CAPPORT Architecture

draft-ietf-capport-architecture-02

Authors: K. Larose, D. Dolson

Architecture Updates

Presenter: Kyle Larose

Agenda

- Summary of Changes
- Signalling Protocol
- Open Issues and Questions

Summary of Changes

- Added Requirements for Signalling Protocol
- Reworked ICMP sections to reflect Signalling Protocol
- Fixed various spelling mistakes/typos

Signalling Protocol

- Similar Semantics to old ICMP workflow
- Optional
- Not easy to spoof
- Able to send before portal closure
- Signal source identification
- Minimal information
- Doesn't need to be reliable

Open Issues and Questions

Mechanism to indicate no captive portal

- It'd be nice if we could explicitly indicate that there is no captive portal to bypass discovery/etc.
- Looks to be addressed in draft-ekwk-capport-rfc7710bis-00

Open Issues and Questions

Clarify Provisioning Domains CAPPORT Representation

- Planning on referencing draft-pfister-capport-pvd-00

Open Issues and Questions

TODO: Backwards Compatibility of Signals

- Section 2.4 Mentions that captive protals MAY use legacy methods
- Also mentions that if this is done, they SHOULD also use the signalling protocol
- There's a TODO here about considering backwards compatibility issues.

Open Issues and Questions

API Accept Field and Backwards Compatibility

- What did we actually decide here?
- Do the details of this belong in the API or Architecture document
- If API, do we need to mention the fallback behaviour?

Open Issues and Questions

Signal Plausibility

- Section 4.2 mentions that the UE verifies the "plausibility" of signals
- Plausibility probably isn't the right term. Authenticity?
- Idea here is to capture that the protocal should have some form of mechainsm to ensure it came from the portal.
- Proposal for language relating to this on mailing list, replicated here:

```
The protocol SHOULD have a method of validating that signals were sent by an
enforcement device on the user equipment's path to the external network.
```