

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)  
Request for Comments: 7969  
Category: Informational  
ISSN: 2070-1721

T. Lemon  
Nominum, Inc.  
T. Mrugalski  
ISC  
October 2016

## Customizing DHCP Configuration on the Basis of Network Topology

### Abstract

DHCP servers have evolved over the years to provide significant functionality beyond that described in the DHCP base specifications. One aspect of this functionality is support for context-specific configuration information. This memo describes some such features and explains their operation.

### Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for informational purposes.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7969>.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. Terminology . . . . .	3
3. Identifying Client's Location by DHCP Servers . . . . .	3
3.1. DHCPv4-Specific Behavior . . . . .	7
3.2. DHCPv6-Specific Behavior . . . . .	7
4. Simple Subnetted Network . . . . .	10
5. Relay Agent Running on a Host . . . . .	12
6. Cascaded Relays . . . . .	12
7. Regional Configuration Example . . . . .	13
8. Multiple Subnets on the Same Link . . . . .	15
9. Security Considerations . . . . .	16
10. References . . . . .	17
10.1. Normative References . . . . .	17
10.2. Informative References . . . . .	18
Acknowledgements . . . . .	20
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	20

## 1. Introduction

The DHCPv4 [RFC2131] and DHCPv6 [RFC3315] protocol specifications describe how addresses can be allocated to clients based on network topology information provided by the DHCP relay infrastructure. Address allocation decisions are integral to the allocation of addresses and prefixes in DHCP.

The DHCP protocol also describes mechanisms for provisioning devices with additional configuration information, for example, DNS [RFC1034] server addresses, default DNS search domains, and similar information.

Although it was the intent of the authors of these specifications that DHCP servers would provision devices with configuration information appropriate to each device's location on the network, this practice was never documented, much less described in detail.

Existing DHCP server implementations do in fact provide such capabilities; the goal of this document is to describe those capabilities for the benefit of both operators and protocol designers who may wish to use DHCP as a means for configuring their own services but may not be aware of the capabilities provided by most modern DHCP servers.

## 2. Terminology

- o CPE device: Customer Premise Equipment device. Typically a router belonging to the customer that connects directly to the provider link.
- o DHCP, DHCPv4, and DHCPv6: DHCP refers to the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol in general and applies to both DHCPv4 and DHCPv6. The terms DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 are used in contexts where it is necessary to avoid ambiguity and explain differences.
- o PE router: Provider Edge router. The provider router closest to the customer.
- o Routable IP address: An IP address with a scope of use wider than the local link.
- o Shared subnet: A case where two or more subnets of the same protocol family are available on the same link. 'Shared subnet' terminology is typically used in Unix environments. It is typically called 'multinet' in the Windows environment. The administrative configuration inside a Microsoft DHCP server is called 'DHCP Superscope'.
- o Link or local link: A layer 2 network link, as defined in Section 1.2 of [RFC3297].
- o Link subset: A portion of a link containing a subset of all the connection points on that link, which may be used to finely determine the physical location of a set of clients or may be used to determine topology to a finer degree of detail than the set of all locations at which that particular link is available. The smallest link subset is a single link attachment point, for example, a port on a layer 2 switch.

## 3. Identifying Client's Location by DHCP Servers

Figure 1 illustrates a small hierarchy of network links with Link D serving as a backbone to which the DHCP server is attached.

Figure 2 illustrates a more complex case. Although some of its aspects are unlikely to be seen in actual production networks, they are beneficial for explaining finer aspects of the DHCP protocols. Note that some nodes act as routers (which forward all IP traffic) and some are relay agents (i.e., they run DHCP-specific software that forwards only DHCP traffic).




Figure 1: A Simple Network with a Small Hierarchy of Links




Figure 2: Complex Network

These diagrams allow us to represent a variety of different network configurations and illustrate how existing DHCP servers can provide configuration information customized to the particular location from which a client is making its request.

It is important to understand the background of how DHCP works when considering those diagrams. It is assumed that the DHCP clients may not have routable IP addresses when they are attempting to obtain configuration information.

