

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: October 14, 2007

R. Johnson  
J. Kumarasamy  
K. Kinnear  
M. Stapp  
Cisco  
April 12, 2007

**Virtual Subnet Selection Option  
draft-ietf-dhc-vpn-option-06.txt**

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/1id-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 October 14, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

## Abstract

This memo defines a new DHCP option for passing Virtual Subnet Selection (VSS) information between the DHCP client and the DHCP server. It is intended for use primarily by DHCP proxy clients in situations where VSS information needs to be passed to the DHCP server for proper address allocation to take place.

The option number currently in use is TBD. This memo documents the current usage of the option in agreement with [7], which declares that any pre-existing usages of option numbers in the range 128 - 223 should be documented and the working group will try to officially assign those numbers to those options.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Conventions . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">VSS Information Definition . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
	<a href="#">Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>



## **1. Introduction**

There is a growing use of Virtual Private Network (VPN) configurations. The growth comes from many areas; individual client systems needing to appear to be on the home corporate network even when traveling, ISPs providing extranet connectivity for customer companies, etc. In some of these cases there is a need for the DHCP server to know the VPN (hereafter called a "Virtual Subnet Selector" or "VSS") from which an address, and other resources, should be allocated.

If the allocation is being done through a DHCP relay, then a relay suboption could be included. In some cases, however an IP address is being sought by a DHCP proxy on behalf of a client (would may be assigned the address via a different protocol). In this case, there is a need to include VSS information relating to the client as a DHCP option.

A good example might be a dial-in aggregation device where PPP addresses are acquired via DHCP and then given to the remote customer system via IPCP. In a network where such a device is used to aggregate PPP dial-in from multiple companies, each company may be assigned a unique VSS.

This memo defines a new DHCP [2] option, the VSS Information option, which allows the DHCP client to specify the VSS Information needed in order to allocate an address. If the receiving DHCP server understands the VSS Information option, this information may be used in conjunction with other information in determining the subnet on which to select an address as well as other information such as DNS server, default router, etc.



## **2. Conventions**

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 [[1](#)].

### 3. VSS Information Definition

The VSS Information option is a DHCP option [3]. The option contains generalized VSS information in one of two formats: NVT ASCII VPN identifier, or [RFC2685](#) VPN-ID [4].

The format of the option is:

Code	Len	Type	VSS Information octets			
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
TBD	n	t	v1	v2	v3	...
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

  

Type:	0	NVT ASCII VPN identifier
	1	<a href="#">RFC2685</a> VPN-ID
	2-255	Not Allowed

Figure 1

The option minimum length (n) is 2.

There are two types of identifiers which can be placed in the VSS Information Option. The first type of identifier which can be placed in the VSS Information 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 VSS Information Option is an [RFC2685](#) VPN-ID [4], which is typically 14 hex digits in length (though it can be any length as far as the VSS Information Option is concerned).

If the type field is set to zero (0), it indicates that all following bytes of the option contain a NVT ASCII string. This string MUST NOT be terminated with a zero byte.

If the type field is set to one (1), it indicates that all following bytes should be interpreted in agreement with [RFC2685](#) as a VPN Identifier, typically 14 hex digits.

All other values of the type field are invalid as of this memo and VSS options containing any other value than zero (0) or one (1) SHOULD be ignored.

Any VSS information contained in a DHCP Relay Suboption SHOULD override the information contained in this VSS Information option. [8]

Servers configured to support this option MUST return an identical





copy of the option to any client that sends it, regardless of whether or not the client requests the option in a parameter request list. Clients using this option MUST discard DHCP OFFER or DHCP ACK packets that do not contain this option.

This option provides the DHCP server additional information upon which to make a determination of address to be assigned. The DHCP server, if it is configured to support this option, should use this information in addition to other options included in the DHCP DISCOVER packet in order to assign an IP address for DHCP client.

In the event that a VSS Information Option and a VSS Information Relay Suboption are both received in a particular DHCP client packet, the information from the VSS Information Suboption MUST be used in preference to the information in the VSS Information Option.

