RADEXT WG

-   No additional items identified

Preliminaries

RFC 7542 and 7499 published. Draft-wierenga-eitf-eduroam is in IESG review (telechat) and now blocks dynamic-discovery.

Two documents awaiting shepherd writeup.

Three items proposed that required rechartering. Now that chartering is complete.

Not clear if draft klamm-morissette fits in the current charter

Draft-ietf-radext-dynamic-discovery-15
-   Onto RFC editor

Draft-ietf-radext-ip-port-radius-ext-05
-   Waiting for shepherd write up
-   Dean Cheng gave overview of draft history. No questions. Write up needed and then can progress.

Draft-ietf-radext-bigger-packets
-   Waiting for shepherd write up
-   Lionel Morand: OK with the principle, purpose is to be an experimental RFC. I was wondering if the Protocol-Error code could be generic. Why not put the protocol error elsewhere more generalized?
-   Sam Hartman: Another document can register the code point. There is nothing stopping you from using it as a generic error code even if defined in this document. My feeling was it was not worth delaying this document to split out a one page definition in the error code.
-   Alan Dekok: Doing a STD document for protocol error would require a charter update. Defined in the context of this doc, well it should be standards track soon. I can imagine 10 uses for it.
-   Sam: This is exactly why I don't want to do this. A simple registration mushrooms. We've discussed this, there is no new information.
-   Alan: So now this is experimental and has no meaning outside the experimental specs.
-   Sam: First time you want to use it STDs track you put it there too.
-   Kathy AD: Agree that when you want to use it outside of experimental, you deal with it.

New Work

Datatypes
-   Draft-dekok
    o   Alignment of text and string
    o   Alan: Broadly speaking UTF8 is printable. Binary like CHAP attributes is not. Will want to leave it the way it is with the ambiguity as changing it will confuse everyone. Future RFCs should refer to the datatypes defined here. The extended attribute space is in ASCII art and you glue the datatypes together. If you need new datatypes you update the datatypes doc, or do it in your draft and work through IANA.

EAP Response/Identity

- Draft-winter
    - o Alan: Main point of contention Housekeeping and Bernard in with both feet. Couple of issues 4284 says the NAS can send an EAP request of type identity, but no one implements this so the doc is totally useless. Need to be clear about which identity where. There are 3 of them and can be completely different.
    - o Sam: Definitely some issues. Need to follow up on this on the list. Now I understand the issue.
    - o Lionel: Could define how you use this over RADIUS, then over DIAMETER. Everything else could be good points for EAP implementers. Think we can find consensus here and on the list. The principle is there is clarification needed
- COA Proxying
    - o Lionel: Is MUST absolutely necessary. Alan: Unless the NAS sends you an attribute you should never send it back.
    - o Diego: The first formulation is better IMO.
    - o Sam: Does not like the first formulation. Prefer "NAS is known to accept", than NAS has absolutely sent it.
    - o Alan: NAS sends stuff to proxy, who adds stuff to do the proxy…. <lost rest of comment> the text needs very careful wordsmithing.
    - o Stefan: FWIW I prefer the second approach.
    - o Sam: If 5176 is wrong this is all experimental. There are a lot of NASs that do not ignore unknown attributes. You are making the protocol behave differently in the proxy and non-proxy cases.
    - o Alan: All the intermediate proxies do not know what the NAS implements. Only the immediately adjacent proxy knows this. Will craft some text to refine this.

Various
> Advancement of RFC 6614 to STD track.? Also RFC 6613.
> So we have an editor for 6613 (Alan), does 6614 need an editor? Stefan is WG chair and would yield if someone else feels like taking.

Draft-klamm
- We have a liaison statement from the BBF who would like to reference this work at some point.
- Stefan: Is the goal to make the other VSAs you replace extinct? Is there a migration strategy. What exactly do you want to achieve.
- Fred: We want as many standardized as possible.
- Group: Why?
- Alan: There is precedent, 4679 is informational from the BBF. I think that path would be of benefit to everyone involved.
- Fred: This is wider than the BBF scope. We also want to come back and obsolete 4679.
- Bernard: Standardizing them means changing them and that does not help interoperability.
- Sam: If the BBF wants to publicise them so more folks use them, fine. If you can show me the benefit then I'm willing to listen.

- Alan: If you look through the various vendor dictionaries you see the same stuff over and over again. I think a common list, perhaps not done here, would be a step ahead.
- Lionel: It looks like BBF wants RADEXT review. So one path is to define this as an informational RFC and reviewed by RADEXT.
- Dave: So the intention is to have the BBF use its OUI. Yes. Thanks, just clarifying.

Alan: For people who were not aware, there is a proposal to add TACACS as a protocol. Most have not implemented it interoperability. TACACS does command auth and RADIUS does not. If you have an opinion, go to ops.