

DHC Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: February 7, 2005

M. Stapp  
R. Johnson  
T. Palaniappan  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
August 9, 2004

Vendor-Specific Information Suboption for the DHCP Relay Agent Option  
<[draft-ietf-dhc-vendor-suboption-00.txt](#)>

#### Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, I certify that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which I am aware have been disclosed, and any of which I become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3667](#).

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 February 7, 2005.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). All Rights Reserved.

#### Abstract

This memo defines a new Vendor-Specific Information suboption for the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol's (DHCP) relay agent information option. The suboption allows a DHCP relay agent to include vendor-specific information in DHCP messages it forwards, as configured by its administrator.

Internet-Draft

Vendor-Specific Relay Suboption

August 2004

Table of Contents

- [1. Requirements Terminology . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [2. Introduction . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [3. The Vendor-Specific Suboption . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [4. Relay Agent Behavior . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [5. DHCP Server Behavior . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [6. Security Considerations . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [8. Acknowledgements . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- Normative References . . . . . [7](#)
- Informative References . . . . . [7](#)
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . [7](#)
- Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . . [9](#)

## 1. Requirements Terminology

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 [RFC 2119](#) [1].

## 2. Introduction


DHCP ([RFC 2131](#) [2]) provides IP addresses and configuration information for IPv4 clients. It includes a relay agent capability, in which processes within the network infrastructure receive broadcast messages from clients and forward them to DHCP servers as unicast messages. In network environments like DOCSIS data-over-cable and xDSL, for example, it has proven useful for the relay agent to add information to the DHCP message before forwarding it, using the relay agent information option ([RFC 3046](#) [3]).

Servers that recognize the relay agent option echo it back in their replies, and some of the information that relays add may be used to help an edge device efficiently return replies to clients. The information that relays supply can also be used in the server's decision making about the addresses and configuration parameters that the client should receive.

In many environments it's desirable to associate some vendor- or provider-specific information with clients' DHCP messages. This is often done using the relay agent information option. [RFC 3046](#) defines Remote-ID and Circuit-ID sub-options that are used to carry such information. The values of those suboptions, however, are usually based on some network resource, such as an IP address of a network access device, an ATM Virtual Circuit identifier, or a DOCSIS cable-modem identifier. As a result, the values carried in these suboptions are dependent on the physical network configuration. The Vendor-Specific suboption allows administrators to associate other useful data with relayed DHCP messages.

### 3. The Vendor-Specific Suboption

This memo defines a new DHCP relay agent option suboption that carries vendor-defined data. The suboption takes a form similar to the Vendor-Identifying Vendor-Specific Option [8].



The Code for the suboption is <TBD> (to be assigned by IANA).

The one-byte Length field is the length of the data carried in the suboption, in bytes. The length includes the length of the first Enterprise Number; the minimum length is 4 bytes.

"Enterprise NumberN" is a vendor's Enterprise Number as registered with IANA [4]. It is a four-byte integer value in network byte-order.

DataLenN is the length of the data associated with the Enterprise Number.

The Suboption Data is an opaque sequence of bytes.

The Vendor-Specific suboption includes at least one Enterprise Number and carries opaque data defined by the organization identified by the Enterprise Number. A relay may include data associated with more than one vendor's Enterprise Number within a single instance of the Suboption.

The Vendor-Specific data are of course provider-specific. This specification does not establish any requirements on the data in the suboption. Vendors who make use of this suboption are encouraged to document their usage in order to make interoperability possible.

#### [4.](#) Relay Agent Behavior

DHCP relay agents MAY be configured to include Vendor-Specific suboptions if they include a relay agent information option in

relayed DHCP messages. The suboptions' types and data are assigned and configured through mechanisms that are outside the scope of this memo.

Relay implementors are encouraged to offer their administrators some means of configuring what data can be included in this suboption, and to document what they are capable of.

