

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Obsoletes: [5203](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: August 3, 2016

J. Laganier  
Luminate Wireless, Inc.  
L. Eggert  
NetApp  
January 31, 2016

**Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Registration Extension**  
**draft-ietf-hip-rfc5203-bis-10**

Abstract

This document specifies a registration mechanism for the Host Identity Protocol (HIP) that allows hosts to register with services, such as HIP rendezvous servers or middleboxes. This document obsoletes [RFC5203](#).

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 3, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	HIP Registration Extension Overview . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Registrar Announcing Its Ability . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Requester Requesting Registration . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
3.3.	Registrar Granting or Refusing Service(s) Registration .	4
<a href="#">4.</a>	Parameter Formats and Processing . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Encoding Registration Lifetimes with Exponents . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	REG_INFO . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	REG_REQUEST . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.4.</a>	REG_RESPONSE . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.5.</a>	REG_FAILED . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Establishing and Maintaining Registrations . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Contributors . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Changes from <a href="#">RFC 5203</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
Authors' Addresses	. . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

This document specifies an extension to the Host Identity Protocol (HIP) [[RFC7401](#)]. The extension provides a generic means for a host to register with a service. The service may, for example, be a HIP rendezvous server [[I-D.ietf-hip-rfc5204-bis](#)] or a middlebox [[RFC3234](#)].

This document makes no further assumptions about the exact type of service. Likewise, this document does not specify any mechanisms to discover the presence of specific services or means to interact with them after registration. Future documents may describe those operations.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

## [2.](#) Terminology

In addition to the terminology defined in the HIP Architecture [[I-D.ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis](#)], the HIP specification [[RFC7401](#)], and the



HIP Rendezvous Extension [[I-D.ietf-hip-rfc5204-bis](#)], this document defines and uses the following terms:

Requester:

a HIP node registering with a HIP registrar to request registration for a service.

Registrar:

a HIP node offering registration for one or more services.

Service:

a facility that provides requesters with new capabilities or functionalities operating at the HIP layer. Examples include firewalls that support HIP traversal or HIP rendezvous servers.

Registration:

shared state stored by a requester and a registrar, allowing the requester to benefit from one or more HIP services offered by the registrar. Each registration has an associated finite lifetime. Requesters can extend established registrations through re-registration (i.e., perform a refresh).

Registration Type:

an identifier for a given service in the registration protocol. For example, the rendezvous service is identified by a specific registration type.

### **3. HIP Registration Extension Overview**

This document does not specify the means by which a requester discovers the availability of a service, or how a requester locates a registrar. After a requester has discovered a registrar, it either initiates HIP base exchange or uses an existing HIP association with the registrar. In both cases, registrars use additional parameters, which the remainder of this document defines, to announce their quality and grant or refuse registration. Requesters use corresponding parameters to register with the service. Both the registrar and the requester MAY also include in the messages exchanged additional HIP parameters specific to the registration type requested. Other documents will define parameters and how they shall be used.

The HIP base exchange, including the definition of the HIP I1, R1, I2, and R2 packets, is defined in [RFC7401](#) [[RFC7401](#)]. The following sections describe the differences between this registration handshake and the standard HIP base exchange [[RFC7401](#)].



### **3.1. Registrar Announcing Its Ability**

A host that is capable and willing to act as a registrar vis-a-vis a specific requester SHOULD include a REG\_INFO parameter in the R1 packets it sends during all base exchanges with that requester. If it is currently unable to provide services due to transient conditions, it SHOULD include an empty REG\_INFO, i.e., one with no services listed. If services can be provided later, it SHOULD send UPDATE packets indicating the current set of services available in a new REG\_INFO parameter to all hosts it is associated with.

### **3.2. Requester Requesting Registration**

To request registration with a service, a requester constructs and includes a corresponding REG\_REQUEST parameter in an I2 or UPDATE packet it sends to the registrar.

If the requester has no HIP association established with the registrar, it SHOULD send the REG\_REQUEST at the earliest possibility, i.e., in the I2 packet. This minimizes the number of packets that need to be exchanged with the registrar. A registrar MAY end a HIP association that does not carry a REG\_REQUEST by including a NOTIFY with the type REG\_REQUIRED in the R2. In this case, no HIP association is created between the hosts. The REG\_REQUIRED notification error type is 51.

### **3.3. Registrar Granting or Refusing Service(s) Registration**

Once registration has been requested, the registrar is able to authenticate the requester based on the host identity included in I2.

