draft-moura-dnsop-authoritative-recommendations-04

Giovane C. M. Moura[1,2], Wes Hardaker[3],
John Heidemann[3], Marco Davids[1]

DNSOP – IETF 105
Montreal, CA
2019-07-23

[1]SIDN Labs, [2]TU Delft, [3]USC/ISI

Draft History

- First time presented at DNSOP @ IETF103
  - Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l2ixYuwuaqY
  - Slides: https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/slides-104-dnsop-dnsop-authoritative-recommendations-01.pdf
- Today: -04
  - https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-moura-dnsop-authoritative-recommendations/04/
- All changes are documented in the text and on Github:
  - https://github.com/gmmoura/draft-moura-dnsop-authoritative-recommendations/issues

Draft History

- Before we show the changes: **thanks folks** for all your comments @103 in Prague
  - Even if I did not seem to agree there, most of folks were right
  - (I realized it watching the recordings later at the office)
- Today: covering most important issues (others on Github, fixed)

Changes from -03

Issue #14: `s/Recommendations/Considerations/`

- Liman pointed at 103 that the word “recommendations” is too strong
  - Could reduce setups’ heterogeneity
- So we replace it by “considerations”
- "Considerations" also used on other DNS RFCs (5395,6135,6895,7626)
- Note to self:
  - `IETF(Recommendation) != Paper(Recommendation)`
  - `Paper(Recommendation)` $\simeq$ `IETF(Consideration)`

Changes from -03

Issue #13: Draft mostly about anycast, but not exclusively

- Joe Abley pointed that except for the TTL consideration, all the others are related to anycast
- He is right
- Our fix:
  - `“It is likely that these considerations might be useful in a wider context, such as for any stateless/short-duration, anycasted service. Because the conclusions of the studies don’t verify this fact, the wording in this document discusses DNS authoritative services only.”`

Changes from -03

Issue #17: TTL considerations controversy

- Peter Koch pointed how complex the issue was (and it was tried 15 years ago)
- He says TTLs is for zone maintainers, not DNSOPs
  - Not true for all cases: many TLDs ops run their own DNSs as well, their parent TTLs may affect their child delegations TTLs
- Our fix:
  1. Rewritten it completely (highlighting issues pointed by Peter)
  2. New study (Moura19a) on TTLs (presented at IEPG) that covers most issues

Changes from -03

Issue #15: Paper selection could be more diverse

- 3 papers (not by the authors) added to references
- Also, paper's related work sections cover it
- "`This document describes the key engineering options, and points readers to the pertinent papers for details and other research works related to each recommendation here presented.`"

Changes from -03

Issue #12: Ripe Atlas bias on Consideration on anycast locations (C3)

- George Michaelson pointed that the “view of Atlas is biased to Europe" in C3
- The paper, however, show results *per region and country* (not mentioned in -03)



(b) L-Root

Fig. 5. Median RTT (quartiles as error bars) for countries with at least 5 VPs (number of VPs per country is given between parenthesis). Letters at top indicate continents.

Changes from -03

Issue #12: Ripe Atlas bias on Consideration on anycast locations (C3)

- Our fix: "`Given that Atlas has better coverage in Europe than other regions, the authors specifically analyzed results per region and per country (Figure 5 in [Schmidt17a]), and show that Atlas bias to Europe does not change the conclusion that location of anycast instances dominates latency.`"
- Also, the study has been peer-reviewed

Questions?

- Questions?
- Draft future?