Recommendations for Transport Port Uses

draft-ietf-tsvwg-port-use-05
IETF 91 - Honolulu

Joe Touch, USC/ISI
As presented by David Black

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

Current status

- ## WGLC completed
  - WG comments addressed
  - Feedback by Gorry on obsolete references
  - IANA Ports Expert Review team
    - Not using ports for loopback services
    - Using clients to decide service equivalence

- ## Revision addressing the above pending
  - (Mostly) waiting for I-D submission queue
  - Gorry will submit with write-up once done

USC Viterbi
School of Engineering

Information Sciences Institute

Expert review team issues

- ## Intra-machine comms
  - Ports SHOULD NOT be requested for services solely within a single host
  - There are numerous other ways to coordinate such services, and the service is not available on the public Internet
- ## Service equivalence
  - Currently considered equivalent if the same client can access both services, e.g., a new service is the same as HTTP if it can be accessed by a vanilla browser
  - Is this a moving target?
  - Seek advice from Apps-Directorate

USCViterbi
School of Engineering

Information Sciences Institute