Bulk Leasequery for DHCPv4

draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv4-bulk-leasequery-02.txt

Authors:

Cisco Systems:

Kim Kinnear (prepared these slides)

Bernie Volz

Mark Stapp

Infosys Technologies

D. Rao

B. Joshi

Neil Russell

P. Kurapati

History

- Combined existing DHCPv4 Bulk Leasequery drafts from IETF 72:
  - draft-kinnear-dhc-dhcpv4-bulk-leasequery-00.txt
  - draft-dtv-dhc-dhcpv4-bulk-leasequery-00.txt
- Went through WG Last Call May 2009
- Two massive reviews, little other support.
- New draft (-01) October 2009
- Two reviews on that draft
- Current draft (-02) March 2010

How does it work?

- Existing DHCPv4 Leasequery (RFC4388) style query and responses
- Multiple responses to single query
- Uses TCP and frames existing messages
- Several new query types
  - relay-agent relay-id
  - relay-agent remote-id
  - query start and query end time
- Adds additional information necessary to properly interpret data

New Draft for this IETF (-02), changes from (-01) draft

- Removed grace period.
- Removed “sub-classing” of Message option in favor of a new status-code option.
- Numerous editorial changes based on another extensive review by Alfred Hoenes, didn’t change intent of draft.

Issues from Last Call

Comments here:

Ted Lemon: http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/dhcwg/current/msg09977.html
David Miles: http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/dhcwg/current/msg09979.html
Bud Millwood: http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/dhcwg/current/msg10253.html
Alfred Hoenes: two reviews, both extensive and I took essentially all of the edits.

I took most of the comments in these reviews (all of Bud's, most of Ted's and David's).

Comments not taken

- Needs less motivation, should generalize it. *Can't win here, everyone wants less or more.*
- Don't assign new message types. *Whatever the WG chairs tell me to do, I'll do.*
- Don't mix absolute and relative times in messages. *Absolute is necessary to support query times, and accurate time skew calculations. Relative makes sense so that disagreement is imposible.*
- Don't have query-times, too complicated. *We need to limit amount of data sent in many cases, some reviewers thought this was good too.*

Comments not taken (2)

- Released, Abandoned, Reset means servers have to keep track how IP's got available. *Not required, useful if you've got the info, ok if you don't.*
- TCP requires relay-agent to have IP. *True, but UDP based solutions have been shot down in the past, so here we are.*
- Why do you need more info than active vs. inactive? *Deciding "best" value from two DHCP servers running some kind of availability solution requires considerable data. We can always to this with vendor specific options, but thought that others might care too.*

Next Steps

Another WG last call.

- It needs people to read it and either support it or not!
- This doesn’t mean you have to send in three pages of comments, just that you’ve read it and thought about it and think it worth moving forward.