

# EDDI Meeting Notes

## London 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020

### Introductions

- The anti-trust guidelines were displayed and highlighted – see also <https://www.encrypted-dns.org/legal-privacy>
- Glenn reminded people to be kind and respectful

### Agenda

- Agenda bash
- EDDI Introduction
- Introductions
- IETF activity

### Break

- Deployments – Andy Fidler
- Use cases and taxonomy
- Next steps and future meetups
- AoB

### EDDI Introduction

(See GitHub for the slides - <https://github.com/Encrypted-DNS-Deployment-Initiative/Reference/blob/master/meetings/1.30.20-London/blob/master/meetings/1.30.20-London/Agenda%20EDDI%201.30.20.pdf>)

The goal of EDDI is to ensure the smooth introduction and reliable operation at scale of DNS encryption operation. It overlaps with the IETF list on technical issues but extends into policy issues too, and will develop best practices for deployment. All interactions are public.

### IETF Activity

- IETF Adaptive DNS Discovery (ADD) Draft Working Group Charter – see the two slides for the text
- It's worth stating on the list that people can live with the draft charter, don't get drawn into detailed discussion on the list on topics that the WG itself can discuss in due course. Focus instead on the scope or the WG, sorting co-chairs, key milestones etc.
- Think about contributions to the WG in terms of ideas etc through microphone comments, information draft(s) etc. Ideally keep any drafts simple and focused – if necessary, use several submissions to cover different ideas.

- Treat topics such as DNS filtering with sensitivity, focusing on high level requirements, use cases etc.
- The draft charter proposal is deliberately high level, concentrates on resolver discovery and selection across public, private and local networks. It doesn't address many issues that aren't directly relevant to protocol design as these are largely out of scope for the IETF, might be addressed elsewhere including by documents developed within the auspices of EDDI, for example by documenting requirements in use cases on GitHub.
- Whilst the charter is being agreed and working group established, use the time to write information drafts and have them ready to submit to the group when formed. In the meantime, indicate support for the draft charter and encourage the ADs etc to form the WG, preferably stating which area(s) you are prepared to work on too.
- Milestones for the working group are needed – please send any suggestions directly to Glenn. The group probably needs to start by reviewing existing documents, harmonise them by IETF 108 etc. With regards co-chairs, Glenn has already volunteered, no doubt others will do too: co-chairs will ideally be neutral, focus on ensuring that the group runs smoothly towards consensus, probably over the next 2-3 years.

**Action (all): if people email Andrew Campling ([Andrew.Campling@419.COnsulting](mailto:Andrew.Campling@419.COnsulting)) with details of relevant drafts from the various IETF lists, a list of those pertinent to the Working Group will be included within the EDDI GitHub.**

## DoH Deployments – Andy Fidler, BT

(See GitHub for the slides - <https://github.com/Encrypted-DNS-Deployment-Initiative/Reference/blob/master/meetings/1.30.20-London/EDDI%20Jan%20Update%20on%20BT%20DoH%20trials%20Issue%201%20300120.pdf>)

The BT DoH resolver is working okay with Firefox, should be okay with Chrome from version 81. Supports BT parental controls if selected by the user.

Problems identified during the trial to date:

- Lack of support for stub resolvers in CPE – **Action (ISPs): this needs to be documented on GitHub in a use case at <https://github.com/Encrypted-DNS-Deployment-Initiative/Use-Cases>**
- Need for discovery to be context aware, eg to use a closed resolver when on-net and an open resolver when on a coffee shop network – **Action (all): this needs to be documented on GitHub in a use case (see above link).**
- The early BT test results suggest that TLS1.2 adds an overhead vs TLS1.3
- Some of the test results highlight differences in resolver behavior settings which suggest there are trade-offs being made between performance and privacy
- Cookie policy of servers and clients needs to be addressed, as do other mechanisms that might serve to identify users
- **Action (Andy Fidler): Andy will review ways to share the Curl test scripts**

(See also the post on Comcast's proposed testing using Sam Knows from Jason Livingood at <http://lists.encrypted-dns.org/scripts/wa-ENCDNS.exe?A2=ENCRYPTED-DNS;72ebe169.2001&S=>).

## Use Cases (and Taxonomy)

Some documents have been placed on GitHub, use cases now need to be added and populated

EDDI: <https://www.encrypted-dns.org/>

Email archive: <http://lists.encrypted-dns.org/scripts/wa-ENCDNS.exe?A0=ENCRYPTED-DNS>

GitHub: <https://github.com/Encrypted-DNS-Deployment-Initiative>

## Next Steps and Future EDDI Meetings

(See notes of past meetings on GitHub)

- In San Francisco on 9<sup>th</sup> February during DNS OARC
- In London on March 2<sup>nd</sup> pm, possibly at Sky offices in Osterly, may include breakout tables to focus on particular topics and move discussions forward
- An IETF 107 Vancouver side meeting, ditto IETF 108 Madrid in July
- Is it worth considering an IETF 108 hackathon session, eg on test scripts?
- Other EDDI meetings? Possibly during the DNS OARC meeting in Paris, May 2020, potentially on the Thursday? Or during Ripe Berlin meeting the following week?

## AoB

- GitHub testing and measurement section: Use this to document methodologies
- Be aware that ISP performance testing results required by European regulation may be impacted by encrypted DNS (which in turn may need to be reflected in advertising)
- A suggested format for use cases would be helpful: follow RFC 7744? Chris Box will put a template on GitHub.
- Registries and Registrars are watching this space, with an interest in application behavior.