possible second document later.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's actually what I read that bullet—the last that was at the bottom of the screen before the scroll—was the reason I said including whether this is a target for removal.

BARRY LEIBA: That and its sub bullets should be pulled aside. We might decide to take an item or two from the sub bullets and move it back up later, but yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If people don't want to talk now, then we'll just take this homework. I'll give you a half hour back.

BARRY LEIBA: All right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right.

BARRY LEIBA: So I guess we're saying that the top-level bullets on page six in Section 4 are stuff we want to focus on first?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, guys. Thank you. Please do your homework this week.

BARRY LEIBA: And tell all your friends.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Have a good one.

WARREN KUMARI: Actually, Russ, do you have a couple of minutes and chat just about other stuff?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]