

Internet-Draft  
[draft-moats-ldap-taxonomy-00](#)  
Expires in six months

Ryan Moats  
AT&T  
Roland Hedberg  
Catalogix  
June 1999

**A Taxonomy of Methods for LDAP Clients Finding Servers**

Filename: [draft-moats-ldap-taxonomy-00.txt](#)

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#). 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>.

Abstract

There are several different methods for a LDAP client to find a LDAP server. This draft discusses these methods and provides pointers for interested parties to learn more about implementing a particular method.

**1. Introduction**

The Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) [[1](#)] can be used to build "islands" of servers that are not a priori tied into a single Directory Information Tree (DIT.) Here, it is necessary to determine how a client can discover LDAP servers. This documents discusses the currently available methods and provides pointers for interested parties to learn more about implementing a particular method.

While this draft documents only those methods that are currently documented, other methods have been considered for this problem. The

Expires 12/31/99

[Page 1]

history of these other methods are presented in an Appendix.

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Client Configuration**

The simplest method of enabling a LDAP client to discover LDAP servers is for the client administrator to configure the client with a list of known LDAP servers (and associated base objects) to send queries to. While this method has the advantage of being correct (initially), it adds the requirement that the list of initial servers be kept small and constant. Otherwise, the required client update process won't scale.

### **2.2 Well known DNS aliases**

If the DIT uses a naming scheme similar to that in [RFC 2377 \[2\]](#), then it is possible to build the DNS names of potential servers using well known DNS aliases, like those documented in [RFC 2219 \[3\]](#). When a different naming scheme is used, it is also possible to build potential server names based on the client's fully qualified domain name or local (within the organization or country) environment.

One shortcoming of this method are that it is not exact. Multiple DNS lookups and LDAP protocol operations may be necessary to find the proper LDAP server to serve the client requests. To support client roaming, it is necessary that either the [RFC 2377](#) (or similar) naming scheme be used or that roaming be implemented through tunnels.

Because this method uses DNS, it inherits all the security considerations of using DNS to discover LDAP servers: see the security consideration in [\[3\]](#) for more details.

### **2.3 Service Location Protocol**

If a client supports the service location protocol [\[4\]](#), it could use a SLP query for LDAP servers. The SLP template that is used to describe LDAP servers is presented in [\[5\]](#), and requires that the servers announce themselves using SLP and this template.

Using this method inherits the scaling and security considerations for the service location protocol, which are documented further in [\[4\]](#).

### **2.4 Referrals**

In LDAPV3, servers can return referrals to the client if the server has knowledge of where a query might be satisfiable. Two ways of

deploying referral information are deploying a LDAP knowledge server or exchanging CIP index objects [6] between servers.

A LDAP knowledge server would hold cross references to possibly hundreds of other LDAP servers, so that a client would only need to know about its local LDAP server and the knowledge server. As an optimization, the local LDAP server could also act as a knowledge server.

If CIP index objects are exchanged between LDAP servers, then those objects can also carry URL information for providing referrals to clients. Here, the client would only need to know about the local server. Using CIP index objects inherits the security considerations of CIP: see [6, 7, 8] for more details.

In either of these cases, the local LDAP server could be determined using another of the methods discussed.

### 3. Implementation

The Norwegian Directory Forum plan to start a service based on a central LDAP service containing contact information for every organization within Norway [12]. And if a organization has more information about its organizational units, employees or functions that it wants to publish it can do so by placing this information in a publicly available LDAP server and providing the management of the central service with a pointer (URL) to this server.

The TISDAG project is running a test service based on the TISDAG specification [13]. This service gathers indexes from connected White Pages Service Providers using CIP Tagged Index Objects [9]. The rationale for this service is that by supplying the name of a person or a function/role to the service it will return pointers to where more information can be found about persons/functions with that name.

The European Co-funded project DESIRE (www.desire.org) is using a LDAP server that communicates with a referral index that is based on CIP Tagged Index Objects [9] and fed by LDAP crawlers. DANTE plans to set up an European infrastructure of such referral index servers.

### 4. References

Request For Comments (RFC) and Internet Draft documents are available from numerous mirror sites.

- [1] M. Wahl, T. Howes, S. Kille, Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (v3), [RFC 2251](#), December 1997.

- [2] A. Grimstad, R. Huber, S. Sataluri, M. Wahl, Naming Plan for Internet Directory-Enabled Applications, [RFC 2377](#), September 1998.
- [3] M. Hamilton, R. Wright, "Use of DNS Aliases for Network Services," [RFC 2219](#) (Also [BCP 17](#)), October, 1997.
- [4] E. Guttman, C. Perkins, J. Veizades, M. Day, "Service Location Protocol, Version 2," Internet Draft (work in progress), April 1999.
- [5] J. Wood, R. Tam, "The LDAP Service Type," Internet Draft (work in progress), February 1998.
- [6] J. Allen, M. Mealling, "The Architecture of the Common Indexing Protocol (CIP)," Internet Draft (work in progress), November 1998.
- [7] J. Allen, M. Mealling, "MIME Object Definitions for the Common Indexing Protocol (CIP)," Internet Draft (work in progress), June 1997.
- [8] J. Allen, P. Leach, R. Hedberg, "CIP Transport Protocols," Internet Draft (work in progress), April 1999.
- [9] R. Hedberg, B. Greenblatt, R. Moats, M. Wahl, "A Tagged Index Object for use in the Common Indexing Protocol," Internet Draft (work in progress), December 1998.
- [10] L. Hedstrom, L. Howard, "DHCP Options for Locating LDAP Servers," Internet Draft (work in progress), July 1997
- [11] R. Droms, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol," [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.
- [12] R.Hedberg, H. Alverstrand, "Technical Specification, The Norwegian Directory of Directories (NDD)," Internet Draft (work in progress), May 1999
- [13] R.Hedberg, L. Daigle, "Technical Infrastructure for Swedish Directory Access Gateways (TISDAG)," Internet Draft (work in progress), June 1999

## **5. Author's Addresses**

Ryan Moats	Roland Hedberg
AT&T	Catalogix
15621 Drexel Circle	Dalsveien 53
Omaha, NE 68135	0775 Oslo
USA	Norway
Email: jayhawk@att.com	Email: roland@catalogix.ac.se

## **Appendix A. Other methods**

### **A.1 Discovery**

The discovery approach was to use a combination of other methods presented in this taxonomy along with storing either the search DN or a related URL in the DNS in some way. This method requires an administrator to configure the DNS with the information and the idea of storing either a DN or an URL in the DNS is an extremely controversial one. Therefore, this summary is presented just for history and will not be further expounded.

### **A.2 DHCP extensions**

In an internet-draft [[10](#)], now expired, a method was proposed for using DHCP to deliver information about LDAP server to a DHCP client. This would require that such information be configured into the DHCP server and that the client use DHCP to load host configuration information. Interested parties should contact the draft's authors for more information.

Such a method would inherit the security considerations for DHCP. See [[11](#)] for more details.