

RADEXT WG

IETF 92

Agenda & Status

Monday, March 23rd, 2014
Chairs: Lionel Morand, Stefan Winter





Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- The IETF plenary session
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of [RFC 5378](#) and [RFC 3979](#) (updated by [RFC 4879](#)).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult [RFC 5378](#) and [RFC 3979](#) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.



Agenda 1/2

- ❖ Preliminaries (Chairs, 5mn)
 - ❖ Note takers/jabber scribes
 - ❖ Agenda Bashing
- ❖ Document Status (Chairs, 5mn)
- ❖ WG Drafts discussion (20 mn)
 - ❖ IP Port Configuration and Reporting (Dean, 10mn)
 - ❖ draft-ietf-radext-ip-port-radius-ext-03
 - ❖ Larger Packets for RADIUS over TCP (Sam, 10mn)
 - ❖ draft-ietf-radext-bigger-packets-03

Agenda 2/2

- ❖ Individual Drafts Discussion (15mn)
 - ❖ Dynamic Authorization Proxying (5mn)
 - ❖ draft-dekok-radext-coa-proxy-00
 - ❖ Correct use of EAP-Response/Identity (5mn)
 - ❖ draft-winter-radext-populating-eapidentity-01
 - ❖ RADIUS Data Types (5mn)
 - ❖ draft-dekok-radext-datatypes-05
- ❖ Recharter discussion (Chairs, 15mn)
- ❖ Wrap-up (Chairs, ADs, 10mn)
 - ❖ Next Steps

WG Status Update (1/2)



*Changes since IETF91 noted in red

Document	Editor	Status	Next Step(s)
<i>RFC Published</i>			
None			
<i>In RFC Editor Queue</i>			
Network Access Identifier (RFC 4282bis) draft-ietf-radext-nai-15	A. DeKok	Comments addressed after IETF LC and IESG evaluation Last DISCUSS recently cleared	• RFC Publication
RADIUS packets fragmentation draft-ietf-radext-radius-fragmentation-12	A. Perez-Mendez	Comments addressed after IETF LC and IESG evaluation New version submitted	• RFC publication
<i>IESG Processing</i>			
NAI-based Dynamic Peer Discover draft-ietf-radext-dynamic-discovery-13	S. Winter	IETF LC completed (2015-03-20) No comment received	• Expert reviews for IANA • IESG evaluation/RFC Ed

WG Status Update (2/2)



*Changes since IETF91 noted in red

Document	Editor	Status	Next Step(s)
<i>In progress WG items (active)</i>			
Larger Packets for RADIUS over TCP draft-ietf-radext-bigger-packets-03	S. Hartman	Version -03 published 2015-03-06 All known comments addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WGLC?• IESG submission
IP Port Configuration and Reporting draft-ietf-radext-ip-port-radius-ext-03	D. Cheng	Version -03 published 2015-02-06 Defined RADIUS TLV types and IPFIX Elements mapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WGLC?• IESG submission
<i>Proposals for Chartered Work</i>			
Dynamic Authorization Proxying draft-dekok-radext-coa-proxy-00	A. DeKok	No change since IETF91 Late comments (along recharter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WG document
Correct use of EAP-Response/Identity draft-winter-radext-populating-eapidentity-01	S. Winter	No change since IETF91	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WG document
RADIUS Data Types draft-dekok-radext-datatypes-05	A. DeKok	No change since IETF91	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• WG document



WG Drafts Discussion

- ❖ IP Port Configuration and Reporting (Dean, 10mn)
 - ❖ [draft-ietf-radext-ip-port-radius-ext-03](#)

- ❖ Larger Packets for RADIUS over TCP (Sam, 10mn)
 - ❖ [draft-ietf-radext-bigger-packets-03](#)



Individual Drafts Discussion

- ❖ Dynamic Authorization Proxying (5mn)
 - ❖ draft-dekok-radext-coa-proxy-00
 - ❖ Proposed as WG document with STD. RFC in Nov' 15

- ❖ Correct use of EAP-Response/Identity (5mn)
 - ❖ draft-winter-radext-populating-eapidentity-01
 - ❖ Proposed as WG document with BCP RFC in Nov' 16

