Discovering Provisioning Domain Names and Data

draft-ietf-intarea-provisioning-domains-05

Tommy Pauly, Eric Vyncke, Pierre Pfister, David Schinazi, Wenqin Shao

> INTAREA IETF 104, March 2019, Montreal



draft-ietf-intarea-provisioning-domains is in Working Group last call

Version -05 added some updates in response to Secdir review

In-depth review received from Ted Lemon

Preparing an -06 version

Updates in -05

Overall

Added more explanatory text for the scenario in which a user would have multiple uplink networks

PvD Additional Information

Replaced x-* scheme with vendor-* IANA registry

Registered the media type application/pvd+json

Clarified header values for nested RAs

Version -06, https://github.com/IPv6-mPvD/mpvd-ietf-drafts/pull/11

Editorial updates

Shorten abstract, rework introduction to better introduce the concept of PvDs

Add examples for how DHCPv4 coexists in PvD deployments

Update case-insensitivity checking to reference RFC 4343

Version -06, https://github.com/IPv6-mPvD/mpvd-ietf-drafts/pull/11

DHCPv6 handling

DHCPv6 messages with addresses and prefixes can be associated with Implicit and Explicit PvD RAs when the PIO matches

Non-matching prefixes treated as separate Implicit PvDs

Stateless DHCPv6 content associated with all Implicit PvDs on the interface

Version -06, https://github.com/IPv6-mPvD/mpvd-ietf-drafts/pull/11

Additional information

Remove name and localizedName to avoid attack or spoofing surface

Instead, include and validate "identifier", which is the PvD ID FQDN

Version -06, https://github.com/IPv6-mPvD/mpvd-ietf-drafts/pull/11

Security Considerations

Explain validation of PIO matching the prefixes given in additional information

NAT66 may allow spoofing, but PvD information server can detect this

Clarify that Explicit PvDs cannot identify networks as "safe" or "trusted"; rather, some attacks are avoided or made more difficult



Publish -06 version

Respond to any further reviews

Conclude WGLC