The reason for making this assumption is that one of the functions of DHCP is to bootstrap the DHCP client's IP address configuration. If the client does not yet have an IP address configured, it cannot route packets to an off-link DHCP server; therefore, some kind of relay mechanism is required.

The details of how packet delivery between clients and servers works are different between DHCPv4 and DHCPv6, but the essence is the same: whether or not the client actually has an IP configuration, it generally communicates with the DHCP server by sending its requests to a DHCP relay agent on the local link; this relay agent, which has a routable IP address, then forwards the DHCP requests to the DHCP server (directly or via other relays). In later stages of the configuration, when the client has acquired an address and certain conditions are met, it is possible for the client to send packets directly to the server, thus bypassing the relays. The conditions for such behavior are different for DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 and are discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

To determine the client's point of attachment and link-specific configuration, the server typically uses the client-facing IP address of the relay agent. In some cases, the server may use the routable IP address of the client if the client has the routable IP address assigned to its interface and it is transmitted in the DHCP message. The server is then able to determine the client's point of attachment and select the appropriate subnet- or link-specific configuration.

Sometimes it is useful for the relay agents to provide additional information about the topology. A number of extensions have been defined for this purpose. The specifics are different, but the core principle remains the same: the relay agent knows exactly where the original request came from, so it provides an identifier that will help the server to choose appropriate address pool and configuration parameters. Examples of such options are mentioned in the following sections.

Finally, clients may be connected to the same link as the server, so no relay agents are required. In such cases, the DHCPv4 server typically uses the IPv4 address assigned to the network interface over which the transmission was received to select an appropriate subnet. This is more complicated for DHCPv6, as the DHCPv6 server is not required to have any globally unique addresses. In such cases,

additional configuration information may need to be required. Some servers allow indicating that a given subnet is directly reachable over a specific local network interface.

### 3.1. DHCPv4-Specific Behavior

In some cases in DHCPv4, when a DHCPv4 client has a routable IPv4 address, the message is unicast to the DHCPv4 server rather than going through a relay agent. Examples of such transmissions are renewal (DHCPREQUEST) and address release (DHCPRELEASE).

The relay agent that receives the client's message sets the `giaddr` field to the address of the network interface the message was received on. The relay agent may insert a relay agent option [RFC3046].

There are several options defined that are useful for subnet selection in DHCPv4. [RFC3527] defines the Link Selection sub-option that is inserted by a relay agent. This option is particularly useful when the relay agent needs to specify the subnet/link on which a DHCPv4 client resides, which is different from an IP address that can be used to communicate with the relay agent. The Virtual Subnet Selection (VSS) sub-option, specified in [RFC6607], can also be added by a relay agent to specify information in a VPN environment. In certain cases, it is useful for the client itself to specify the Virtual Subnet Selection option, e.g., when there are no relay agents involved during the VPN setup process.

Another option that may influence the subnet selection is the IPv4 Subnet Selection option, defined in [RFC3011], which allows the client to explicitly request allocation from a given subnet.

### 3.2. DHCPv6-Specific Behavior

In DHCPv6, unicast communication is possible in cases where the server is configured with a Server Unicast option (see Section 22.12 in [RFC3315]) and clients are able to take advantage of it. In such cases, once a client is assigned a (presumably global) address, it is able to contact the server directly, bypassing any relays. It should be noted that such a mode is completely controllable by administrators in DHCPv6. (They may simply choose to not configure the Server Unicast option, thus forcing clients to always send their messages via relay agents in every case).

The DHCPv6 protocol [RFC3315] defines two core mechanisms that allow a server to distinguish which link the relay agent is connected to. The first mechanism is the link-address field in the Relay-forward and Relay-reply messages. The link-address field uniquely identifies

the link and should not be mistaken for a link-local address. In normal circumstances, this is the solution that is easiest to maintain, as existing address assignments can be used and no additional administrative actions (like assigning dedicated identifiers for each relay agent, making sure they are unique, and maintaining a list of such identifiers) are needed. It requires, however, for the relay agent to have an address with a scope larger than link-local configured on its client-facing interface.

