Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: December 16, 2006

B. Fenner
AT&T Labs - Research
June 14, 2006

Experimental Values In IPv4, IPv6, ICMPv4, ICMPv6, UDP and TCP Headers
draft-fenner-iana-exp-2780-05

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

When experimenting with or extending protocols, it is often necessary to use some sort of protocol number or constant in order to actually test or experiment with the new function, even when testing in a closed environment. This document reserves some ranges of numbers for experimentation purposes in specific protocols where the need to support experimentation has been identified, and describes the numbers that have already been reserved by other documents.

1. Introduction

[RFC3692] recommends assigning option numbers for experiments and testing. This document requests [[anchor2: documents --(when assigned)]] such assignments for the number spaces whose IANA considerations are documented in [RFC2780]. This document generally follows the form of [RFC2780].

When using these values, carefully consider the advice in Sections 1 and 1.1 of [RFC3692]. It is not appropriate to simply select one of these values and hard code it into a system.

Note: while [RFC3692] says that it may not be necessary to allocate values for UDP and TCP ports, sections 6 and 7.1 explicitly reserve ports for this purpose to avoid any possible conflict.

2. Fields in the IPv4 header

The IPv4 header [RFC0791] contains the following fields that carry values assigned by the IANA: Version, Type of Service, Protocol, Source Address, Destination Address, and Option Type.

2.1. IP Version field in the IPv4 header

The Version field in IPv4 packets is always 4.

2.2. IPv4 Type of Service field

[RFC2474] defines Pool 2 (all code points xxxx11, where 'x' refers to either '0' or '1') as Experimental / Local Use, so no additional code points should be needed. The ECN field [RFC3168] has no free code points to assign.

2.3. IPv4 Protocol field

[RFC3692] allocates two experimental code points (253 and 254) for the IPv4 Protocol field.

2.4. IPv4 Source and Destination addresses

2.4.1. IPv4 Unicast

No experimental IPv4 addresses are defined. For certain experiments, the address ranges set aside for Private Internets in [RFC1918] may be useful. It is not appropriate to use other special-purpose IPv4 addresses [RFC3330] for experimentation.

At the time of this writing, some Internet Registries have policies allowing experimental assignments from number spaces that they control. Depending on the experiment, the registry, and their policy, this may be an appropriate path to pursue.

2.4.2. IPv4 Multicast

The globally routable group 224.0.1.20 is set aside for experimentation. For certain experiments, the administratively scoped multicast groups defined in [RFC2365] may be useful. This document assigns a single link-local scoped group, 224.0.0.TBD, and a single scope-relative group, TBD.

2.5. IPv4 Option Type field

This document assigns a single option number, with all defined values of the "copy" and "class" fields, resulting in four distinct option type codes. See Section 8 for the assigned values.

3. Fields in the IPv6 header

The IPv6 header [RFC2460] contains the following fields that carry values assigned from IANA-managed name spaces: Version, Traffic Class, Next Header, Source and Destination Address. In addition, the IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options and Destination Options extension headers include an Option Type field with values assigned from an IANA-managed name space. The IPv6 Routing Header contains a Type field for which there is not currently an explicit IANA assignment policy.

3.1. IP Version field in the IPv6 header

The Version field in IPv6 packets is always 6.

3.2. IPv6 Traffic Class field

[RFC2474] defines Pool 2 (all code points xxxx11, where 'x' refers to either '0' or '1') as Experimental / Local Use, so no additional code points should be needed. The ECN field [RFC3168] has no free code points to assign.

3.3. IPv6 Next Header field

[RFC3692] allocates two experimental code points (253 and 254) for the IPv6 Next Header field.

3.4. IPv6 Source and Destination Addresses

3.4.1. IPv6 Unicast Addresses

[RFC2928] defines a set of IPv6 addresses for testing and experimental usage:

> The block of Sub-TLA IDs assigned to the IANA (i.e., 2001:0000::/29 - 2001:01F8::/29) is for assignment for testing and experimental usage to support activities such as the 6bone, and for new approaches like exchanges.

