

Dynamic Host Configuration
Internet-Draft
Expires: January 12, 2006

T. Chown
University of Southampton
S. Venaas
UNINETT
C. Strauf
Technical University of Clausthal
July 11, 2005

DHCP: IPv4 and IPv6 Dual-Stack Issues
draft-ietf-dhc-dual-stack-03

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

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 <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 12, 2006.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

Abstract

A node may have support for communications using IPv4 and/or IPv6 protocols. Such a node may wish to obtain IPv4 and/or IPv6 configuration settings via the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP). The original version of DHCP [1] designed for IPv4 has now been complemented by a new DHCPv6 [4] for IPv6. This document

Internet-Draft

DHCP: Dual-Stack Issues

July 2005

describes issues identified with dual IP version DHCP interactions, the most important aspect of which is how to handle potential problems in clients processing configuration information received from both DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 servers. The document makes a recommendation on the general strategy on how best to handle such issues, and identifies future work to be undertaken.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Configuration scenarios	3
3.	Dual-stack issues	4
3.1	Handling multiple responses	4
3.2	Different administrative management	5
3.3	Multiple interfaces	5
3.4	DNS load balancing	5
3.5	DNS search path issues	5
3.6	Protocol startup sequence	5
3.7	DHCP option variations	6
3.8	Security issues	6
4.	Potential solutions	6
4.1	Separate DHCP servers	6
4.2	Single DHCPv6 server	7
4.3	Optimising for failure with lists of addresses	9
4.4	Administrative and other areas	9
5.	Summary	9
6.	IANA Considerations	11
7.	Security Considerations	11
8.	Acknowledgements	11
9.	Informative References	11
	Authors' Addresses	12
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	13

[1.](#) Introduction

The original specification of the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) was made with only IPv4 in mind. That specification has been subsequently revised, up to the latest version of DHCP [\[1\]](#). With the arrival of IPv6, a new DHCP specification for IPv6 has been designed, and published as DHCPv6 [\[4\]](#).

These protocols allow nodes to communicate via IPv4 or IPv6 to retrieve configuration settings for operation in a managed environment. While an IPv6 node may acquire address-related configuration settings via IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration [\[2\]](#), such a node may wish to use stateless DHCPv6 [\[5\]](#) for other administratively configured options, such as DNS or NTP.

In early IPv6 deployments, a dual-stack mode of operation is typically used. There will thus be nodes that require both IPv4 and IPv6 configuration settings. This document discusses issues with obtaining such settings in a dual-stack environment.

While there is a more general multihoming issue to be solved for DHC, in this text we focus on the specific issues for operating DHCP in a mixed (typically dual-stack) IPv4 and IPv6 environment.

In this document, we refer to a "DHCP server" as a server implementing the original DHCP [\[1\]](#), and a "DHCPv6 server" as a server implementing DHCPv6 [\[4\]](#) or its stateless subset [\[5\]](#).

[2.](#) Configuration scenarios

For a node in an IPv4-only or IPv6-only environment, the choice of DHCP server is a straightforward one; a DHCP server for IPv4, or a DHCPv6 server for IPv6.

In a dual-stack environment a node in a managed environment will need to obtain both IPv4 and IPv6 configuration settings, e.g.

- o IPv4 address
- o IPv6 address
- o NTP server
- o DNS server
- o NIS server

- o DNS search path

While the format of address settings will be IP-specific, the node may equally well acquire IPv4 or IPv6 addresses for some settings, such as for DNS or NTP, if those services are available via IPv4 or IPv6 transport. Currently, a DHCP server returns IPv4 data, while a DHCPv6 server returns IPv6 data.

It is worth noting that in an IPv4 environment, with a DHCP server, the choice of whether to use DHCP is made by the node. In an IPv6 environment, the use of the managed and other bits in the Router Advertisement can offer a hint to the node whether or not to use full DHCPv6 or its stateless variant. It is perhaps not clear whether a dual-stack node should do DHCP for IPv4 if Managed and OtherConfig flags in the Router Advertisement are both off; it seems most appropriate that the decision to use DHCP for IPv4 or not should be as if the host was IPv4-only.

[3.](#) Dual-stack issues

In this section we list issues that have been raised to date related to dual-stack DHCP operation.

It has been noted from comments that the first four, and possibly five, subsections here may also be viewed as multihoming issues.

[3.1](#) Handling multiple responses

The general question is how to handle configuration information that

may be gathered from multiple sources. Where those sources are DHCP and DHCPv6 servers (which may be two physical nodes or two servers running on the same node) the client node needs to know whether to use the most recent data, or whether to perform some merger or union of the responses by certain rules. A method for merging lists of addresses, for options that carry such information, may also be required. A node may choose to ask a DHCPv6 server and only use a DHCP server if no response is received.

