DHCP Options for the Port Control Protocol (PCP)

I-D.iets-pcp-dhcp
IETF 85-Atlanta, November 2012

M. Boucadair, R. Penno & D. Wing
Status

• Submit -05 which integrates the following changes agreed in the Vancouver meeting
  – Abandon RFC1035 encoding
  – Remove the text about server selection
WGLC Comments

• Spell out what strings are legal (S. Cheshire)
  – Proposed text: “A name may be a fully qualified domain name (e.g., myservice.example.com"), IPv4 address literals (e.g., 192.0.2.33) or IPv6 address literals (e.g., 2001:db8::1) [RFC5952].”
  – Need to say more?
WGLC Comments

• Specify what is meant by validate the name
  – Raised by D. Thaler and S. Cheshire
  – Resolution: A text was proposed in the mailing list
    “A name is considered as valid if it is a legal UTF-8 string which does not contain any nulls. The DHCPv6 client MUST silently ignore invalid names.”
WGLC Comments

• Suggest use multiple options each including a name or specify that it's multiple null-terminated Net-Unicode strings packed into the option (S. Cheshire)
  – The multiple option approach was abandoned in -03 as a result received during the WGLC
  – Any opinion about the null-terminated approach?
    • Keep the current text which prevents nulls in the name but uses the space character as a separator?
WGLC Comments

• Why a name option is defined instead of an IP address? (S. Cheshire)
  – This was discussed several times
  – The consensus of the WG is to define a name option
  – A more detailed discussion can be found here: http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-boucadair-dhc-address-name-encoding-01