

DHCP Options for the Port Control Protocol (PCP)

draft-ietf-pcp-dhcp

IETF 84-Vancouver, July 2012

M. Boucadair, R. Penno and D. Wing

Presenter: J. Queiroz

Proposed changes to handle WGLC Comments

- Add a reference to I-D.ietf-dhc-option-guidelines where aliasing issues are discussed (Section 3)
- Update the text to clearly indicate multiple names may be conveyed in the same option (Section 4.1 and Section 5.1)
- Remove duplicated text (from Section 4.2 and Section 5.2) to a new sub-section (Section 6.1)
- Add a reference to RFC3396 (Section 5.2)

Proposed changes to handle WGLC Comments

- Add a new Section “Use of PCP Server Names”
 - Clarify this procedure is not specific to DHCP but applies to mechanism to configure names
 - Section 6 of -03 is now Section 6.2
- Some other editorial changes
- All these changes have been notified to the reviewers
 - -04 implementing these changes will be submitted

Discussion Point #1: IP Literals

- When RFC1035 is used to encode the name, encoding IP literals will result in being decoded as a domain name (e.g., "1.2.3.4.")
 - How to solve this?
 - Suggested position
 - Indicate in the document the trailing dot is removed for IP literals
 - Any other alternative?

Discussion Point #2: Name resolution at the DHCP server side

- T. Lemon suggested that instead of sending a name, the DHCP server can resolve the name and then send the result to the client
 - This is not compatible with the rationale elaborated in Section 3 (need to levels of redirection)
 - The WG has a consensus to use name instead of IP Address option
 - Moreover, DHC WG has no recommendation on this subject
- Suggested position
 - No change to add to the draft