

IANA & Port Assignments

Eliot Lear

Procedures are Crufty!

- The notion of a well known port is antiquated
- The range is less magical than it was
- Very few protocol developers can predict in advance whether their port needs to be “well known”

The TCP/UDP registry is crufty!

- Lots of entries by people and organizations that we have lost track of
 - (some no longer exist)

Goals

- We want port usage documented, in terms of what is running on that port
- We want broadly deployed protocols that use ports to get a central allocation still to avoid conflicts
- We should encourage protocol developers to consider SRV records

SRV Records

- RFC 2782:
- `_Service._Proto.Name TTL Class SRV Priority Weight Port Target`
- Similar to MX records but with specific weight for load balancing targets with the same priority

SRV good

- No IANA port allocation required
- Not that we're running short now, but good to conserve even so
- SRV records allow for prioritized and load balanced services

SRV bad

- 👁️ DNS dependency (and attendant issues)
- 👁️ Potential additional service delay

So...

- 👁 SRV records may be useful
- 👁 But not for everybody

Service Documentation

- RFCs are a great way to document services (either standards or other)
- Publication by academic journals and other standards organizations is good to
- Not having a service documented does pose a long term resource issue
- RFC 3205 is still valid. Better to use port numbers than to use HTTP inappropriately

More information

- 👁️ draft-lear-iana-no-more-well-known-ports-02.txt
- 👁️ Comments welcome
 - 👁️ (now or later)