#### [5.](#) DHCP Server Behavior

This suboption provides additional information to the DHCP server. The DHCP server, if it is configured to support this suboption, may use this information in addition to other relay agent option data and other options included in the DHCP client messages in order to assign an IP address and/or other configuration parameters to the client. There is no special additional processing for this suboption.

DHCP server vendors are encouraged to offer their administrators some means of configuring the use of data from incoming Vendor-Specific suboptions in DHCP decision-making.

## 6. Security Considerations

Message authentication in DHCP for intradomain use where the out-of-band exchange of a shared secret is feasible is defined in [RFC 3118](#) [5]. Potential exposures to attack are discussed in [section 7](#) of the DHCP protocol specification in [RFC 2131](#) [2].

The DHCP relay agent option depends on a trusted relationship between the DHCP relay agent and the server, as described in section 5 of [RFC 3046](#). Fraudulent relay agent option data could potentially lead to theft-of-service or exhaustion of limited resources (like IP addresses) by unauthorized clients. A host that tampered with relay agent data associated with another host's DHCP messages could deny service to that host, or interfere with its operation by leading the DHCP server to assign it inappropriate configuration parameters.

While the introduction of fraudulent relay agent options can be prevented by a perimeter defense that blocks these options unless the relay agent is trusted, a deeper defense using authentication for relay agent options via the Authentication Suboption [6] or IPSEC [7] SHOULD be deployed as well.

There are several data in a DHCP message that convey information that may identify an individual host on the network. These include the chaddr, the client-id option, and the hostname and client-fqdn options. Depending on the type of data included, the Vendor-Specific suboption may also convey information that identifies a specific host

or a specific user on the network. In practice, this information isn't exposed outside the internal service-provider network, where DHCP messages are usually confined. Administrators who configure data that's going to be used in DHCP Vendor-Specific suboptions should be careful to use data that are appropriate for the types of networks they administer. If DHCP messages travel outside the service-provider's own network, or if the suboption values may become visible to other users, that may raise privacy concerns for the access provider or service provider.

## 7. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to assign a suboption number for the Vendor-Specific Information Suboption from the DHCP Relay Agent

Information Option [[3](#)] suboption number space.

## [8](#). Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Andy Sudduth, Josh Littlefield, and Kim Kinnear for their review and comments.

Stapp, et al.

Expires February 7, 2005

[Page 6]

---

Internet-Draft

Vendor-Specific Relay Suboption

August 2004

## Normative References

- [1] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [2] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.

- [3] Patrick, M., "DHCP Relay Agent Information Option", [RFC 3046](#), January 2001.
- [4] IANA, "Private Enterprise Numbers (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/enterprise-numbers.html>)".

#### Informative References

- [5] Droms, R. and W. Arbaugh, "Authentication for DHCP Messages", [RFC 3118](#), June 2001.
- [6] Stapp, M., "The Authentication Suboption for the DHCP Relay Agent Option", [draft-ietf-dhc-auth-suboption-04.txt](#) (work in progress), October 2003.
- [7] Droms, R., "Authentication of Relay Agent Options Using IPsec", [draft-ietf-dhc-relay-agent-ipsec-01.txt](#) (work in progress), November 2003.
- [8] Littlefield, J., "Vendor-Identifying Vendor Options for DHCPv4", [draft-ietf-dhc-vendor-03.txt](#) (work in progress), June 2004.

#### Authors' Addresses

Mark Stapp  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
1414 Massachusetts Ave.  
Boxborough, MA 01719  
USA

Phone: 978.936.0000  
EMail: [mjs@cisco.com](mailto:mjs@cisco.com)



Richard Johnson  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
170 W. Tasman Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95134  
USA

Phone: 408.526.4000  
EMail: raj@cisco.com

Theyn Palaniappan  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
170 W. Tasman Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95134  
USA

Phone: 408.526.4000  
EMail: athenmoz@cisco.com

Internet-Draft

Vendor-Specific Relay Suboption

August 2004

## 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 IETF's procedures with respect to rights in IETF 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).

## 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 (2004). 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.

Stapp, et al.

Expires February 7, 2005

[Page 9]