

Using PvD for Captive Portal Discovery

Explicit Provisioning Domains (PvD) document adopted by **intarea** as draft-ietf-intarea-provisioning-domains

Moved to Standards Track

Added Privacy Considerations

- Calls out Captive Portal as a case that has privacy improved by PvD, since it can eliminate the need for any probe on the network

Let's use PvDs!

RFC 7710 needs to be updated or replaced to be more specific with how it relates to the API

PvD information points to the configured Captive API server, and is **updated** with a new RA if the API server ever changes

Should specify that a PvD-aware network shouldn't use captive probes, to improve privacy

Always use IPv6 Router Advertisement, even if no IPv6 route is provided and only IPv4 can access the Internet

A Few Questions

Do we mind the indirection of going through the static PvD information to get to the Captive API URL?

- ✗ Less direct lookup
- ✓ More info can fit in PvD API than in DHCP/RA; sent over TLS; and more flexibility for pointing to different future kinds of captive-style APIs

Should the Captive API Server be written as a general “interactive per-device sub-PvD API”? Will future use-cases need similar identifier and update mechanisms?

Should we write a Captive Portal discovery draft to specify how to use PvDs, etc, in this method?