If the registrar knows the Host Identities (HIs) of all the hosts that are allowed to register for service(s), it SHOULD reject registrations from unknown hosts. However, since it may be infeasible to pre-configure the registrar with all the HIs, the registrar SHOULD also support HIP certificates [[I-D.ietf-hip-rfc6253-bis](#)] to allow for certificate based authentication.

When a requester wants to register with a registrar, it SHOULD check if it has a suitable certificate for authenticating with the registrar. How the suitability is determined and how the certificates are obtained is out of scope for this document. If the requester has one or more suitable certificates, the host SHOULD include them (or just the most suitable one) in a CERT parameter to the HIP packet along with the REG\_REQUEST parameter. If the requester does not have any suitable certificates, it SHOULD send the



registration request without the CERT parameter to test whether the registrar accepts the request based on the host's identity.

When a registrar receives a HIP packet with a REG\_REQUEST parameter, and it requires authentication for at least one of the Registration Types listed in the REG\_REQUEST parameter, it MUST first check whether the HI of the requester is in the allowed list for all the Registration Types in the REG\_REQUEST parameter. If the requester is in the allowed list (or the registrar does not require any authentication), the registrar MUST proceed with the registration.

If the requester was not in the allowed list and the registrar requires the requester to authenticate, the registrar MUST check whether the packet also contains a CERT parameter. If the packet does not contain a CERT parameter, the registrar MUST reject the registrations requiring authentication with Failure Type 0 (Registration requires additional credentials). If the certificate is valid and accepted (issued for the requester and signed by a trusted issuer), the registrar MUST proceed with the registration. If the certificate in the parameter is not accepted, the registrar MUST reject the corresponding registrations with Failure Type [IANA TBD] (Invalid certificate).


After successful authorization, the registrar includes a REG\_RESPONSE parameter in its response, which contains the service type(s) for which it has authorized registration, and zero or more REG\_FAILED parameters containing the service type(s) for which it has not authorized registration or registration has failed for other reasons. This response can be either an R2 or an UPDATE message, respectively, depending on whether the registration was requested during the base exchange, or using an existing association. In particular, REG\_FAILED with a failure type of zero indicates the service(s) type(s) that require further credentials for registration.

If the registrar requires further authorization and the requester has additional credentials available, the requester SHOULD try to register again with the service after the HIP association has been established.


Successful processing of a REG\_RESPONSE parameter creates registration state at the requester. In a similar manner, successful processing of a REG\_REQUEST parameter creates registration state at the registrar and possibly at the service. Both the requester and registrar can cancel a registration before it expires, if the services afforded by a registration are no longer needed by the requester, or cannot be provided any longer by the registrar (for instance, because its configuration has changed).







A requester (RQ) registers for service (S1) with a registrar (R) of services (S1), (S2), and (S3), with which it has no current HIP association.



A requester (RQ) registers for service (S) with a registrar (R) of services (S), with which it currently has a HIP association established.

#### 4. Parameter Formats and Processing

This section describes the format and processing of the new parameters introduced by the HIP registration extension. The encoding of these new parameters is conforms to the HIPv2 TLV format described in [section 5.2.1 of RFC7401](#) [RFC7401].

##### 4.1. Encoding Registration Lifetimes with Exponents

The HIP registration uses an exponential encoding of registration lifetimes.


The special value 0 (zero) of the lifetime field MUST be interpreted as representing a special lifetime duration of 0 (zero) seconds, and is used to request and grant cancellation of a registration.

The non-zero values of the lifetime field used throughout this document MUST be interpreted as an exponent value representing a lifetime duration of  $2^{((lifetime - 64)/8)}$  seconds.



This allows a compact encoding of 255 different lifetime durations (in addition to the special lifetime duration of zero seconds) ranging from  $2^{(63/8)}$  seconds (i.e., ~4 ms) to  $2^{(191/8)}$  seconds (i.e., ~178 days) into an 8-bit integer field.

#### 4.2. REG\_INFO



Type	930
Length	Length in octets, excluding Type, Length, and Padding.
Min Lifetime	Minimum registration lifetime.
Max Lifetime	Maximum registration lifetime.
Reg Type	The registration types offered by the registrar.


Other documents will define specific values for registration types. See [Section 7](#) for more information.