The second mechanism uses an Interface-ID option (see Section 22.18 of [RFC3315]) inserted by the relay agent, which identifies the link that the client is connected to. This mechanism may be used when the relay agent does not have a globally unique address or Unique Local Address (ULA) [RFC4193] configured on its client-facing interface, thus making the first mechanism not feasible. If the interface-id is unique within an administrative domain, the interface-id value may be used to select the appropriate subnet. As there is no guarantee for the uniqueness ([RFC3315] only mandates the interface-id to be unique within a single relay agent context), it is up to the administrator to check whether the relay agents deployed use unique interface-id values. If the interface-id values are not unique, the Interface-ID option cannot be used to determine the client's point of attachment.

It should be noted that Relay-forward and Relay-reply messages are exchanged between relays and servers only. Clients are never exposed to those messages. Also, servers never receive Relay-reply messages. Relay agents must be able to process both Relay-forward (sending an already relayed message further towards the server when there is more than one relay agent in a chain) and Relay-reply (sending back the response towards the client when there is more than one relay agent in a chain).

For completeness, we also mention an uncommon but valid case where relay agents use a link-local address in the link-address field in relayed Relay-forward messages. This may happen if the relay agent doesn't have any address with a larger scope on the interface connected to that specific link. Even though link-local addresses cannot be automatically used to associate the relay agent with a given link, with additional configuration information, the server may still be able to select the proper link.

This requires that the DHCP server has a way of associating a particular link-local address with a particular link. The network administrator can then explicitly configure the DHCP server to recognize that the particular link-address field in a relay message refers to that link.

There are two ways that this can work. One is that the DHCP server can provide a mechanism that explicitly associates the link-local address with a link. In this case, the network administrator simply determines the link-local address of the relay agent on a particular link, which we are presuming to be stable, and configures an association between that address and the link.

If the DHCP server doesn't explicitly provide such a mechanism, it may still provide a "shared subnet" mechanism (see Section 8). If it does, the shared subnet mechanism can be used to explicitly associate a link-local address with a link. To do this, the network administrator creates a shared subnet association for the link, if one does not already exist. The network administrator then configures a /128 subnet that contains just the link-local address of the relay agent. The administrator then adds this new /128 to the shared subnet. Now, when a DHCP message comes in with that link-layer address in the link-address field, the correct shared network will be selected.

DHCPv6 also has support for more finely grained link identification using Lightweight DHCPv6 Relay Agents (LDRAs) [RFC6221]. In this case, the link-address field is set to an unspecified address (::), but the DHCPv6 server also receives an Interface-ID option from the relay agent that can be used to more precisely identify the client's location on the network. It is possible to mix LDRA and regular relay agents in the same network. See Sections 7.2 and 7.3 in [RFC6221] for detailed examples.

What this means in practice is that the DHCP server has sufficient information in all cases to pinpoint the link to which the client is connected. In some cases, it may additionally be possible to pinpoint the particular link subset to which the client is connected.

In all cases, then, the DHCPv6 server will have a link-identifying IP address, and in some cases, it may also have a link-specific identifier (e.g., the Interface-ID option or the Link Address option defined in Section 5 of [RFC6977]). It should be noted that the link-specific identifier is unique only within the scope of the link-identifying IP address. For example, the link-specific identifier of "eth0" assigned to a relay agent using IPv6 address 2001:db8::1 is distinct from an "eth0" identifier used by a different relay agent with address 2001:db8::2.

It is also possible for link-specific identifiers to be nested so that the actual identifier that identifies the specific link subset is an aggregate of two or more identifiers sent by a set of LDRAs in a chain; in general, this functions exactly as if a single identifier were received from a single LDRA, so we do not treat it specially in

the discussion below, but sites that use chained LDRA configurations will need to be aware of this when configuring their DHCPv6 servers.

The Virtual Subnet Selection options, present in DHCPv4, are also defined for DHCPv6. The use case is the same as in DHCPv4: the relay agent inserts VSS options that can help the server to select the appropriate subnet with its address pool and associated configuration options. See [RFC6607] for details.

#### 4. Simple Subnetted Network

Consider Figure 1 in the context of a simple subnetted network. In this network, there are four leaf subnets on which DHCP clients will be configured: Links A, B, F, and G. Relays A, B, C, and D in this example are represented in the diagram as IP routers with an embedded relay function, because this is a very typical configuration, but the relay function can also be provided in a separate node on each link.

