DHCP Options for the Port Control Protocol (PCP)

I-D.ietf-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