Servers that do not understand this option will allocate an address using their normal algorithms and will not return this option in the DHCP OFFER or DHCP ACK. In this case the client will discard the DHCP OFFER or DHCP ACK. Servers that understand this option but are administratively configured to ignore the option MUST ignore the option, use their normal algorithms to allocate an address, and MUST NOT return this option in the DHCP OFFER or DHCP ACK. In this case the client will discard the DHCP OFFER or DHCP ACK. In other words, this option MUST NOT appear in a DHCP OFFER from a server unless it was used by the server in making the address allocation requested.



#### **4. Security Considerations**

Message authentication in DHCP for intradomain use where the out-of-band exchange of a shared secret is feasible is defined in [\[5\]](#). Potential exposures to attack are discussed in [section 7](#) of the DHCP protocol specification in [\[2\]](#).

The VSS Information option could be used by a client in order to obtain an IP address from a VSS other than the one where it should. DHCP relays MAY choose to remove the option before passing on DHCPDISCOVER packets. Another possible defense would be for the DHCP relay to insert a Relay option containing a VSS Information Suboption, which would override the DHCP VSS Information option.

This option would allow a client to perform a more complete address-pool exhaustion attack since the client would no longer be restricted to attacking address-pools on just its local subnet.

Servers that implement the VSS Information option MUST by default disable use of the feature; it must specifically be enabled through configuration. Moreover, a server SHOULD provide the ability to selectively enable use of the feature under restricted conditions, e.g., by enabling use of the option only from explicitly configured client-ids, enabling its use only by clients on a particular subnet, or restricting the VSSs from which addresses may be requested.

This option SHOULD NOT be used without also making use of the DHCP Authentication option [\[5\]](#).



## **5. IANA Considerations**

IANA is requested to assign option number 221 for this option, in accordance with [7]. Option 221 has been used for this option and there were no conflicting users of option 221 identified during the 6-month notification period specified in [7]. No assignment of values for the type field need be made at this time. New values may only be defined by IETF Consensus, as described in [6]. 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 VSS Information Option. The type bytes and data formats of the VSS Information Option and VSS Information Suboption MUST always be identical.



## **6. Acknowledgements**

This document is the result of work done within Cisco Systems.  
Thanks to Kim Kinnear, Mark Stapp, and Jay Kumarasamy for their work  
on this option definition and the other related work for which this  
is necessary.

## **7. Informative References**

- [1] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [2] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.
- [3] Alexander, S. and R. Droms, "DHCP Options and BOOTP Vendor Extensions", [RFC 2132](#), March 1997.
- [4] Fox, B. and B. Gleeson, "Virtual Private Networks Identifier", [RFC 2685](#), September 1999.
- [5] Droms, R. and W. Arbaugh, "Authentication for DHCP Messages", [RFC 3118](#), June 2001.
- [6] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 2434](#), October 1998.
- [7] Volz, B., "Reclassifying Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol version 4 (DHCPv4) Options", [RFC 3942](#), November 2004.
- [8] Kinnear, K., "Virtual Subnet Selection Sub-Option for the Relay Agent Information Option for DHCPv4", [draft-ietf-dhc-agent-vpn-id-04](#) (work in progress), March 2007.





Authors' Addresses

Richard A. Johnson  
Cisco Systems  
170 W. Tasman Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95134  
US

Phone: +1 408 526 4000  
Email: raj@cisco.com

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

Phone: +1 408 526 4000  
Email: jayk@cisco.com

Kim Kinnear  
Cisco Systems  
250 Apollo Drive  
Chelmsford, MA 01824  
US

Phone: +1 978 244 8000  
Email: kkinnar@cisco.com

Mark Stapp  
Cisco Systems  
250 Apollo Drive  
Chelmsford, MA 01824  
US

Phone: +1 978 244 8000  
Email: mjs@cisco.com



## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

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.

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, THE IETF TRUST 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.

## Intellectual Property

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](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).

