

Communicating Proxy Configurations in Provisioning Domains

`draft-ietf-intarea-proxy-config-pvd-04`

Tommy Pauly

Dragana Damjanovic

Yaroslav Rosomakho

Updates since IETF-121

- “mandatory” key to list keys that a client must understand/parse to use the proxy
 - Similar to `mandatory` from SVCB/HTTPS
 - Making format extensible for future standards and proprietary extensions
- Next iteration of match/exclude criteria for proxies: lists of dictionaries with domains/IPs and optional port specification

Next steps: further refine match criteria

- Move match to separate list of dictionaries
 - Reusable
 - Easier for clients to select a proxy from candidates
 - Simpler troubleshooting
- Provide examples for typical use cases
 - Catch-all web proxy with exceptions
 - Remote access VPN / Extranet / site-to-site VPN
- Clarify OR/AND logic for matching and proxy priorities

Match/exclude criteria as separate list

```
"proxies": [{
  "identifier": "Legacy HTTP",
  "protocol": "http-connect",
  "proxy": "proxy.example.org:80"
}, {
  "identifier": "Internal UDP",
  "protocol": "connect-udp",
  "proxy": "https://proxy.example.org/masque{?target_host,target_port}"
}],
"matchProxies": [{
  "proxies": [ "Legacy HTTP", "Internal UDP" ],
  "domains": [ "*.internal.example.org" ],
  "ports": [ "80", "443" ]
}, {
  "proxies": [ "Internal UDP" ],
  "domains": [ "*.internal.example.org" ],
  "ports": [ "3389" ]
}],
"excludeProxies": [{
  "proxies": [ "Legacy HTTP", "Internal UDP" ],
  "domains": [ "directonly.internal.example.org" ]
}]
```

Any thoughts/comments/ objections?

Next steps: proprietary keys

- Some proxy properties or match criteria are very vendor specific
 - For example, there is no way to define a standard “Process id”
- Use “mandatory” list to allow clients to ignore keys they don’t support
- Use “_” as the separator between key and organization namespace
- Restrict valid key characters to [A-Za-z_]

Any thoughts/comments/ objections?

Thank you!

- Any thoughts, comments or objections to the current plan?
- Anything else we missing in the specification?