# Discussion of seDHCPv6 and RAAN

IETF-98 (Chicago) DHC WG Thursday, March 30, 2017

#### draft-ietf-dhc-sedhcpv6

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

<Slide to be updated before DHC WG session>

#### draft-ietf-dhc-sedhcpv6 - Confirm

- 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

### draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-agentoptdelegate background

- 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)

### draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-agentoptdelegate operation

- 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

## draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv6-agentopt-delegate-04

- 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?