Merging is possible, but is likely to be complex. There could be some priority, so that if both DHCP and DHCPv6 servers offer a value, only one is used. Or the node could choose to store and use both, in some order of its choosing. Merging issues are discussed further later in this document.

A node may also obtain information from other sources, such as a manual configuration file (for example /etc/resolv.conf for DNS data on many UNIX systems). A node configured manually to use an IPv6 DNS server may lose that configuration if it is in a dual-stack

environment and uses DHCP to obtain IPv4 settings; the new IPv4 settings from the DHCP response may then overwrite the manual IPv6 DNS setting.

[3.2](#) Different administrative management

In some deployments, the IPv4 and IPv6 services may not be administered by the same organisation or people, such as in a community wireless environment. This poses problems for consistency of data offered by either DHCP version.

[3.3](#) Multiple interfaces

A node may have multiple interfaces and run IPv4 and IPv6 on different interfaces. A question then is whether the settings are per interface or per node? DHCPv6 introduces the idea of a DHCP Unique Identifier (DUID) which does not yet exist for DHCP; some effort is being made to retrofit the concept to DHCPv4 [\[6\]](#).

Per interface settings can be complex because a client node needs to know from which interface system settings like NTP server came from. And it may not be apparent which setting should be used, if e.g. an

NTP server option is received on multiple interfaces, potentially over different protocols.

[3.4](#) DNS load balancing

In some cases it is preferable to list DNS server information in an ordered way per node for load balancing, giving different responses to different clients. Responses from different DHCP and DHCPv6 servers may make such configuration problematic, if the knowledge of the load balancing is not available to both servers.

[3.5](#) DNS search path issues

The DNS search path may vary for administrative reasons. For example, a site under the domain foo.com chooses to place an early IPv6 deployment under the subdomain ipv6.foo.com, until it is confident of offering a full dual-stack service under its main domain. The subtlety here is that the DNS search path then affects choice of protocol used, such as IPv6 for nodes in ipv6.foo.com.

[3.6](#) Protocol startup sequence

In the dual-stack environment, one needs to consider what happens if, for example, the IPv6 interface (transport) is started after DHCPv4 was used to configure the client. Should the client then simply discard the current IPv4 information, or merge it with a subsequent

IPv6 response?

[3.7](#) DHCP option variations

Some options in DHCP are not available in DHCPv6 and vice-versa. Some IP-version limitations naturally apply, such as only IPv6 addresses can be in an IPv6 NTP option. The DHCP and DHCPv6 option numbers may be different.

Some sites may choose to use IPv4-mapped addresses in DHCPv6-based options. The merits and drawbacks of such an approach need discussion.

A site administrator may wish to configure all their dual-stack nodes with (say) two NTP servers, one of which has an IPv4 address, the

other an IPv6 address. In this case it may be desirable for an NTP option to carry a list of addresses, where some may be IPv4 and some may be IPv6. In general one could consider having DHCPv6 options that can carry a mix of IPv4 and IPv6 addresses.

[3.8](#) Security issues

This document does not introduce any new security issues per se. A detailed analysis of DHCP and DHCPv6 security is out of scope for this document.

While there is a specification for authentication for DHCP messages [3], the standard seems to have very few, if any, implementations. Thus DHCP and DHCPv6 servers are still liable to be spoofed. Adding an additional protocol may give an extra avenue for attack, should an attacker perhaps spoof a DHCPv6 server but not a DHCP server.

[4.](#) Potential solutions

Here we discuss the two broad solution strategies proposed within the IETF dhcp WG. The first is to run separate DHCP and DHCPv6 servers (with the client merging information received from both where necessary, or perhaps choosing to query a particular version first), the second is to run only a DHCPv6 server, and relay IPv4 configuration information within (new) IPv4 configuration options.

[4.1](#) Separate DHCP servers

One solution is to run separate DHCP and DHCPv6 servers. These may or may not be run on the same physical node. The information served from the DHCP servers could be generated from a single database instance for consistency.

In this approach, some best practice guidance is required for how multiple responses are handled or merged. Administrators have the onus to maintain consistency (for example, scripts may generate common DHCP and DHCPv6 configuration files).

In some cases, inconsistencies may not matter. In a simple case, an NTP server will give the same time whether accessed by IPv4 or IPv6. Even if different recursive DNS servers are offered via DHCP or

DHCPv6, then those name servers should provide the same response to a given query. In cases where sites may be operating a 'two-faced DNS' this will still hold true given the node is on the same topological point on the network from an IPv4 or IPv6 perspective. The order of DNS servers in a node's configuration is not important, unless DNS load balancing is required.

