Network Working Group INTERNET DRAFT Kim Kinnear Mark Stapp Richard Johnson Jay Kumarasamy Cisco Systems

March 2002 Expires August 2002

# VPN Identifier sub-option for the Relay Agent Information Option <<u>draft-ietf-dhc-agent-vpn-id-01.txt</u>>

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of <u>Section 10 of RFC2026</u>.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <a href="http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html">http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html</a>.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2002). All Rights Reserved.

## Abstract

In some environments, a relay agent resides in a network element which also has access to one or more VPNs. If one DHCP server wishes to offer service to DHCP clients on those different VPNs the DHCP server needs to know the VPN on which each client resides. The vpnid sub-option of the relay-agent-information option is used by the relay agent to tell the DHCP server the VPN for every DHCP request it passes on to the DHCP server, and is also used to properly forward

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002

[Page 1]

any DHCP reply that the DHCP server sends back to the relay agent.

## **<u>1</u>**. Introduction

There exist situations where there are multiple VPNs serviced by one or more network elements which also contain relay agents. These VPNs contain DHCP clients, and there is a desire to allow one DHCP server to supply the full range of DHCP services to these DHCP clients.

The network element which contains the relay agent typically is also the network element which knows about the VPN association of the DHCP client and could include this information in the relay-agentinformation option in the client's DHCP requests. This document defines a sub-option for the relay-agent-information option which contains the vpn-id, and which allows the relay agent to communicate the VPN association to the DHCP server.

When the DHCP server sends its response to the relay agent for forwarding back to the DHCP client, the relay agent will also need to use the vpn-id sub-option to determine to which VPN to send the DHCP response.

This sub-option can also be used by the DHCP server to inform a relay agent that a particular DHCP client is associated with a particular VPN by sending the vpn-id sub-option to the relay agent in the relay-agent-information option back to the relay agent.

Consider the following architecture:

+---+ +---+ | DHCP | IP x| Relay Agent | IP z | Server |-....| and +---+ | VPN manager | | +---+ +---+ | |IP y +---+ +--++ +--++ +-+---+ |Host1| |Host2| |Host3| 1 +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +--+- VPN 2 |Host1| |Host2| +---+ +----+

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002

[Page 2]

VPN-ID sub-option

In this architecture, the relay agent knows the VPN for each of the DHCP clients, and inserts that information in the vpn-id sub-option in every DHCP request it forwards onto the DHCP server.

When the DHCP server copies over the relay-agent-information option from the request to the reply packet, it will copy over the vpn-id sub-option as well.

When the relay agent receives a DHCP reply packet from the server with a vpn-id sub-option, it will forward the packet onto the proper VPN based on the value of the vpn-id sub-option.

#### 2.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in <u>RFC 2119</u> [<u>RFC 2119</u>].

This document uses the following terms:

o "DHCP client"

A DHCP client is an Internet host using DHCP to obtain configuration parameters such as a network address.

o "DHCP relay agent"

A DHCP relay agent is a third-party agent that transfers BOOTP and DHCP messages between clients and servers residing on different subnets, per [<u>RFC 951</u>] and [<u>RFC 1542</u>].

o "DHCP server"

A DHCP server is an Internet host that returns configuration parameters to DHCP clients.

o "downstream"

Downstream is the direction from the access concentrator towards the subscriber.

o "upstream"

Upstream is the direction from the subscriber towards the access concentrator.

o "VPN"

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002 [Page 3]

Virtual private network. A network which appears to the client to be a private network.

o "VPN Identifier"

The VPN-ID is defined by  $[\underline{RFC2685}]$  to be a sequence of 14 hex digits.

## 3. VPN identifier sub-option definition

The vpn-id sub-option MAY be used by any DHCP relay agent which desires to specify the VPN from which a DHCP client request was sent.

The vpn-id sub-option contains a generalized VPN identifier.

The format of the option is:

 SubOpt
 Len
 Type
 VPN identifier

 +----+
 +---+
 +---+
 +---+

 | TBD | n | t | id1 | id2 | id3 | ...

 +---+
 +---+

 Type:
 0
 NVT ASCII VPN identifier

 1
 RFC2685
 VPN-ID

 2-255
 Not Allowed

There are two types of identifiers which can be placed in the vpn-id sub-option. The first type of identifier which can be placed in the vpn-id sub-option is an NVT ASCII string. It MUST NOT be terminated with a zero byte.

