Status-Server

http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-radext-status-server-00.txt
Introduction

- Status-Server defined in RFC 2865
  - No further discussion.
- In use since (1997? earlier?)
  - Application-layer “ping”
  - Is the service alive, rather than the machine (ICMP)
- Document started as individual draft
  - “this will be small”
  - Now a WG item with a lot of text
Background

- Overloading Access-Request && Acct-Request
  - Bad! Requires fake users
  - Allows for potential attacks using fake users
- Some NAS use Access-Request this way
  - Non-configurable, almost always blocked by servers
Benefits

• Status-Server is defined to have no side effects
  – Explicitly called out in this document
• Can be used as “are you alive”
  – Not “keep alive”
• Increased reliability of client-server communication
  – Fail-over, etc.
Protocol

• Packet format is based on Access-Request
  – Even when sent to accounting port

• Message-Authenticator
  – For security, otherwise packets could be forged
  – Not much else.

• Support SHOULD be configurable

• No retransmissions

• Suggests unique source port
Protocol 2

- Response is Access-Accept or Acct-Response
  - Simplifies server handling
  - Makes client handling a little more difficult
- MAY update MIB counters
  - Is this a good idea?
- Reliable transport MUST use RFC3539
Discuss

- Document also includes recommendations for use of Access-Request
  - Contents, security, etc.