

Mobile Ad hoc Networking (MANET)  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [5444](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: November 14, 2015

C. Dearlove  
BAE Systems ATC  
T. Clausen  
LIX, Ecole Polytechnique  
May 13, 2015

TLV Naming in the MANET Generalized Packet/Message Format  
draft-ietf-manet-tlv-naming-03

## Abstract

This document reorganizes the naming of already allocated TLV (type-length-value) types and type extensions in the Mobile Ad hoc NETWORK (MANET) registries defined by [RFC 5444](#) to use names appropriately. It has no consequences in terms of any protocol implementation.

This document also updates the Expert Review guidelines from [RFC 5444](#), so as to establish a policy for consistent naming of future TLV type and type extension allocations. It makes no other changes to [RFC 5444](#).

## 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 November 14, 2015.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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

Internet-Draft

TLV Naming

May 2015

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

- [1. Introduction . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [2. Terminology . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [3. IANA Considerations . . . . .](#) [5](#)
  - [3.1. Expert Review: Evaluation Guidelines . . . . .](#) [5](#)
  - [3.2. Updated IANA Registries . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [4. Security Considerations . . . . .](#) [13](#)
- [5. Acknowledgments . . . . .](#) [13](#)
- [6. Normative References . . . . .](#) [14](#)
- [Authors' Addresses . . . . .](#) [14](#)

## 1. Introduction

This document reorganizes and rationalizes the naming of TLVs (type-length-value structures), defined by [\[RFC5444\]](#) and recorded by IANA in the Mobile Ad hoc NETwork (MANET) Parameters registries "Packet TLV Types", "Message TLV Types", and "Address Block TLV Types".

This document reorganizes the naming of already allocated Packet, Message and Address Block TLV types, and their corresponding Type Extensions, and updates corresponding IANA registries.

TLVs have a type (one octet) and a type extension (one octet) which together form a full type (of two octets). A TLV may omit the type extension when it is zero, but that applies only to its representation, it still has a type extension of zero. A TLV type defines an IANA registry of type extensions for that type.

There have been two forms of TLV allocation.

The first, but less common, form of allocation has been that allocation of the type has immediately defined (but not necessarily allocated) all the corresponding type extensions for versions of that type. This applies, for example, to the Address Block TLV LINK\_METRIC specified in [\[RFC7181\]](#). The LINK\_METRIC type extensions are all available for allocation for different definitions of link metric. It is appropriate in this case to apply the name LINK\_METRIC to the type, and also to all the full types corresponding to that type, as has been done. Type extensions can then be individually named, or can be simply referred to by their number.

The second, more common, form of allocation has been that for a TLV type, only type extension 0, and possibly the type extension 1, are defined. An example is the Address Block TLV LINK\_STATUS defined in [\[RFC6130\]](#), where only type extension 0 is allocated. It is not reasonable to assume that the remaining 255 type extensions will be allocated to forms of LINK\_STATUS. (Other forms of link status are

already catered to by the introduction, in [[RFC7188](#)], of a registry for values of the LINK\_STATUS TLV.) Thus the name LINK\_STATUS should be attached to that specific type extension for that type, i.e., to the full type, and not to the TLV type when used with all other type extensions therefore. This was, however, not done as part of the initial registration of this TLV type. Effectively, this leaves, for the LINK\_STATUS TLV type, the type extensions 1-255 either unavailable for allocation (if applying strictly the interpretation that they must relate to a LINK\_STATUS), or counterintuitively named for their intended function.

The purpose of this document is to change how names of the second form are applied, and recorded in IANA registries, and to provide guidelines and instructions for future TLV type allocations. This is to facilitate the addition of new TLVs using type extensions other than 0, but without them having inappropriate names attached. So, for example, LINK\_STATUS will become the name of the full type (as composed by the TLV type 3 and the TLV type extension 0), and will cease being the name of the TLV type 3. This leaves the question of how to name the type. As it is not clear what other TLVs might be defined for other type extensions of the same type, it is proposed to leave the type currently unnamed, specified only by number.

This document also updates the Expert Review guidelines from [[RFC5444](#)], so as to establish a policy for consistent naming of future TLV type and type extension allocations.

For clarity, all currently allocated TLVs in [[RFC5497](#)], [[RFC6130](#)], [[RFC6621](#)], [[RFC7181](#)] and [[RFC7182](#)] will be listed in the IANA considerations section of this document, indicating no change when that is appropriate (such as the LINK\_METRIC TLV, and including both TLVs defined in [[RFC6621](#)]). The only changes are of naming.

Note that nothing in this draft changes the operation of any protocol. This naming is already used, in effect, in [[RFC6130](#)] and [[RFC7181](#)], currently the main users of allocated TLVs. For example the former indicates that all usage of LINK\_STATUS refers to that TLV with type extension 0.

## [2.](#) Terminology

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

All references to elements such as packet, message and TLV in this document refer to those defined in [\[RFC5444\]](#).

## [3.](#) IANA Considerations

This document updates the Expert Review evaluation guidelines for Packet TLV Type, Message TLV Type, and Address Block TLV Type allocations, from [\[RFC5444\]](#), and updates the registries for already made allocations to follow these guidelines.