Registrars include the parameter in R1 packets in order to announce their registration capabilities. The registrar SHOULD include the parameter in UPDATE packets when its service offering has changed. HIP\_SIGNATURE\_2 protects the parameter within the R1 packets.

The registrar indicates the minimum and maximum registration lifetime that it is willing to offer to a requester. A requester SHOULD NOT request registration with lifetime greater than the maximum registration lifetime or smaller than the minimum registration lifetime.

#### 4.3. REG\_REQUEST





Type	932
Length	Length in octets, excluding Type, Length, and Padding.
Lifetime	Requested registration lifetime.
Reg Type	The preferred registration types in order of preference.

Other documents will define specific values for registration types. See [Section 7](#) for more information.

A requester includes the REG\_REQUEST parameter in I2 or UPDATE packets to register with a registrar's service(s). If the REG\_REQUEST parameter is in an UPDATE packet, the registrar MUST NOT modify the registrations of registration types that are not listed in the parameter. Moreover, the requester MUST NOT include the parameter unless the registrar's R1 packet or latest received UPDATE packet has contained a REG\_INFO parameter with the requested registration types.


The requester MUST NOT include more than one REG\_REQUEST parameter in its I2 or UPDATE packets, while the registrar MUST be able to process one or more REG\_REQUEST parameters in received I2 or UPDATE packets.

When the registrar receives a registration with a lifetime that is either smaller or greater than the minimum or maximum lifetime, respectively, then it SHOULD grant the registration for the minimum or maximum lifetime, respectively.

HIP\_SIGNATURE protects the parameter within the I2 and UPDATE packets.

#### 4.4. REG\_RESPONSE





Type            934  
Length          Length in octets, excluding Type, Length, and Padding.  
Lifetime        Granted registration lifetime.  
Reg Type        The granted registration types in order of preference.

Other documents will define specific values for registration types.  
See [Section 7](#) for more information.

The registrar SHOULD include an REG\_RESPONSE parameter in its R2 or UPDATE packet only if a registration has successfully completed.

The registrar MUST NOT include more than one REG\_RESPONSE parameter in its R2 or UPDATE packets, while the requester MUST be able to process one or more REG\_RESPONSE parameters in received R2 or UPDATE packets.

The requester MUST be prepared to receive any registration lifetime, including ones beyond the minimum and maximum lifetime indicated in the REG\_INFO parameter. It MUST NOT expect that the returned lifetime will be the requested one, even when the requested lifetime falls within the announced minimum and maximum.

HIP\_SIGNATURE protects the parameter within the R2 and UPDATE packets.

#### [4.5.](#) REG\_FAILED





Failure type zero (0) indicates that the registrar requires additional credentials to authorize a requester to register with the registration types listed in the parameter. Failure type one (1) indicates that the requested service type is unavailable at the registrar. Failure type ([TBD-IANA-Insufficient-resources]) indicates that the registrar does not currently have enough resources to register the requester for the service(s); when that is the case the requester MUST NOT reattempt immediately to register for the same service(s), and MAY attempt to contact another registrar to register for these service(s). Failure type ([TBD-IANA-Invalid-Certificates]) indicates that the registrar could not validate the certificate provided by the requester to register for the service(s); when that is the case the requester MUST NOT reattempt to register for the same set of services while providing the same certificate, and MAY attempt to register for the same set of service(s) with a different certificate, or with a different set of service(s) with the same certificate.



The registrar SHOULD include a REG\_FAILED parameter in its R2 or UPDATE packet, if registration with the registration types listed has not completed successfully and a requester is asked to try again with additional credentials.

HIP\_SIGNATURE protects the parameter within the R2 and UPDATE packets.

## **5. Establishing and Maintaining Registrations**

Establishing and/or maintaining a registration may require additional information not available in the transmitted REG\_REQUEST or REG\_RESPONSE parameters. Therefore, registration type definitions MAY define dependencies for HIP parameters that are not defined in this document. Their semantics are subject to the specific registration type specifications.

The minimum lifetime both registrars and requesters MUST support is 10 seconds, while they SHOULD support a maximum lifetime of 120 seconds, at least. These values define a baseline for the specification of services based on the registration system. They were chosen to be neither too short nor too long, and to accommodate for existing timeouts of state established in middleboxes (e.g., NATs and firewalls.)

