

DHCPv6 bis

Issues Needing Consensus

Thursday, November 5, 2015

15:20-17:20 JST

Latest Edit: 11/4/2015 10:50JST

Status

- We continue to work on document
 - Ticket count dropping
 - But still have plenty outstanding
- We meet virtually first Wed each month and at IETF meetings when possible
- We have a few issues we want WG input on
 - We have proposal for each
 - We will confirm any “decisions” on ML

Current Ticket Status (1/2)

<u>Ticket</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Status</u>
#102	Merge RFC3633 Section 7: Overview of DHCP with Prefix Delegation (0.7 page)	Assigned (Bernie)
#142	Reorganize server/client behavior?	Assigned (Marcin)
#145	Add privacy considerations?	In progress (Tomek)
#131	Confusion on T1/T2 times (option values vs client renew/rebind triggers)	Assigned (Bernie)
#61	stateful-issues 4.3: T1/T2 timers	Assigned (Bernie)
#132	Use DHCPv6 or DHCP	Open – last step cleanup
#133	Update abstract	Assigned (Ted)
#137	Move/rework sections 1.2/1.3 (& 5)?	Open (unassigned)
#138	Security considerations update needed	Assigned (Ted)
#141	Delegated prefix selection	Assigned (Tim)
#114	Clarify Prefix Length Hint	Likely done – referenced draft-cui-dhc-dhcpv6-prefix-length-hint-issue

Current Ticket Status (2/2)

<u>Ticket</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Status</u>
#81	Bakeoff: Server: ORO	Assigned (Ted) – Will be discussed
#140	Client uses information from the IAs that do not contain NoPrefixAvail and NoAddrsAvail status code	Assigned (Marcin) – awaiting consensus?
#147	Document the process of acquiring of the client-forced "new" address and deprecation of the "old" address	Assigned (Andrew)
#18	ORO - mandatory?	Assigned (Ted)
#68	Bakeoff: Clients - Prefix Length of Assigned Addresses	Assigned (Sheng)
#150	Clarify client MUST drop option if not received in subsequent Reply	New
#151	Release IA_PD information	New
#152	Prefix lifetime is 0	New

There are a few others, but they are mostly editorial (i.e., to assure consistency in the document).

ORO (#81)

- Options in ORO:
 - Protocol-required options **MUST NOT** appear in ORO
 - 3315bis will enumerate options which **MUST NOT** appear in the ORO (i.e., Client ID, Server ID, ...)
 - Will request IANA to add a column in option registry
 - Other top-level options **MUST** appear in ORO or will not be sent by server
 - Slight change from RFC 3315, which allows the server to send extra options
 - Exception: ***options MAY be administratively configured to be sent on server***
 - Only container options **MUST** appear in the ORO:
 - The server **MUST** send all options that are eligible to be encapsulated in that container, if that container option is requested
 - Those options that are only encapsulated in a container **MUST NOT** be in the ORO
 - Exception: The ORO can be used to signal support for a feature even when that option is encapsulated, as in the case of the Prefix Exclude option (RFC 6603)
 - However, this requires special processing by the server

Client Option Handling (#150 - new)

- Clarify that if client stops receiving “other configuration” option X in a Reply when requested, **in general** it should drop any previous configuration and “return” to its default state regarding that configuration
 - Renew/Rebind
 - Information-Request
- Option documents may specify other behavior for more complex cases (i.e.,
OPTION_DHCP4_O_DHCP6_SERVER)

Release Delegated Prefix (#151 - new)

- Problem: There is currently no text for if/when a client should invalidate prefix information that has been delegated when a DHCPv6 Release for a IA_PD is performed
- Solution: The prefix should be invalidated once the DHCPv6 Release is performed. For example, RAs must be transmitted to set the preferred lifetime to zero.

Prefix Lifetime of 0 (#152 - new)

- A DHCPv6 client SHOULD send a DHCPv6 Renew for a given address if a Router Advertisement is received with a lifetime of 0
- This covers the case when the DHCPv6 Server that gave out the address has released the Delegated pool back to the Server
 - According to Ticket [#151](#), the Request Router should transmit RAs with a lifetime of 0
 - Triggering a DHCPv6 Renew will make sure the address is still valid or new one may be assigned

Prefix Delegation Hints (#114)

- See draft-cui-dhc-dhcpv6-prefix-length-hint-issue draft (discussed earlier)
 - 3315bis coauthors will monitor to determine next steps
 1. Let draft proceed on its own
 2. Incorporate changes into 3315bis document
- Intent is still to leave to server policy whether PD length hints honored, but describe expected behavior if server supports

Document Shepherd / Consensus

- WG co-chairs and secretary are co-authors
- Ralph Droms agreed to shepherd this document when ready
 - Current WG chairs and secretary are co-authors
- AD will do WGLC consensus call