Status-Server

http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-radext-status-server-00.txt

Alan DeKok
FreeRADIUS

IETF 72

Introduction

- Status-Server defined in RFC 2865

    - No further discussion.

- In use since (1997? earlier?)

    - Application-layer "ping"

    - Is the *service* alive, rather than the machine (ICMP)

- Document started as individual draft

    - "this will be small"

    - Now a WG item with a lot of text

Background

- Overloading Access-Request && Acct-Request

  – Bad! Requires fake users

  – Allows for potential attacks using fake users

- Some NAS use Access-Request this way

  – Non-configurable, almost always blocked by servers

Benefits

- Status-Server is defined to have no side effects

  – Explicitly called out in this document

- Can be used as "are you alive"

  – Not "keep alive"

- Increased reliability of client-server communication

  – Fail-over, etc.

Protocol

- Packet format is based on Access-Request

  - Even when sent to accounting port

- Message-Authenticator

  - For security, otherwise packets could be forged

  - Not much else.

- Support SHOULD be configurable

- No retransmissions

- Suggests unique source port

Protocol 2

- Response is Access-Accept or Acct-Response
    - Simplifies server handling
    - Makes client handling a little more difficult
- MAY update MIB counters
    - Is this a good idea?
- Reliable transport MUST use RFC3539

Discuss

- Document also includes recommendations for use of Access-Request

  - Contents, security, etc.