A zero lifetime is reserved for canceling purposes. Requesting a zero lifetime for a registration type is equal to canceling the registration of that type. A requester MAY cancel a registration before it expires by sending a REG\_REQ to the registrar with a zero lifetime. A registrar SHOULD respond and grant a registration with a zero lifetime. A registrar (and an attached service) MAY cancel a registration before it expires, at its own discretion. However, if it does so, it SHOULD send a REG\_RESPONSE with a zero lifetime to all registered requesters.

## **6. Security Considerations**

This section discusses the threats on the HIP registration protocol, and their implications on the overall security of HIP. In particular, it argues that the extensions described in this document do not introduce additional threats to HIP.

The extensions described in this document rely on the HIP base exchange and do not modify its security characteristics, e.g., digital signatures or HMAC. Hence, the only threat introduced by these extensions is related to the creation of soft registration state at the registrar.



Registrars act on a voluntary basis and are willing to accept being a responder and then to create HIP associations with a number of potentially unknown hosts. Because they have to store HIP association state anyway, adding a certain amount of time-limited HIP registration state should not introduce any serious additional threats, especially because HIP registrars may cancel registrations at any time at their own discretion, e.g., because of resource constraints during an attack.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This section is to be interpreted according to the Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs [[RFC5226](#)].

This document updates the IANA Registry for HIP Parameters Types by replacing references to [[RFC5203](#)] by references to this document.

This document also updates the registry for registration failure types by making the following failure type definitions and reservations:

Failure Type	Reason
-----	-----
[TBD-IANA]	Insufficient resources
[TBD-IANA]	Invalid certificate

## 8. Contributors

Teemu Koponen co-authored an earlier, experimental version of this specification [[RFC5203](#)].

## 9. Acknowledgments

The following people (in alphabetical order) have provided thoughtful and helpful discussions and/or suggestions that have helped to improve this document: Jeffrey Ahrenholz, Miriam Esteban, Ari Keranen, Mika Kousa, Pekka Nikander, and Hannes Tschofenig.

Lars Eggert has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program 2014-2018 under grant agreement No. 644866. This document reflects only the authors' views and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Ari Keranen suggested inclusion of the text specifying requester authorization based on certificates as a direct adaption of text found in HIP native NAT traversal specification [[I-D.ietf-hip-native-nat-traversal](#)].



Thanks to Joel M. Halpern for performing the Gen-ART review of this document as part of the publication process.

## **10. References**

### **10.1. Normative References**

- [I-D.ietf-hip-rfc5204-bis]  
Laganier, J. and L. Eggert, "Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Rendezvous Extension", [draft-ietf-hip-rfc5204-bis-07](#) (work in progress), December 2015.
- [I-D.ietf-hip-rfc6253-bis]  
Heer, T. and S. Varjonen, "Host Identity Protocol Certificates", [draft-ietf-hip-rfc6253-bis-06](#) (work in progress), December 2015.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5226, May 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5226>>.
- [RFC7401] Moskowitz, R., Ed., Heer, T., Jokela, P., and T. Henderson, "Host Identity Protocol Version 2 (HIPv2)", [RFC 7401](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7401, April 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7401>>.

### **10.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.ietf-hip-native-nat-traversal]  
Keranen, A. and J. Melen, "Native NAT Traversal Mode for the Host Identity Protocol", [draft-ietf-hip-native-nat-traversal-10](#) (work in progress), January 2016.
- [I-D.ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis]  
Moskowitz, R. and M. Komu, "Host Identity Protocol Architecture", [draft-ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis-13](#) (work in progress), December 2015.
- [RFC3234] Carpenter, B. and S. Brim, "Middleboxes: Taxonomy and Issues", [RFC 3234](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3234, February 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3234>>.





[RFC5203] Laganier, J., Koponen, T., and L. Eggert, "Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Registration Extension", [RFC 5203](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5203, April 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5203>>.

**Appendix A. Changes from [RFC 5203](#)**

- o Updated references to revised HIP specifications.
- o Added a new registration failure type for use in case of insufficient resources available at the HIP registrar.
- o Added requester authorization based on certificates, and new registration failure type for invalid certificate.

**Authors' Addresses**

Julien Laganier  
Luminate Wireless, Inc.  
Cupertino, CA  
USA

EMail: [julien.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:julien.ietf@gmail.com)

Lars Eggert  
NetApp  
Sonnenallee 1  
Kirchheim 85551  
Germany

Phone: +49 151 12055791

EMail: [lars@netapp.com](mailto:lars@netapp.com)

URI: <http://eggert.org>

