dhc WG

Agenda

Administrivia	**Ralph Droms**	**0:05**
New I-Ds to be considered by dhc WG	**Ralph Droms**	**0:15**
Node-Specific Client Identifiers for DHCPv4	**Ted Lemon**	**0:10**
Rapid Reply Option for DHCPv4	**S. D. Park**	**0:10**
Vendor-Identifying Vendor Options for DHCPv4	**Ralph Droms**	**0:05**
Client Identifier option in server replies	**Ralph Droms**	**0:10**
Extending DHCP Options Codes	**Ralph Droms**	**0:10**
Implementation Issues with RFC 2131	**Ralph Droms**	**0:20**
DHCPv4 Threat Analysis	**Mimi Zohar**	**0:10**
Platform integrity measurements	**Mimi Zohar**	**0:05**
Discussion of DHCP authentication	**Ralph Droms**	**0:20**
Configuration of dual-stack hosts with DHCP	**Ralph Droms**	**0:20**

New I-Ds for dhc WG

DHCPv6 support for IPv6 Transition, <draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-ipv6trans-00.txt>
A.K. Vijayabhaskar, S. Daniel Park

DHCP Discovery Extensions, <draft-rentschler-dhc-discovery-00.txt>
Markus Rentschler

DHCP Interface Information Option, <draft-rentschler-dhc-interface-opt-00.txt>
Markus Rentschler

DHCP Option for Proxy Server Configuration, <draft-ietf-dhc-proxyserver-opt-00.txt>
Senthil K Balasubramanian

The Extended Remote Boot Option for DHCPv4, <draft-ietf-dhc-opt-extrboot-00.txt>
A.K. Vijayabhaskar, B. Senthil Kumar

DHCPv6 Support for Remote Boot, <draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-opt-rboot-00.txt>
A.K. Vijayabhaskar, B. Senthil Kumar

Node-Specific Client Identifiers for DHCPv4

<draft-ietf-dhc-3315id-for-v4-00.txt>

- Definition of client identifiers in RFC 2131 is inadequate
- RFC 3315 defines “DUID” that can be used for DHCPv4
- Requires changes to RFC 2131
- Ready for WG last call? How do we address section 4.3?

Vendor-Identifying Vendor Options for DHCPv4

<draft-ietf-dhc-vendor-00.txt>

- Two new options for vendor class and vendor options – self-identifying
- Modeled on options in DHCPv6
- Ready for WG last call?

Extending DHCP Option Codes
<draft-ietf-dhc-extended-optioncodes-00.txt>

- Roughly 20 option codes remain unassigned
- Four proposals:
  1. Use option 126/127 encapsulation
  2. Use option codes 128-223
  3. Reclaim publicly assign codes not in use
  4. Use 16-bit options and new magic cookie
- Which to use?

RFC 2131 Implementation Issues

<draft-ietf-dhc-implementation-01.txt>

- Comments on document
- Publication – Informational?
- Next steps
  - RFC 2131bis
  - Full Standard status

Configuration of dual-stack hosts with DHCP

- Dual stack host may run DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 on same interface; what are the issues:
  - Why DHCPv4 if IPv6 RA and DHCPv6 is used?
    - Many DHCPv4 options that are not in DHCPv6
    - DHCPv4 address assignment
    - Different search paths
    - DNS server list; one with IPv4, IPv6
    - NTP servers

- Potential problem: merging information from two different sources
  - Already have that problem with dual-interface hosts in DHCPv4
  - “Laissez-faire” OK; or BCP for merging information
- Extensions to DHCPv6 for additional information (including IPv4 servers)
- Assume common administration of DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 service
- Can stacks be completely independent?
- Consider encoding IPv4 addresses in IPv6 addresses

- Not just DHCP – RA vs DHCPv4
- Implementation example: overwrite resolv.conf
- Search path is sort of an inverse problem: can pass names that resolve to both IPv6 and IPv4 in either DHCPv4 or DHCPv6
- DDNS updates are an issue…
  - But…it's "all one Internet"
  - Updates all go to authoritative server

- Experimentation?
- Some information is interface-specific; some is not
  - Can we use observation to give guidance?
  - May have to make case-by-case decision
- Rules to give mechanism for only consulting one server