IETF 69 dnsop

reverse-mapping-considerations
Andrew Sullivan <andrew@ca.afilias.info>
Daniel Senie <dts@senie.com>

Major changes -02 to -03

- Numerous edits for clarification and disambiguation (many thanks to reviewers!):
  - eliminate terms like "useful"
  - fix NXDOMAIN to Name Error
  - etc
- Broke former section 3.1 into two pieces:
  - practices
  - utility and effectiveness

Major changes -02 to -03 cont'd

- History section

- General recommendations section

- Note about "undue burden" on network operators

Missed in -03

- A certain addle-minded editor misfiled useful feedback from the list about the term "in use"

- Required quick release of -04 to fix

- Became issue 17 in tracker

Additional changes in -04

- Issue 18: RFC 1912
  - RFC 1912 appears to suggest that missing PTR records for any A record is a configuration or operational error
  - seems contrary to feedback from WG
  - mentioned explicitly in -04 draft
- Issue 19: confusing example
  - references to RFC 4255 removed from examples in section 1.3 of the text.

Remaining controversies

- Suggestion that the document still imposes too great a burden on operators

    - commentators remain concerned about recommendation that in most cases, hosts in the forward tree should almost always have an entry in the reverse tree

    - Question to group: is this not addressed by "not intended to impose undue burden" in section 4.2?

Remaining controversies cont'd

- Remark on a non-IETF list suggested that MTAs attached to Internet MUST have reverse mappings.
  - unable to find such an RFC
  - investigation of RFC 2505/BCP 0030 appears to suggest reverse mappings may be used as part of validation strategy
  - question for WG: should RFC2505 be referenced in this draft?

Remaining controversies cont'd

- draft-anderson-reverse-dns-status contribution

  - should we incorporate references to RFC 1788, which is experimental?

  - section 3.6 includes the exhortation

    Delegate all addresses in block. Do not assume that everyone uses ethernet.

  Should that language be incorporated in the current draft?

Comments, please

This work item has been around for a *long* time

Your editors are cautiously optimtistic that the current version is very close to finished

If you think there are problems with the draft as it is, please send those comments to the list as soon as possible.