However, at this writing, there are no RFC3692-style experimental IPv6 addresses assigned. [I-D.huston-ipv6-iana-specials] creates an IANA registry which may in the future contain such assignments. For certain experiments, Unique Local Addresses [RFC4193] may be useful. It is not appropriate to use addresses in the documentation prefix [RFC3849] for experimentation.

At the time of this writing, some Internet Registries have policies allowing experimental assignments from number spaces that they control. Depending on the experiment, the registry, and their policy, this may be an appropriate path to pursue.

3.4.2. IPv6 Multicast Addresses

The group FF0X::114 is set aside for experimentation at all scope levels. Smaller scopes may be particularly useful for experimentation, since they are defined not to leak out of a given defined boundary which can be set to be the boundary of the experiment. For certain experiments, other multicast addresses with the T (non-permanently-assigned or "transient" address) bit [RFC4291] set may be useful.

3.5. IPv6 Hop-by-Hop and Destination Option Fields

This document assigns a single option type, with all possible values of the "act" and "chg" fields, resulting in eight distinct option type codes. See Section 8 for the assigned values.

3.6. IPv6 Routing Header Routing Type

This document assigns two values for the Routing Type field in the IPv6 Routing Header, TBDY and TBDZ.

4. Fields in the IPv4 ICMP header

This document assigns two ICMPv4 type numbers, TBD3 and TBD4. ICMPv4 code values are allocated per-type, so it's not feasible to assign experimental values in this document.

5. Fields in the IPv6 ICMP header

[I-D.ietf-ipngwg-icmp-v3] includes experimental ICMPv6 type values for Informational (200, 201) and Error (100, 101) message types. ICMPv6 code values are allocated per-type, so it's not feasible to assign experimental values in this document.

5.1. IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Fields

The IPv6 Neighbor Discovery header [RFC2461] contains the following fields that carry values assigned from IANA-managed name spaces: Type, Code and Option Type.

5.1.1. IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Type

The Neighbor Discovery Type field is the same as the ICMPv6 Type field. See Section 5 for those code points.

5.1.2. IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Code

The ICMPv6 Code field is not used in IPv6 Neighbor Discovery, so no experimental code points are necessary.

5.1.3. IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Option Type

This document assigns two IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Option Types, TBD1 and TBD2.

6. Fields in the UDP header

Two system ports, TBD5 and TBD6, have been reserved for experimentation for UDP and TCP.

7. Fields in the TCP header

7.1. TCP Source and Destination Port fields

Two system ports, TBD5 and TBD6, have been reserved for experimentation for UDP and TCP.

7.2. Reserved Bits in TCP Header

There are not enough reserved bits to allocate any for experimentation.

7.3. TCP Option Kind field

Two TCP options, TBD7 and TBD8, have been reserved for experimentation with TCP Options.

8. IANA Considerations

The new assignments are summarized below.

IPv4 Multicast Addresses (multicast-addresses (224.0.0/24) Local Network Control Block section) (Section 2.4.2)

Group Address	Name
224.0.0.TBD	RFC3692-style Experiment (*)

IPv4 Multicast Addresses (multicast-addresses relative addresses section) (Section 2.4.2)

Relative	Description
TBD	RFC3692-style Experiment (*)

IPv4 Option Numbers (ipv4-parameters initial section) (Section 2.5)

Copy	Class	Number	Value
0	0	?	??_30_
0	2	?	??_94_
1	0	?	??_158_
1	2	?	??_222_

[all '?' are the same, suggest ? = 11110; '??' calculated from other values]

IPv6 Option Types (ipv6-parameters section 5.b.) (Section 3.5)

HEX	act	chg	rest
0x??_[0x1e]_	00	0	?????
0x??_[0x3e]_	00	1	?????
0x??_[0x5e]_	01	0	?????
0x??_[0x7e]_	01	1	?????
0x??_[0x9e]_	10	0	?????
0x??_[0xbe]_	10	1	?????
0x??_[0xde]_	11	0	?????
0x??_[0xfe]_	11	1	?????

