

EDDI Meeting, 1st November

Nick Blades, Telefonica	Robert Mortimer, Schlumberger
Andy Fidler, BT	Jim , Infoblox
Glenn Deen, Comcast	Simon Hicks, DDCMS
Adam Kinsley, Sky	Stacie Hoffman, Oxford Information Labs
Nancy Hine, Sky	Chris Box, BT
Ian Sharp, Atis	Dave Clelland, BT
Andrew Campling, 419 Consulting	Stuart Paton, Open-Xchange
Pat Tarpey, Ofcom	Peter, Infoblox
Alistair, Safecast	Till Sommer, ISPA
Hugh Dixon, Sky	

Introductions and Agenda

- GitHub material for the meeting accessible [here](#).
- Slide presentation [here](#)
- EDDI anti-trust policy applies to the meeting – see slides for details.

Recent Activity

- Ian – see latest Google blog post on resolver choice
- Robert – increase in Chrome browsers using DoH, catching up with FF on enterprise network; also FF registry setting to disable DoH doesn't work at session level (ie user can over-ride, will be reset when next restarted).
- Glenn – Comcast DoT and DoH servers are up and running (early stages, are running as open resolvers unlike Do53); DNS teams may have less recent experience in TCP than UDP therefore something to pay attention to is that they may need to refresh their memory on TCP tuning. Comcast is now on the Chrome list for DoH servers.
- Deutsche Telekom also has a DoH server up and running
- Dave – BT/OX DoH test server has been up and running for a couple of months

IETF ABCD

- The ABCD BoF will cover resolver discovery, resolvers expressing differing policies (the latter point appears to have been moved from the DPrive charter). Possibly also the Canary Domain.
- A decision is to be made whether to proceed to charter an IETF Working Group – a presentation at NANOG suggested that a WG was pretty much guaranteed.
- Ref to the BCP and proposed WG charter (Chris Box – <https://trac.tools.ietf.org/bof/trac/#ApplicationsandReal-Time>).
- Iain –include canary domain, also O/S using DOH
- Pat – Interactions with other WGs, eg DANE are not clear from the documentation, need to be addressed

- From the draft WG charter, there was consensus that following section should be removed:
 - Best Current Practices for the deployment and operation of encrypted DNS transport, including:
 - recommendations on detailed protocol usage
 - best practices for running a DNS service with encrypted transport
 - guidelines for deployment models that minimize issues with pervasive monitoring, commercial use of DNS data, and other privacy concerns
- Clarity is needed on the use case(s) being addressed
- Discussion about merits of o/s doing DNS vs apps doing DNS directly – benefits of the latter remain far from clear.
- Predictability and consistency of performance need to be addressed.
- Naming of the WG needs to be addressed, should not be ABCD

IETF DoH Discovery and Privacy Related IDs – Andy (with Chris and Dave)

- Slide presentation [here](#)
- There are at least seven current draft IDs spread across 4 WGs:
 - DNS Ops: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-dnsop-resolver-information-00>
 - DPRIVE:
 - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-pauly-dprive-adaptive-dns-privacy>
 - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-pauly-dprive-oblivious-doh>
 - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-reddy-dprive-dprive-privacy-policy-00#section-9>
 - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-reddy-dprive-bootstrap-dns-server-05>
 - DoH - <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-peterson-doh-dhcp-01>
 - ADD - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-grover-add-policy-detection/>
- There are too many disparate documents with inconsistent content, the authors need to harmonise and consolidate the proposals
- ISPs need to document a use case around CPE-based stub resolvers
- The Canary domain – this needs clarity on when / how it works as implemented by Mozilla (and whether there is a better solution) together with a clear use case
- Oblivious – unclear on use case(s) to be solved, has significant adverse implications for malware C&C detection. Complex, does raise concerns re operational viability and well as with regards predictability and consistency of performance.
- DPrive Privacy Policy – are the proposals consistent with this?
- DPrive Bootstrapping Endpoints – not aligned with the other I-Ds
- ADD Policy detection (Mozilla Canary Domain) – a lot more work needed

Use Cases - Glenn

Much more clarity is needed on use cases to enable consistent, objective evaluation of proposals, to go on Github accessible via

Example use cases could include:

- Dissident
- Coffee Shop
- A user simply wanting to know where their traffic is going (eg with an indicator within a browser session)
- CPE behaviour for stub resolvers....

AoB

Future Meetups - EDDI North America in late Jan / early Feb (possibly after OARC / NANOG in SF?)

DCMS – to publish technical advice to enterprises

Iain – NSIE to discuss DoH in January