In a simple network like this, there may be no need for link-specific configuration in DHCPv6, since local routing information is delivered through router advertisements. However, in IPv4, it is very typical to configure the default route using DHCP; in this case, the default route will be different on each link. In order to accomplish this, the DHCP server will need link-specific configuration for the default route.

To illustrate, we will use an example from a hypothetical DHCP server that uses a simple JSON notation [RFC7159] for configuration. Although we know of no DHCP server that uses this specific syntax, most modern DHCP servers provide similar functionality.

```
{
  "prefixes": {
    "192.0.2.0/26": {
      "options": {
        "routers": ["192.0.2.1"]
      },
      "on-link": ["A"]
    },
    "192.0.2.64/26": {
      "options": {
        "routers": ["192.0.2.65"]
      },
      "on-link": ["B"]
    },
    "192.0.2.128/26": {
      "options": {
        "routers": ["192.0.2.129"]
      },
      "on-link": ["F"]
    },
    "192.0.2.192/26": {
      "options": {
        "routers": ["192.0.2.193"]
      },
      "on-link": ["G"]
    }
  }
}
```

Figure 3: Configuration Example

In Figure 3, we see a configuration example for this scenario: a set of prefixes, each of which has a set of options and a list of links for which it is on-link. We have defined one option for each prefix: a routers option. This option contains a list of values; each list only has one value, and that value is the IP address of the router specific to the prefix.

When the DHCP server receives a request, it searches the list of prefixes for one that encloses the link-identifying IP address provided by the client or relay agent. The DHCP server then examines the options list associated with that prefix and returns those options to the client.

So, for example, a client connected to Link A in the example would have a link-identifying IP address within the 192.0.2.0/26 prefix, so the DHCP server would match it to that prefix. Based on the configuration, the DHCP server would then return a routers option

containing a single IP address: 192.0.2.1. A client on Link F would have a link-identifying address in the 192.0.2.128/26 prefix and would receive a routers option containing the IP address 192.0.2.129.

## 5. Relay Agent Running on a Host

A relay agent is DHCP software that may be run on any IP node. Although it is typically run on a router, this is by no means required by the DHCP protocol. The relay agent is simply a service that operates on a link, receiving link-local multicasts (IPv6) or broadcasts (IPv4) and relaying them, using IP routing, to a DHCP server. As long as the relay has an IP address on the link and a default route or a more specific route through which it can reach a DHCP server, it need not be a router or even have multiple interfaces.

A relay agent can be run on a host connected to two links. That case is presented in Figure 2. There is router B that is connected to Links D and E. At the same time, there is also a host that is connected to the same links. The relay agent software is running on that host. That is uncommon but is a valid configuration.

## 6. Cascaded Relays

Let's observe another case, shown in Figure 2. Note that in this configuration, the clients connected to Link G will send their requests to relay D, which will forward its packets directly to the DHCP server. That is typical but not the only possible configuration. It is possible to configure relay agent D to forward client messages to relay E, which in turn will send them to the DHCP server. This configuration is sometimes referred to as "cascaded relay agents".

Note that the relaying mechanism works differently in DHCPv4 and in DHCPv6. In DHCPv4, only the first relay is able to set the giaddr field in the DHCPv4 packet. Any following relays that receive that packet will not change it as the server needs giaddr information from the first relay (i.e., the closest to the client). The server will send the response back to the giaddr address, which is the address of the first relay agent that saw the client's message. That means that the client messages travel on a different path than the server's responses. A message from a client connected to Link G will pass through relay D, then through relay E, to reach the server. A response message will be sent from the server to relay D via router B, and relay D will send it to the client on Link G.

Relaying in DHCPv6 is more structured. Each relay agent encapsulates a packet that is destined to the server and sends it towards the server. Depending on the configuration, that can be a server's unicast address, a multicast address, or the next relay agent address. The next relay repeats the encapsulation process. Although the resulting packet is more complex (may have up to 32 levels of encapsulation if the packet traveled through 32 relays), every relay may insert its own options, and it is clear which relay agent inserted which option.

