

draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

IETF 90

Toronto

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Version -06 reached “WG Consensus: Waiting for Write-Up” state
- During PROTO write-up
  - Stefan raised 6 issues
  - Addressed in a new version -07 before TSVDIR review
- Status to be (hopefully) moved to “Waiting for TSVDIR review”

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #177
  - **Q:** Text about the *Violating RFC2865* Operational consideration (section 11) was outdated. Newer version was provided by Alan on the mailing list, but not included.
  - **A:** Revision -07 has the corrected text
  - **Status:** Resolved.

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #178
  - **Q:** It was not clear whether fragments were allowed to go in both directions during pre-authorization and post-authorization phases.
  - **A:** Revision -07 contains a more clear text explaining that pre-authorization is intended for traffic from the NAS to the AS, whereas post-authorization is intended for traffic from the AS to the NAS.
  - **Status:** Almost resolved. Need a stronger statement against sending traffic in the opposite direction.

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #179
  - **Q:** IANA considerations section did not follow RFC 5226 suggestions.
  - **A:** Revision -07 contains a new IANA considerations section, following RFC 5226
  - **Status:** Almost resolved. There is a nit when referring RFC2865 instead of RFC6929 for the Long Extended Space.

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #180
  - **Q:** Stefan provided several small comments and nits
  - **A:** Revision -07 addressed most of these comments, including the new figure for the CoA section.
  - **Status:** Almost resolved. Some of the comments haven't been addressed yet.

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #181
  - **Q:** Section 6 was not clear about fragmentation limits in terms of both, total size limit and packet count limit.
  - **A:** Revision -07 includes more clear text provided by Stefan.
  - **Status:** Resolved.

# draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation

- Issue #182
  - **Q:** Some transport-related issues were raised by Joe Touch (tsv-area)
  - **A:** Revision -07 includes a new section called *Transport Considerations*, clarifying that the use of this specification does not modify the way RADIUS interacts with transport layer. Other comments were considered out of the scope of this document, as they were more related to RADIUS itself rather than to this particular specification.
  - **Status:** Resolved.