In other cases, inconsistencies may be an issue, for example where lists of values are returned, an algorithm is needed for list merger (e.g. "alternate, DHCPv6 first"). Or there may be incompatible configuration values where, for example, DHCPv6 supplies domain names (such the SMTP or POP servers) whereas DHCPv4 provided only IPv4 addresses.

In the case of separate servers, there are some options like DNS search path, that aren't used in a specific IP protocol context.

The multiple server approach will have some simplifications. The DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 servers may provide the same value for a particular parameter, in which case there is no conflict. In some cases the value may be different, but the effect should be the same (such as an NTP server). The crux of the issue is to identify where differences may occur and where these differences will have an impact on node behaviour.

One possible solution is to have per-host preferences, or an ordered list of preferences, for example "use manually configured", "prefer DHCPv4", or "prefer DHCPv6", assuming the host can act based upon which protocol is used. It is then up to the site administrator to ensure values returned from either DHCP are consistent (a principle which extends if other methods are used, such as NIS or SLP).

[4.2](#) Single DHCPv6 server

There is an argument for not having to configure and operate both DHCP and DHCPv6 servers in a dual-stack site environment. The use of both servers may also lead to some redundancy in the information served. Thus one solution may be to modify DHCPv6 to be able to return IPv4 information. This solution is hinted at in the DHCPv6 [\[4\]](#) specification: "If there is sufficient interest and demand,

carry IPv4 addresses and configuration information." This solution may allow DHCP for IPv4 to be completely replaced by DHCPv6 with additional IPv4 information options, for dual-stack nodes.

A general argument is that which DHCP protocol is used (whether it's over IPv4 or IPv6) shouldn't affect what kind of addresses you can get configured with it, and that simplicity and predicatability comes from using a single server over a single transport. IPv4-capable hosts will likely remain for at least 10 years, probably much longer; do we want dual-stack hosts (which will become the norm) to do both DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 forever while dual-stack? If you need both servers to configure interfaces with addresses, and get other configuration, then you rely on two separate protocols to work (servers and relays, etc) in order for the host to behave correctly.

This approach may require the listing of a mix of IPv4 and IPv6 addresses for an option. This could then be considered when new IPv6 options are introduced. There could be just two options needed, one new option for the address delegation, and one for doing encapsulation.

Also, there are a number of paradigms in DHCPv6 that we miss in DHCPv4, such as going away from using MAC addresses for per-host address assignment but instead using DUIDs/IAIDs, etc (although there is ongoing work to provide DUIDs for DHCPv4 [6]).

However, there are a number of potential problems with this approach:

- o IPv4-only nodes would not have any DHCP service available to them; such an approach is only possible in a fully dual-stack environment.
- o The client node may then be IPv6-only and receiving IPv4 configuration settings that it does not want or be able to meaningfully handle.
- o The DHCPv4 servers need to be configured anyway to support IPv4-only hosts, so there is still duplication of information.
- o What happens if there are DHCPv6 servers that don't return IPv4 information? Does this mean the client can't run IPv4 (since it won't do DHCPv4)?
- o If IPv4 information is served from a DHCPv6 server as well as an IPv4 DHCP server, IPv4 address space will need to be allocated to both servers, fragmenting the potentially precious IPv4 global address resource for the site.

[4.3](#) Optimising for failure with lists of addresses

There is a generic issue with any option that includes a list of addresses of servers (such as DNS server addresses). The list is offered to cater for resilience, such as whether the listed server itself fails, or connectivity to the server fails. If the client does not know the cause of failure, its optimal strategy is to try a different server, via a different protocol. The problem today is that the IPv4 list is returned via DHCPv4 and the IPv6 list via DHCPv6, and the client has no way to really "try a different server", since that information is lost by the protocol, even though it may be known by the server.

Just putting merging heuristics in the client cannot provide the best behaviour, since information is lost. By comparison, if IPv4-mapped addresses were included in the DHCPv6 option along with IPv6 addresses, the DHCP server can give an intelligent order that takes into account which addresses are of the same DNS/whatever server. IPv6-only clients have to know to discard the IPv4-mapped addresses in this solution, and it's much easier to solve this in the combined-DHCP-server case than in the two-server case.

One can argue this is only an optimisation, and in many cases the list has only two elements, so the "next" choice is forced. However, this particular issue highlights the subtleties of merging responses from separate servers.

[4.4](#) Administrative and other areas

There are also administrative issues or best practice that could be promoted. For example, it may be recommended that sites do not split their DNS name space for IPv6-specific testbeds.

It may be worth considering whether separate manual configuration files should be kept for IPv4 and IPv6 settings, such as separate `/etc/resolv.conf` files for DNS settings on UNIX systems. However, this seems a complex solution that should be better solved by other more generalised methods.

