



draft-ietf-radext-radiusdtls-bis Making RadSec a Proposed Standard

IETF 125 in Shenzhen – radext | 19.03.2026

Janfred Rieckers | DFN-Verein



What happened since our last interim

- ▶ some comments and DISCUSS'es from IESG
- ▶ Changes based on this already in the editor's copy on github:
 - Add text for ALPN (compatible with RADIUS/1.1, added IANA request to map „radius/1.0“ ALPN to this document)
 - Implementations MUST reassess the connection if trust base changes
 - s/IP/IP address/ and s/port/port number/

Open DISCUSS'es

- ▶ „MUST establish [(D)TLS] immediately“ – possibly unclear what exactly is meant, Proposed Standard should be crystal clear (Éric Vyncke)
 - Suggestion from Éric was „without any non-protected negotiations such as done by SMTP STARTTTLS“
- ▶ 5-tuple vs CID for DTLS session tracking, why mandate 5-tuple? Should discuss CID (Mike Bishop)
 - Previous section says “MAY choose 5-tuple, but MUST at least check correct originating IP address”, it should be made more clear.

- ▶ Regarding Acct-Delay-Time and Event-Timestamp: Why is this only recommended and not mandated if it contributes to congestion? At least explain under which circumstances it is acceptable to still use Acct-Delay-Time (Gorry Fairhurst)
 - We can't mandate it because it would (unnecessarily) break existing implementations.
 - Maybe add an Appendix with a detailed explanation of why this contributes to congestion?
- ▶ PMTU text is not clear on why this is an issue (Gorry Fairhurst)
 - Maybe add an Appendix detailing why this is necessary and how PMTUD can help at least a little bit?

Open Comments

- ▶ A lot of comments/nits from IESG members
- ▶ Plan: Sort through all comments, reply to the IESG members on all comments, address the open issues
- ▶ Most of the issues can be addressed easily, some may require some more consideration
- ▶ Comment from Éric:
A lot of SHOULD's without explanation, every SHOULD should have an explanation under which circumstances it can be ignored.

Next steps toward publication

- ▶ Address open DISCUSSes and comments
- ▶ Fix (most) editorial nits
- ▶ Publish -16 when most of the comments are addressed (ideally within a few days after the IETF)
 - Please also read the comments from IESG, comment on Pull Requests on the Editor's Copy Github repo
 - <https://github.com/radext-wg/draft-ietf-radext-radiusdtls-bis>
- ▶ We will track issues that need discussion as Issues/Pull Requests on Github

Discussion/Questions?

DFN

► Contact

► Jan-Frederik Rieckers

Mail: rieckers@dfn.de

Phone: 0049 30 884299-339

Fax: 0049 30 884299-370

Address:

DFN-Verein, Geschäftsstelle

Alexanderplatz1

10178 Berlin