The second type of identifier which can be placed in the vpn-id suboption is an <u>RFC2685</u> VPN-ID [<u>RFC 2685</u>], which is typically 14 hex digits in length (though it can be any length as far as the vpn-id sub-option is concerned).

A relay agent which recieves a DHCP request from a DHCP client on a VPN SHOULD include a vpn-id sub-option in the relay-agent-information option that it inserts in the DHCP packet prior to forwarding it on to the DHCP server.

The value placed in the vpn-id sub-option SHOULD be sufficient for the relay agent to properly route any DHCP reply packet returned from

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002 [Page 4]

the DHCP server to the DHCP client for which it is destined. Servers supporting this sub-option MUST return an identical copy of the suboption in the relay-agent-info option to any relay-agent that sends it.

In the event that a vpn-id option and a vpn-id sub-option are both received in a particular DHCP client packet, the information from the vpn-id sub-option MUST be used in preference to the information in the vpn-id option.

Relay agents which include this sub-option when forwarding DHCP client requests MUST discard DHCPOFFER or DHCPACK packets that do not contain this sub-option in their associated relay-agent-info options.

In some cases, a DHCP server may use the vpn-id sub-option to inform a relay agent that a particular DHCP client is associated with a particular VPN. It does this by sending the vpn-id sub-option with the appropriate information to the relay agent in the relay-agentinformation option. If the relay agent is unable to honor the DHCP server's requirement to place the DHCP client into that VPN it MUST drop the packet and not send it back to the DHCP client.

#### 4. Security

DHCP currently provides no authentication or security mechanisms. Potential exposures to attack are discussed is <u>section 7</u> of the protocol specification [<u>RFC2131</u>]. The vpn-id sub-option could allow a program masquerading as a relay agent to obtain addresses on other VPNs than the one on which it resides, possibly aiding in an address-pool exhaustion attack on that VPN.

This attack can be partially prevented by the relay agent not forwarding any DHCP packet which already contains a relay-agentinformation option. Any program which unicasts a DHCP packet to the DHCP server with a relay-agent-information option in it with a vpn-id for a different VPN would cause the DHCP server to allocate an address from that different VPN, but since the DHCP server cannot (in general) communicate directly back to the program that sent in the malicious DHCP packet, the entire cycle of creating a lease will not be completed. Certainly many leases could be offered, which would result in a form of address-pool exhaustion.

Under the current DHCP security model there are no methods available to completely circumvent this type of attack.

## 5. IANA Considerations

IANA has assigned the value of TBD for the VPN Identifier sub-option

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002

[Page 5]

from the DHCP Relay Agent Sub-options space [<u>RFC 3046</u>] for the VPN Identifier sub-option defined in <u>Section 3</u>.

This document defines a number space for the type byte of the vpn-id sub-option. Certain allowable values for this byte are defined in this specification (see <u>Section 3</u>). New values may only be defined by IETF Consensus, as described in [<u>RFC 2434</u>]. Basically, this means that they are defined by RFCs approved by the IESG.

Moreover, any changes or additions to the type byte codes MUST be made concurrently in the type byte codes of the vpn-id option. The type bytes and data formats of the vpn-id option and vpn-id suboption MUST always be identical.

#### 6. Acknowledgments

None (yet).

## 7. References

- [RFC 2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", <u>RFC 2119</u>, March 1997.
- [RFC 2131] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", <u>RFC</u> 2131, March 1997.
- [RFC 2132] Alexander, S., Droms, R., "DHCP Options and BOOTP Vendor Extensions", Internet <u>RFC 2132</u>, March 1997.
- [RFC 2685] Fox, B., Gleeson, B., "Virtual Private Networks Identifier", Internet <u>RFC 2685</u>, September 1999.
- [RFC 3046] Patrick, M., "DHCP Relay Agent Information Option", <u>RFC</u> 3046, January 2001.

## 8. Author's information

Kim Kinnear Mark Stapp Cisco Systems 250 Apollo Drive Chelmsford, MA 01824 Phone: (978) 497-8000

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002 [Page 6]

EMail: kkinnear@cisco.com mjs@cisco.com

Jay Kumarasamy Richard Johnson Cisco Systems 170 W. Tasman Dr. San Jose, CA 95134

Phone: (408) 526-4000

EMail: jayk@cisco.com raj@cisco.com

## 9. Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in <u>BCP-11</u>. Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

## 10. Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2002). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002

[Page 7]

such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FIT-NESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Kinnear, et. al. Expires August 2002 [Page 8]