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draft-ietf-dhc-sedhcppv6

• WGLC was to conclude 3/29 (yesterday)
• Few comments posted as of 3/25

<Slide to be updated before DHC WG session>
Jinmei posted comment on 3/26 regarding Confirm (and Rebind for PD case)

1. Send encrypted Confirm
2. Use Information-Request to see if same server present
3. Send unencrypted Confirm
4. Other options
Discussed issues with relay agent snooping and this expired work at IETF-97 (Seoul)
  - With seDHCPv6 encryption, Relay Agents are no longer able to snoop (peak into client’s packets)
  - WG consensus at IETF-97 was to wait for seDHCPv6 to advance further

Fred Templin asking for WG to start this work now

The agentopt draft had fits and starts and “died” in early 2010 (CableLabs specified snooping)
• Relay includes ORO with RAAN option
• Server responds by adding RAAN option with encapsulated IAADDR/IAPREFIX options to Relay-Reply portion of message
• Relays no longer need to peak into client’s message (i.e., snooping)
• Relays can learn addresses/prefixes used by client and for how long (lifetimes)
Why did draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-agentopt-delegate expire?

- Work taking too long for CableLabs and therefore tried and proven method used for DHCPv4 (snooping) was used for early deployments
- Some concerns about potential issues with out of order delivery
  - However, snooping has same issues
  - And has not been known to cause any problems
- Perhaps some guidance needed for Relays?
  - Use latest update from servers
  - Conflicts could be resolved using Leasequery
• So, is it time to start this work?
• If it is, was proposed solution “correct” approach to start with?
• If so, should we just publish next WG revision?
• If not, what should we do?