Status-Realm & Loop Detection for RADIUS

Radius Extensions (radext) WG
IETF 116: Yokohama, Japan
Margaret Cullen
margaret@painless-security.com

Document status

- https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-cullen-radextra-status-realm/
- Feedback received on the mailing list & at IETF 115
  - Excellent editorial and clarity suggestions – Thank you!
  - Some technical questions, most resolved on list
- Basic functionality implemented for freeradius

Open Questions

- Suggestion was made to add a timestamp to Status-Realm responses at each step
  - Would require definition of a higher-resolution timestamp RADIUS Data Type
  - Might offer some visibility into delay at each hop. However, clock skew is likely to make a timestamp less useful for this purpose.
  - Should we add a timestamp or not?
- Need RADIUS Packet Type Code for implementation/experimentation
  - https://www.iana.org/assignments/radius-types/radius-types.xhtml#radius-types-27
  - IANA registry requires "IESG approval" (i.e. Paul's approval)
  - Only ~50 RADIUS Packet Type Codes (of 255) have been allocated in the past 30 years
  - Does the WG support requesting the first unused RADIUS Packet Type Code (35) for this purpose?

Moving Forward

- Document was the source of this WG work item:
  - Improve operations for multi-hop RADIUS networks: e.g. loop detection and prevention, a multi-hop Status-Server equivalent with ability to Trace the proxy steps a RADIUS message will follow.

- Adopt as WG draft?