## 7. Regional Configuration Example

In the Figure 2 example, Link C is a regional backbone for an ISP. Link E is also a regional backbone for that ISP. Relays A, B, C, and D are PE routers, and Links A, B, F, and G are actually link aggregators with individual layer 2 circuits to each customer -- for example, the relays might be Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers (DSLAMs) or cable head-end systems. At each customer site, we assume there is a single CPE device attached to the link.

We further assume that Links A, B, F, and G are each addressed by a single prefix, although it would be equally valid for each CPE device to be numbered on a separate prefix.

In a real-world deployment, there would likely be many more than two PE routers connected to each regional backbone; we have kept the number small for simplicity.

In the example presented in Figure 4, the goal is to configure all the devices within a region with server addresses local to that region, so that service traffic does not have to be routed between regions unnecessarily.

```

{
  "prefixes": {
    "2001:db8::/40": {
      "on-link": ["A"]
    },
    "2001:db8:100::/40": {
      "on-link": ["B"]
    },
    "2001:db8:200::/40": {
      "on-link": ["F"]
    },
    "2001:db8:300::/40": {
      "on-link": ["G"]
    }
  },
  "links": {
    "A": {"region": "omashu"},
    "B": {"region": "omashu"},
    "F": {"region": "gaoling"},
    "G": {"region": "gaoling"}
  },
  "regions": {
    "omashu": {
      "options": {
        "SIP Server": ["sip.omashu.example.org"],
        "DNS Recursive Name Server": ["dns1.omashu.example.org",
                                      "dns2.omashu.example.org"]
      }
    },
    "gaoling": {
      "options": {
        "SIP Server": ["sip.gaoling.example.org"],
        "DNS Recursive Name Server": ["dns1.gaoling.example.org",
                                      "dns2.gaoling.example.org"]
      }
    }
  }
}

```

Figure 4: Regional Configuration Example

In this example, when a request comes in to the DHCPv6 server with a link-identifying IP address in the 2001:db8::/40 prefix, it is identified as being on Link A. The DHCPv6 server then looks on the list of links to see what region the client is in. Link A is identified as being in omashu. The DHCPv6 server then looks up omashu in the set of regions and discovers a list of region-specific options.

The DHCPv6 server then resolves the domain names listed in the options and sends a SIP Server option containing the IP addresses that the resolver returned for sip.omashu.example.org and a DNS Recursive Name Server option containing the IP addresses returned by the resolver for dns1.omashu.example.org and dns2.omashu.example.org. Depending on the server capability and configuration, it may cache resolved responses for a specific period of time, repeat queries every time, or even keep the response until reconfiguration or shutdown. For more detailed discussion, see Section 7 of [RFC7227].

Similarly, if the DHCPv6 server receives a request from a DHCPv6 client where the link-identifying IP address is contained by the prefix 2001:db8:300::/40, then the DHCPv6 server identifies the client as being connected to Link G. The DHCPv6 server then identifies Link G as being in the gaoling region and returns the SIP Server and DNS Recursive Name Server options specific to that region.

As with the previous example, the exact configuration syntax and structure shown above does not precisely match what existing DHCPv6 servers do, but the behavior illustrated in this example can be accomplished with most existing modern DHCPv6 servers.

## 8. Multiple Subnets on the Same Link

There are scenarios where there is more than one subnet from the same protocol family (i.e., two or more IPv4 subnets or two or more IPv6 subnets) configured on the same link. Such a configuration is often referred to as 'shared subnets' in Unix environments or 'multinet' in Microsoft terminology.

The most frequently mentioned use case is a network renumbering where some services are migrated to the new addressing scheme, but some aren't yet.

A second example is expanding the allocation space. In DHCPv4 and for DHCPv6 Prefix Delegation, there could be cases where multiple subnets are needed, because a single subnet may be too small to accommodate the client population.

The third use case covers allocating addresses (or delegation prefixes) that are not the same as topological information. For example, the link-address is on prefix X, and the addresses to be assigned are on prefix Y. This could be based on differentiating information (i.e., whether the device is a CPE or cable modem in the Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification (DOCSIS)) or just because the link-address/giaddr is different from the actual allocation space.

