

VPN Option draft changes

- “defines a new DHCP option” -> “defines existing usage”
- Small typos fixed
- Added definitions of same terms as VPN sub-option draft

- “14 hex digits” -> “7 octets”
- “Clients using this option MUST discard DHCPOFFER and DHCPACK packets that do not contain this option” ->

“Since this option is placed in the packet in order to change the VPN on which an IP address is allocated for a particular DHCP client, one presumes that an allocation on that VPN is necessary for correct operation. If this presumption is correct, then a client which places this option in a packet and doesn't receive it in the returning packet should drop the packet since the IP address that was allocated will not be in the correct VPN. If an IP address that is not on the requested VPN is not required, then the client is free to accept the IP address that is not on the VPN that the was requested.”

- Additional justification for relay-agent sub-option overriding client's VPN option

“This reasoning behind this approach is that the relay-agent is almost certainly more trusted than the DHCP client, and therefore information in the relay-agent-information option that conflicts with information in the packet generated by the DHCP client is more likely to be correct.”

- Change in wording for case where server doesn't understand the VPN option and thus doesn't return it.

“In this case the client will discard the DHCPOFFER or DHCPACK.” ->

“In this case the client should consider discarding the DHCPOFFER or DHCPACK, as mentioned above.”

- Additional wording for case where server understands the option and **MUST** return it

“such that the client will know that the allocated address is not in the VPN requested and will consider this information in deciding whether or not to accept the DHCPOFFER.”

- Removed:
“DHCP relays **MAY** choose to remove the option before passing on DHCPDISCOVER packets.”

- “This option SHOULD NOT be used without also making use of the DHCP Authentication option.” ->

“Implementations should consider using the DHCP Authentication option in order to provide a higher level of security if it is deemed necessary in their environment.”

- “No assignment of values for the type field need be made at this time. New values may only be defined by IETF Consensus, as described in RFC2434.” ->

“While the type byte of the Virtual Subnet Selection option defines a number space that could be managed by IANA, expansion of this number space is not anticipated and so creation of a registry of these numbers is not required by this document. In the event that additional values for the type byte are defined in subsequent documents, IANA should at that time create a registry for these type bytes.”

- Normative / Informative references reorganized
- Additional RFC references added:

RFC-951

RFC-1542

RFC-1332

RFC-1661

RFC-3118