[suggest ????? = 11110]

Could be represented in registry as:

b	BINARY		
HEX	act	chg	rest
---	---	---	---
...			
1E,3E,5E,7E,	[x = don't care]		
9E,BE,DE,FE	xx	x	????? RFC3692-style Experiment (*) [ref-to-this-doc]

IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Option Formats (icmpv6-parameters)
(Section 5.1.3)

Type	Description
TBD1	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
TBD2	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)

IPv6 Routing Header Routing Types (ipv6-parameters section 5.c.)
(Section 3.6)

Type	Description
TBDY	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
TBDZ	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)

ICMPv4 Type Numbers (icmp-parameters) (Section 4)

Type	Name
TBD3	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
TBD4	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)

System Port Numbers (port-numbers) (Sections 6 and 7.1)

Keyword	Decimal	Description
exp1	TBD5/udp	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
exp1	TBD5/tcp	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
exp2	TBD6/udp	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)
exp2	TBD6/tcp	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)

TCP Option Numbers (tcp-parameters) (Section 7.3)

Kind	Length	Meaning
TBD7	N	RFC3692-style Experiment 1 (*)
TBD8	N	RFC3692-style Experiment 2 (*)

Each of these registrations should be accompanied by the following footnote:

* It is only appropriate to use these values in explicitly-configured experiments; they MUST NOT be shipped as defaults in implementations. See RFC 3692 for details.

9. Security Considerations

Security analyzers such as firewalls and network intrusion detection monitors often rely on unambiguous interpretations of the fields described in this memo. As new values for the fields are assigned, existing security analyzers that do not understand the new values may fail, resulting in either loss of connectivity if the analyzer declines to forward the unrecognized traffic, or loss of security if it does forward the traffic and the new values are used as part of an attack. Assigning known values for experiments can allow such analyzers to take a known action for explicitly experimental traffic.

Because the experimental IPv4 options defined in Section 2.5 are not included in the IPsec AH [RFC4302] calculations, it is not possible for one to authenticate their use. Experimenters ought to keep this in mind when designing their experiments. Users of the experimental IPv6 options defined in Section 3.5 can choose whether or not the

option is included in the AH calculations by choosing the value of the "chg" field.

When experimental code points are deployed within an administratively self-contained network domain, the network administrators should ensure that each code point is used consistently to avoid interference between experiments. When experimental code points are used in traffic that crosses multiple administrative domains, the experimenters should assume that there is a risk of the same code points being used simultaneously by other experiments and thus that there is a possibility that the experiments will interfere. Particular attention should be given to security threats that such interference might create.

10. References

10.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-ipngwg-icmp-v3]
Conta, A., "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", draft-ietf-ipngwg-icmp-v3-07 (work in progress), I-D Status iesg, IETF Datatracker State RFC Ed Queue, Intended Status Draft Standard, Responsible AD Margaret Wasserman, RFC-Editor Queue State RFC-EDITOR, July 2005.

[RFC0791] Postel, J., "Internet Protocol", RFC 791, STD 5, Updated by RFC1349, Current Status STANDARD, September 1981.

[RFC1918] Rekhter, Y., Moskowitz, B., Karrenberg, D., J. de Groot, G., and E. Lear, "Address Allocation for Private Internets", RFC 1918, BCP 5, Current Status BEST CURRENT PRACTICE, February 1996.

[RFC2365] Meyer, D., "Administratively Scoped IP Multicast", RFC 2365, BCP 23, Current Status BEST CURRENT PRACTICE, July 1998.

[RFC2460] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", RFC 2460, Current Status DRAFT STANDARD, December 1998.

[RFC2461] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., and W. Simpson, "Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6)", RFC 2461, Updated by RFC4311, Current Status DRAFT STANDARD, December 1998.

[RFC2474] Nichols, K., Blake, S., Baker, F., and D. Black,

"Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers", RFC 2474, Updated by RFC3168, Updated by RFC3260, Current Status PROPOSED STANDARD, December 1998.

