

draft-ietf-radext-ip-port-radius- ext-01

IETF 91

Status

- Last update in June
- Three comments from Alan & Arran still pending on reusing IPFIX defined stuff..
- Other than those – ready to ship

How to map the IPFIX Element to Radius TLV proposed in the draft?

- The draft proposed IP-Port-Limit TLV (Section 3.2.1):
 - Type - TBA3
 - Length - 4
 - Value - Port limit (2-byte integer)
- IPFIX defined an element called portRangeStepSize that has the similar (not exactly because the protocol definition - see below) semantics:
 - Name - portRangeStepSize
 - ElementID - 363
 - Datatype - unsigned16
- For the re-use, how would you do the mapping assuming we still need a TLV definition in Radius?

"Port type" (or protocol) definition discrepancy

- In the draft, we defined an IP-Port-Type TLV (Section 3.1.1):
 - Type
 - TBA2-1: TCP/UDP/ICMP
 - TBA2-2: TCP/UDP
 - TBA2-3: TCP
 - TBA2-4: UDP
 - TBA2-5: ICMP
 - Length
 - Value - One or more embedded TLVs
- The enumeration on IP transport ports reflects some CGN implementations, where a chunk of ports on a CGN can be reserved for a specific host that uses a shared IPv4 address, and those ports can only be used for specific protocols as specified.

Cont'd

- In the IPFIX Element definition, there are several port related entries including:
 - sourceTransportPort (7)
 - destinationTransportPort (11)
 - portRangeStart (361)
 - portRangeEnd (362)
 - postNAPTSourceTransportPort (227)
 - postNAPTDestinationTransportPort (228)
- However, their semantics are limited to a single protocol (TCP, UDP or SCTP), not ICMP, not multiple protocols.
- Given the above, how would we re-use the port definition defined in IPFIX?

Last Q

- For those that are defined in the draft (e.g., IP-Port-Local-Id TLV, Section 3.2.9) but not currently in IPFIX, what is the appropriate way to handle it?

Next steps?

- Need opinions on the last set of comments..
 - Proceed with the current formats in the draft?
 - Try to retrofit IPFIX in?