- ❖ RADIUS Data Types
 - ❖ draft-dekok-radext-datatypes-05
 - ❖ Proposed as WG document with Informational RFC in Nov' 15



Errata on RFC 5176 (ID4280)

- Tables in Sec. 3.6 says, for both CoA and Disconnect messages:

Request	ACK	NAK	#	Attribute
0	0	0+	101	Error-Cause

- It should say for both CoA and Disconnect messages:

Request	ACK	NAK	#	Attribute
0	0+	0+	101	Error-Cause

- Definition of Error-Cause in Sec. 3.5 to clarify (new errata?):

It is possible that a Dynamic Authorization Server cannot honor Disconnect-Request or CoA-Request packets for some reason. The Error-Cause Attribute provides more detail on the cause of the problem. It MAY be included within CoA-NAK and Disconnect-NAK packets.

Error-Cause MAY be included in a CoA-ACK and Disconnect-ACK packet to indicate successful actions. If it is included in those packets, the Value MUST be within the range 200-299.

Proposed Status for both errata: “VERIFIED”



Revision of the charter

- The current charter is from... December 2012
- Need to update the current out-of-date text
 - maintain interoperation of heterogeneous RADIUS/Diameter deployments
 - RADIUS attribute space extension, IEEE 802 attributes, New RADIUS transports, RFC4282 bis...
- Proposed text sent by chairs on 2015-03-13
- Comments should be sent before 2015-03-27

- PLEASE COMMENT!



Objectives

The RADIUS Extensions Working Group will focus on extensions to the RADIUS protocol pending approval of the new work from the Area Director and clarify its usage and definition.

Furthermore, to ensure backward compatibility with existing RADIUS implementations, as well as compatibility between RADIUS and Diameter, the following restriction is imposed on extensions considered by the RADEXT WG:

All documents produced MUST specify means of interoperation with legacy RADIUS and, if possible, be backward compatible with existing RADIUS RFCs, including RFCs 2865-2869, 3162, 3575, 3579, 3580, 4668-4673, 4675, 5080, 5090, 5176 and 6158. Transport profiles should, if possible, be compatible with RFC 3539.

The WG will review its existing RFCs' document track categories and where necessary or useful change document tracks, with minor changes in the documents if needed. Any changes to document tracks require approval by the responsible Area Director.



Work Items (1/2)

The immediate goals of the RADEXT working group are to address the following issues:

- CoA proxying. RFC 5176 permits proxying of CoA and Disconnect messages, but makes no provisions for how that is done in a roaming environment. This work item will provide descriptions of how to use the Operator-Name attribute in a roaming environment to proxy CoA packets.

It will also define a new attribute which defines an opaque NAS identifier which can be used to uniquely identify a visited NAS, and whose value will not be modified when proxying, as is done with NAS-Identifier and NAS-IP-Address.

- Encoding Rules for EAP-Response/Identity packets over RADIUS. Neither EAP (RFC3748) nor EAP over RADIUS (RFC3579) demand specific character encoding and normalisation rules for EAP Identity responses. RADIUS (RFC2865) requires User-Name attributes to be encoded in UTF-8. Where a NAS is required to verbatimly copy an EAP-Identity into a User-Name, invalid packets might be produced. This document will suggest restrictions on EAP Identities so that transport over AAA becomes correct under all circumstances (UTF-8) and deterministic (normalisation).



Work Items (2/2)

- Data Types. RFC 2865 defines a number of data types, but later documents do not use those types in a consistent way. This work item will define data types, and update the IANA RADIUS Attribute Type registry so that each attribute has a data type. Where necessary, it will correct issues with previous specifications. This will be a standards track document.
- Larger Packets. Support RADIUS packets greater than 4096-octets over RADIUS transports with this capability.
- RADIUS Attributes for IP Port Configuration and Reporting. These attributes are used by devices that implement IP port ranges to configure and report TCP/UDP ports and ICMP identifiers, as well as mapping behaviors. These attributes can be used in the context of address sharing (e.g., NAT44 [RFC3022], Dual-Stack Lite AFTR [RFC6333], CGN [RFC6888], NAT64 [RFC6146], Provider WLAN (e.g., [TR-146]), etc.).

Next Step

- Agree on the charter
- Progress WG documents
- Review, Review, Review!