The fourth use case is a cable network, where cable modems and the devices connected behind them are connected to the same layer 2 link. However, operators want the cable modems and user devices to get addresses from distinct address spaces, so users couldn't easily access their modems' management interfaces.

To support such a configuration, additional differentiating information is required. Many DHCP server implementations offer a feature that is typically called "client classification". The server segregates incoming packets into one or more classes based on certain packet characteristics, e.g., the presence or value of certain options or even a match between existing options. Servers require additional information to handle such configuration, as they cannot use the topographical property of the relay addresses alone to properly choose a subnet. Exact details of such an operation are not part of the DHCPv4 or DHCPv6 protocols and are implementation dependent.

## 9. Security Considerations

This document explains existing practice with respect to the use of Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol [RFC2131] and Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol Version 6 [RFC3315]. The security considerations for these protocols are described in their specifications and in related documents that extend these protocols.

The mechanisms described in this document could possibly be exploited by an attacker to misrepresent its point of attachment in the network. This would cause the server to assign addresses, prefixes, and other configuration options, which can be considered a leak of information. In particular, this could be used as a preliminary stage of an attack when the DHCP server leaks information about available services in parts of the network the attacker does not have access to.

There are several ways that such an attack can be prevented. First, it is a common practice to filter DHCP traffic passing to clients within a particular administrative domain from outside of that domain, and also to filter DHCP traffic to clients outside of a particular administrative domain from within that domain. Second, the DHCP servers can be configured to not respond to traffic that is coming from unknown subnets (i.e., those subnets the server is not configured to serve). Third, some relays provide the ability to reject messages that do not fit expected characteristics. For example, the Cable Modem Termination System (CMTS) acting as a DHCP relay detects if the Media Access Control (MAC) address specified in `chaddr` in incoming DHCP messages matches the MAC address of the cable modem it came from and can alter its behavior accordingly. Also,

relay agents and servers that are connected to clients directly can reject traffic that looks as if it has passed a relay (this could indicate the client is attempting to spoof a relay, possibly to inject forged relay options).

There are a number of general DHCP recommendations that should be considered in all DHCP deployments. While not strictly related to the mechanisms described in this document, they may be useful in certain deployment scenarios. [RFC7819] and [RFC7824] provide an analysis of privacy problems in DHCPv4 and DHCPv6, respectively. If those are of concern, [RFC7844] offers mitigation steps.

Current DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 standards lack strong cryptographic protection. There is an ongoing effort in the DHC working group to address this. [SECURE-DHCPv6] attempts to provide a mechanism for strong authentication and encryption between DHCPv6 clients and servers. [SECURITY-MESSAGES] attempts to improve security of exchanges between DHCP relay agents and servers.

Another possible attack vector is to set up a rogue DHCP server and provide clients with false information, either as a denial of service or to execute a man-in-the-middle type of attack. This can be mitigated by deploying DHCPv6-Shield [RFC7610].

Finally, there is an ongoing effort to update the DHCPv6 specification, which is currently 13 years old. Sections 21 ("Security Considerations") and 22 ("Privacy Considerations") of [DHCPv6bis] contain more recent analysis of the security and privacy considerations.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [RFC2131] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", RFC 2131, DOI 10.17487/RFC2131, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2131>>.
- [RFC3315] Droms, R., Ed., Bound, J., Volz, B., Lemon, T., Perkins, C., and M. Carney, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", RFC 3315, DOI 10.17487/RFC3315, July 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3315>>.

## 10.2. Informative References

## [DHCPv6bis]

Mrugalski, T., Siodelski, M., Volz, B., Yourtchenko, A., Richardson, M., Jiang, S., Lemon, T., and T. Winters, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6) bis", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-dhc-rfc3315bis-05, June 2016.

[RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", STD 13, RFC 1034, DOI 10.17487/RFC1034, November 1987, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1034>>.

[RFC3011] Waters, G., "The IPv4 Subnet Selection Option for DHCP", RFC 3011, DOI 10.17487/RFC3011, November 2000, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3011>>.

