Recommendations on Using Assigned Transport Port Numbers

draft-ietf-tsvwg-port-use-09
IETF 92 - Dallas

Joe Touch, USC/ISI
As presented by Gorry Fairhurst

USC Viterbi
School of Engineering

Information Sciences Institute

Purpose

- ## BCP advice to *protocol designers*
  - Encourage port conservation
  - Encourage use of existing services
  - Discourage 'reinventing the wheel'
  - Clarify how to describe a service in an application and/or ID
- ## **<u>NOT</u>**
  - Direction to the IESG or Expert Review team

Information Sciences Institute

Current status

- ## IESG review
  - Concerns with Secs 7.4, 8 (security)
  - Revised substantially
- ## 08 – Mar 13
  - Interim major roll-in of IESG suggestions
- ## 09 – Mar 23
  - See next slides

Information Sciences Institute

07->09 summary

- ## Clarification of IANA vs. designer
  - Title, Abstract, Sec 1 (Intro)
  - Focus on "assigned ports", not all ports
  - Various other clarifications
- ## Security revisions
  - 7.4, 8 revised completely

7.4 Support for Security

- Refer to additional security mechanisms
  - DTLS, TCP-AO, IPsec

- One vs. two ports for insecure/secure
  - Clarify one port preference is not for security
  - Removed MUST; changed to "encouragement"
  - Updated to reflect both recent SAAG and RFC6335 lack of consensus

- Sec 8
  - Updated to align with 7.4

USC Viterbi
School of Engineering

Information Sciences Institute