Some differences in DHCP and DHCPv6 may not be reconciled, but may not need to be, such as different ways to assign addresses by DUID in DHCPv6, or the non-aligned option numbers for DHCP and DHCPv6.

[5.](#) Summary

There are a number of issues in the operation of DHCP and DHCPv6

servers for nodes in dual-stack environments that should be clarified. While some differences in the protocols may not be

reconciled, there may not be a need to do so. However, for general operation some best practice should be agreed, the principle choice being whether separate DHCP and DHCPv6 servers should be maintained by a site, or whether DHCPv6 should be extended to carry IPv4 configuration settings for dual-stack nodes.

It can certainly be argued that until a site is completely dual-stack, an IPv4 DHCP service will always be required (for example while there are still legacy printers, IP webcams or devices which still configure via DHCPv4), and a single IPv6 transport DHCP server offering configuration information for both protocols will then not be sufficient. In that case, IPv4 DHCP is required, and thus there is a good rationale for focusing effort on how to combine the information received from separate IPv4 DHCP and (stateless) DHCPv6 servers.

In theory, it should be relatively straightforward to write a configuration manager that would accept a single configuration specification from the service manager and distribute the correct (and consistent) configurations to the DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 servers (whether on the same host or not). In this case, maintaining coordinated configurations in two servers is an interface issue, not a protocol issue. The question then is whether the client has all the information it needs to make reasonable choices. We are aware of one implementation of separate DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 clients that is using a preference option for assisting client-side merging of the received information.

Another issue for discussion is whether a combined DHCP service only available over IPv6 transport is a desirable longer-term goal for networks containing only dual-stack or IPv6-only nodes (or IPv4-only nodes where DHCPv4 is not needed). The transition to the long-term position may easily take more than 10 years.

On reflection on the above observations, it was the strong consensus of the dhc WG to adopt the two-server approach (separate DHCP and DHCPv6 servers) in favour to a combined, single server returning IPv4 information over IPv6. The two servers may be co-located on a single node, and may have consistent configuration information generated

from a single asset database.

Having reached this consensus, future work is now required to determine best practice for merging information from multiple servers, including merger of lists of addresses where options carry such information.

As a footnote, we note that this work has overlap with multihoming and multi-interface configuration issues. It is also interwoven with

Chown, et al.

Expires January 12, 2006

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

DHCP: Dual-Stack Issues

July 2005

the Detecting Network Attachment area, for example where a node may move from an IPv4-only network to a dual-stack network, or vice versa. Both aspects may be best abstracted for discussion and progression in the respective IETF multi6, shim6 and dna WGs, in parallel with the two-server progression in the dhcp WG.

6. IANA Considerations

There are no IANA considerations for this document.

7. Security Considerations

There are no security considerations in this problem statement per se, as it does not propose a new protocol.

8. Acknowledgements

The authors thank the following people for input to this document: Bernie Volz, AK Vijayabhaskar, Ted Lemon, Ralph Droms, Robert Elz, Changming Liu, Margaret Wasserman, Dave Thaler and Greg Daley. The document may not necessarily fully reflect the views of each of these individuals.

The authors would also like to thank colleagues on the 6NET project for contributions to this document.

9. Informative References

- [1] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.
- [2] Thomson, S. and T. Narten, "IPv6 Stateless Address

Autoconfiguration", [RFC 2462](#), December 1998.

- [3] Droms, R. and W. Arbaugh, "Authentication for DHCP Messages", [RFC 3118](#), June 2001.
- [4] Droms, R., Bound, J., Volz, B., Lemon, T., Perkins, C., and M. Carney, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", [RFC 3315](#), July 2003.
- [5] Droms, R., "Stateless Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) Service for IPv6", [RFC 3736](#), April 2004.
- [6] Sommerfeld, B. and T. Lemon, "Node-Specific Client Identifiers for DHCPv4", [draft-ietf-dhc-3315id-for-v4-05](#) (work in progress), June 2005.

Chown, et al.

Expires January 12, 2006

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

DHCP: Dual-Stack Issues

July 2005

Authors' Addresses

Tim Chown
University of Southampton
School of Electronics and Computer Science
Southampton, Hampshire S017 1BJ
United Kingdom

Email: tjc@ecs.soton.ac.uk

Stig Venaas
UNINETT
Trondheim NO 7465
Norway

Email: venaas@uninett.no

Christian Strauf
Technical University of Clausthal
Erzstr. 51
Clausthal-Zellerfeld D-38678
Germany

Email: strauf@rz.tu-clausthal.de

Chown, et al. Expires January 12, 2006 [Page 12]

Internet-Draft DHCP: Dual-Stack Issues July 2005

Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights 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; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat 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 implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

Disclaimer of Validity

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM 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 FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.