[RFC2780] Bradner, S. and V. Paxson, "IANA Allocation Guidelines For Values In the Internet Protocol and Related Headers", RFC 2780, BCP 37, Was Internet-Draft draft-bradner-iana-allocation-05, Current Status BEST CURRENT PRACTICE, March 2000.

[RFC2928] Hinden, R., Deering, S., Fink, R., and T. Hain, "Initial IPv6 Sub-TLA ID Assignments", RFC 2928, Was Internet-Draft draft-ietf-ipngwg-iana-tla-03, Current Status INFORMATIONAL, September 2000.

[RFC3168] Ramakrishnan, K., Floyd, S., and D. Black, "The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP", RFC 3168, Was Internet-Draft draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-04, Current Status PROPOSED STANDARD, September 2001.

[RFC3330] "Special-Use IPv4 Addresses", RFC 3330, Was Internet-Draft draft-iana-special-ipv4-05, Current Status INFORMATIONAL, September 2002.

[RFC3692] Narten, T., "Assigning Experimental and Testing Numbers Considered Useful", RFC 3692, BCP 82, Was Internet-Draft draft-narten-iana-experimental-allocations-05, Current Status BEST CURRENT PRACTICE, January 2004.

[RFC3849] Huston, G., Lord, A., and P. Smith, "IPv6 Address Prefix Reserved for Documentation", RFC 3849, Was Internet-Draft draft-huston-ipv6-documentation-prefix-03, Current Status INFORMATIONAL, July 2004.

[RFC4193] Hinden, R. and B. Haberman, "Unique Local IPv6 Unicast Addresses", RFC 4193, Was Internet-Draft draft-ietf-ipv6-unique-local-addr-09, Current Status PROPOSED STANDARD, October 2005.

[RFC4291] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", RFC 4291, Was Internet-Draft draft-ietf-ipv6-addr-arch-v4-04, Current Status DRAFT STANDARD, February 2006.

[RFC4302] Kent, S., "IP Authentication Header", RFC 4302, Was Internet-Draft draft-ietf-ipsec-rfc2402bis-10, Current Status PROPOSED STANDARD, December 2005.

10.2. Informative References

[I-D.huston-ipv6-iana-specials]
Huston, G., "Administration of the IANA Special Purpose Address Block", draft-huston-ipv6-iana-specials-01 (work in progress), I-D Status iesg, IETF Datatracker State AD Evaluation, Intended Status Informational, Responsible AD David Kessens, December 2005.

Appendix A. Change History

(To be removed before publication)

A.1. Changes from -01

- Added refs to 3849 and 3330 for things not to use in unicast addresses.
- Updated ULA ref to be 4193.
- Changed multiple "TBD1+TBD2" to TBD1 through TBD8
- Added IPv6 multicast addresses with T bit.
- Added footnote to be included in all IANA registrations.
- Added link-local and scope-relative v4 multicast addresses

A.2. Changes from -02

- Added IPsec AH discussion in security considerations
- Added mention of the IPv6 special use unicast address block.
- Added IPv6 Routing Header TBDY and TBDZ
- Point out that even though RFC3692 gives UDP/TCP ports as an example where reserving values isn't necessary, we do anyway since it allows avoiding conflicts.

A.3. Changes from -03

- Moved mention of reserving UDP/TCP ports to introduction, to avoid inconsistency of mentioning it in Section 6 and not Section 7.1.

A.4. Changes from -04

- Mention that registries are possible places to get unicast addresses.
- Fixed title of Informative References section.
- Fixed some speling errurs.
- Changed titles of sections 2.1 and 3.1.
- Moved Section 5.1 to a more sensible place under Section 5.

Author's Address

Bill Fenner
AT&T Labs - Research
75 Willow Rd
Menlo Park, CA 94025
USA

Phone: +1 650 330-7893
Email: fenner@research.att.com

Intellectual Property Statement

Disclaimer of Validity

Copyright Statement

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.