[RFC3046] Patrick, M., "DHCP Relay Agent Information Option", RFC 3046, DOI 10.17487/RFC3046, January 2001, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3046>>.

[RFC3297] Klyne, G., Iwazaki, R., and D. Crocker, "Content Negotiation for Messaging Services based on Email", RFC 3297, DOI 10.17487/RFC3297, July 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3297>>.

[RFC3527] Kinnear, K., Stapp, M., Johnson, R., and J. Kumarasamy, "Link Selection sub-option for the Relay Agent Information Option for DHCPv4", RFC 3527, DOI 10.17487/RFC3527, April 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3527>>.

[RFC4193] Hinden, R. and B. Haberman, "Unique Local IPv6 Unicast Addresses", RFC 4193, DOI 10.17487/RFC4193, October 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4193>>.

[RFC6221] Miles, D., Ed., Ooghe, S., Dec, W., Krishnan, S., and A. Kavanagh, "Lightweight DHCPv6 Relay Agent", RFC 6221, DOI 10.17487/RFC6221, May 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6221>>.

[RFC6607] Kinnear, K., Johnson, R., and M. Stapp, "Virtual Subnet Selection Options for DHCPv4 and DHCPv6", RFC 6607, DOI 10.17487/RFC6607, April 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6607>>.

- [RFC6977] Boucadair, M. and X. Pournard, "Triggering DHCPv6 Reconfiguration from Relay Agents", RFC 6977, DOI 10.17487/RFC6977, July 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6977>>.
- [RFC7159] Bray, T., Ed., "The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data Interchange Format", RFC 7159, DOI 10.17487/RFC7159, March 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7159>>.
- [RFC7227] Hankins, D., Mrugalski, T., Siodelski, M., Jiang, S., and S. Krishnan, "Guidelines for Creating New DHCPv6 Options", BCP 187, RFC 7227, DOI 10.17487/RFC7227, May 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7227>>.
- [RFC7610] Gont, F., Liu, W., and G. Van de Velde, "DHCPv6-Shield: Protecting against Rogue DHCPv6 Servers", BCP 199, RFC 7610, DOI 10.17487/RFC7610, August 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7610>>.
- [RFC7819] Jiang, S., Krishnan, S., and T. Mrugalski, "Privacy Considerations for DHCP", RFC 7819, DOI 10.17487/RFC7819, April 2016, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7819>>.
- [RFC7824] Krishnan, S., Mrugalski, T., and S. Jiang, "Privacy Considerations for DHCPv6", RFC 7824, DOI 10.17487/RFC7824, May 2016, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7824>>.
- [RFC7844] Huitema, C., Mrugalski, T., and S. Krishnan, "Anonymity Profiles for DHCP Clients", RFC 7844, DOI 10.17487/RFC7844, May 2016, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7844>>.
- [SECURE-DHCPv6]  
Jiang, S., Li, L., Cui, Y., Jinmei, T., Lemon, T., and D. Zhang, "Secure DHCPv6", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-dhc-sedhcpv6-14, October 2016.
- [SECURITY-MESSAGES]  
Volz, B. and Y. Pal, "Security of Messages Exchanged Between Servers and Relay Agents", Work in Progress, draft-volz-dhc-relay-server-security-02, September 2016.

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dave Thaler for suggesting that even though "everybody knows" how DHCP servers are deployed in the real world, it might be worthwhile to have an IETF document that explains what everybody knows, because in reality not everybody is an expert in how DHCP servers are administered. Thanks to Andre Kostur, Carsten Strotmann, Simon Perreault, Jinmei Tatuya, Suresh Krishnan, Qi Sun, Jean-Francois Tremblay, Marcin Siodelski, Bernie Volz, and Yaron Sheffer for their reviews, comments, and feedback.

## Authors' Addresses

Ted Lemon  
Nominum, Inc.  
800 Bridge Parkway, Suite 100  
Redwood City, CA 94065  
United States of America

Phone: +1-650-381-6000  
Email: Ted.Lemon@nominum.com

Tomek Mrugalski  
Internet Systems Consortium, Inc.  
950 Charter Street  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America

Phone: +1-650-423-1345  
Email: tomasz.mrugalski@gmail.com

