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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