DNSSEC Operational Practices, Version 2

draft-ietf-dnsop-rfc4641bis-03

From: Olaf Kolkman <olaf@NLnetLabs.nl>
Subject: **[DNSOP] 4641bis (draft 3) status update**
Date: July 20, 2010 6:20:02 PM GMT+02:00
To: dnsop WG <dnsop@ietf.org>

Point 1

- Is the set of arguments presented for major operational choices (e.g. single versus ksk-zsk split, and key effectivity period) complete and are the arguments fairly represented?

Point 2

- Should this document try to give strong recommendations or should a separate document (set) be made that gives recommendations for certain operational environments (e.g. BCP for root, BCP for TLD, BCP for enterprise)?

- straw man for consensus:
  This document should not give strong recommendations but provide comprehensive arguments (like it does now); development of recommendations is left for later, either in a follow up (RFC4641bis-bis) or as a set of separate documents)

Point 3

- Document Audience: 'the authoritative side of the DNS equation'.

Point 4

- http://www.nlnetlabs.nl/svn/rfc4641bis/trunk/open-issues/trust_anchor_configuration

- [is] the document in any way restrictive on not using 5011, or is its consideration for advising RFC5011 to strong?

Point 5

- 4.4.2 about a Maximum signature validity and Minimum validity period in fairly broad terms. It also provides motivations for differentiating Signature Validity periods for different RRsets in a zone, those motivations are few and week.

- Is the text about signature validity complete in argumentation and motivation

Point 6

- Drop Appendix B? Improve it?

Point 7

- Closing Open Issues
  - (possibly reopening them)