IETF 77 DHC

draft-ietf-dhc-option-guidelines draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpinform-clarify

David W. Hankins

Internet Systems Consortium, Inc.

March, 2010

ietf-dhc-option-guidelines-06

- Mainly editorial changes from -05.
  - Does expand on option size discussion, enhancing the expression of differences between DHCPv4 and DHCPv6.

- Draft author's primary goal was to give 'deployability' guidelines. Effort was extended to 'DHCP Option Author Better Practices'.

ISC

So what's the Better Practice?

- Differentiates between 'protocol' and 'data' options.
- Stresses the re-use of 'Option Format Fragments', existing well-deployed field types.
- Criminalizes conditional-formatting.
- Advises against aliasing.

So what's the Better Practice?

(cont'd)

- When 'well deployed fragments' are insufficient, recommends towards 'general' new fragments.
- Discusses the pros and cons of a sub options space.
- Discusses option size limitations.
- Discusses PRL/ORO mechanics.

So what's the Better Practice?

(security)

- Points out clear-text nature of DHCP.
- Advises validation of option content length and content as part of new option drafts.
- Points out that a DHCP client can be a "willing Trojan" in a user's system.

Next Steps

- Currently formatted as "a list of mantras." Should it be reformatted as a walk-through or step-by-step?
    - A "template" on v4 and v6 definitions?
- Should PRL discussion recommend a boilerplate?
- Q&A?
- Ready for Last Call?

ietf-dhc-dhcpinform-clarify-04

- Mainly editorial changes from -03.
- Does simplify discussion of 'permitting a server to inspect a lease'

Draft's main points.

- Acknowledge DHCPINFORM is not just for manually configured hosts.
- Document "de facto standard" of clients that zero htype/chaddr/ciaddr.
- Prohibit use of 'chaddr' for vendor identification. "To ARP or not to…"
- Clarify strange situation with 'giaddr'.
- Permits server to interrogate lease.

One Minor Point

- One of the DHCPINFORM clients we're discussion broadcasts a DHCPINFORM after completing DHCPREQUEST/DHCPACK.

  - It clarifies the behaviour as undesired, ("SHOULD") asking the client to contact the server-identifier'd server rather than broadcast.

  - Is that correct?

Next Steps?

- The draft is currently organized as a set of overlays. Should it be a complete start-to-finish?
  - This clarification is useful if you already have a DHCPv4 implementation to compare it against.
  - Is it useful if you're writing a new server?
- Q&A? Last call?