### [3.1.](#) Expert Review: Evaluation Guidelines

For registration from the registries for Packet TLV Types, Message TLV Types, and Address Block TLV Types, the following guidelines apply, in addition to those given in [section 6.1 in \[RFC5444\]](#):

- o If the requested TLV Type immediately defines (but not necessarily allocates) all the corresponding type extensions for versions of that type, then a common name SHOULD be assigned for the TLV type.
- o Otherwise, if the requested TLV Type does not immediately define all the corresponding type extensions for versions of that type, then a common name SHOULD NOT be assigned for that TLV type. Instead, it is RECOMMENDED that:

- \* The "description" for the allocated TLV type be "Defined by Type Extension";
- \* For Packet TLV Types, that the Type Extension registry, created for the TLV Type, be named "Type XX Packet TLV Type Extensions", with XX replaced by the numerical value of the TLV Type.
- \* For Message TLV Types, that the Type Extension registry, created for the TLV Type, be named "Type XX Message TLV Type Extensions", with XX replaced by the numerical value of the TLV Type.
- \* For Address Block TLV Types, that the Type Extension registry, created for the TLV Type, be named "Type XX Address Block TLV Type Extensions", with XX replaced by the numerical value of the TLV Type.
- \* That when a new Type Extension is required that, unless there are reasons to the contrary, the next consecutive type extension is allocated and given a name. (Reasons to the contrary MAY include maintaining a correspondence between corresponding Packet, Message, and Address Block TLVs, and reserving type extension zero if not yet allocated.)

Note that the former case is unchanged by this specification, this

currently includes TLV types named ICV, TIMESTAMP and LINK\_METRIC, and the HELLO Message-Type-specific TLVs defined in [[RFC6621](#)].

### [3.2.](#) Updated IANA Registries

The following changes all apply to the IANA registry "Mobile Ad hoc NETwork (MANET) Parameters". For clarity, registries that are unchanged, including those that define all type extensions of a TLV type, are listed as unchanged.

The IANA registry "Packet TLV Types" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "ICV Packet TLV Type Extensions" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "TIMESTAMP Packet TLV Type Extensions" is

unchanged.

The IANA Registry "Message TLV Types" is changed to Table 1.

Type	Description	Reference
0	Defined by Type Extension	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>
1	Defined by Type Extension	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>
2-4	Unassigned	
5	ICV	<a href="#">[RFC7182]</a>
6	TIMESTAMP	<a href="#">[RFC7182]</a>
7	Defined by Type Extension	<a href="#">[RFC7181]</a>
8	Defined by Type Extension	<a href="#">[RFC7181]</a>
9-223	Unassigned	
224-255	Reserved for Experimental Use	<a href="#">[RFC5444]</a>

Table 1: Message TLV Types

The IANA Registry "INTERVAL\_TIME Message TLV Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 0 Message TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 2.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
----------------	------	-------------	-----------

0	INTERVAL_TIME	The maximum time before another message of the same type as this message from the same originator should be received	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>

Table 2: Type 0 Message TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "VALIDITY\_TIME Message TLV Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 1 Message TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 3.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	VALIDITY_TIME	The time from receipt of the message during which the information contained in the message is to be considered valid	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>

Table 3: Type 1 Message TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "ICV Message TLV Type Extensions" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "TIMESTAMP Message TLV Type Extensions" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "MPR\_WILLING Message Type Extensions" is renamed as



"Type 7 Message TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 4.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	MPR_WILLING	Bits 0-3 specify the originating router's willingness to act as a flooding MPR; bits 4-7 specify the originating router's willingness to act as a routing MPR	[RFC7181]
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC7181]

Table 4: Type 7 Message TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "CONT\_SEQ\_NUM Message Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 8 Message TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 5.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	CONT_SEQ_NUM (COMPLETE)	Specifies a content sequence number for this complete message	[RFC7181]
1	CONT_SEQ_NUM (INCOMPLETE)	Specifies a content sequence number for this incomplete message	[RFC7181]
2-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC7181]

Table 5: Type 8 Message TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "HELLO Message-Type-specific Message TLV Types" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "TC Message-Type-specific Message TLV Types" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "Address Block TLV Types" is changed to Table 6.

Type	Description	Reference
0	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC5497]
1	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC5497]
2	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC6130]
3	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC6130]
4	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC6130]
5	ICV	[RFC7182]
6	TIMESTAMP	[RFC7182]
7	LINK_METRIC	[RFC7181]
8	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC7181]
9	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC7181]
10	Defined by Type Extension	[RFC7181]
11-223	Unassigned	
224-255	Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC5444]

Table 6: Address Block TLV Types

The IANA Registry "INTERVAL\_TIME Address Block TLV Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 0 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 7.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	INTERVAL_TIME	The maximum time before another message of the same type as this message from the same originator and containing this address should be received	[RFC5497]
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC5497]

Table 7: Type 0 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "VALIDITY\_TIME Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 1 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 8.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	VALIDITY_TIME	The time from receipt of the address during which the information regarding this address is to be considered valid	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>
1-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	<a href="#">[RFC5497]</a>

Table 8: Type 1 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "LOCAL\_IF Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 2 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 9.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	LOCAL_IF	This value is to be interpreted according to the registry [LOCAL_IF TLV Values]	<a href="#">[RFC7188]</a> [RFC6130]
1-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	<a href="#">[RFC6130]</a>

Table 9: Type 2 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "LINK\_STATUS Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 3 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 10.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	LINK_STATUS	This value is to be interpreted according to the registry [LINK_STATUS TLV Values]	[ <a href="#">RFC7188</a> ] [RFC6130]
1-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	[ <a href="#">RFC6130</a> ]

Table 10: Type 3 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "OTHER\_NEIGHB Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 4 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 11.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	OTHER_NEIGHB	This value is to be interpreted according to the	[ <a href="#">RFC7188</a> ] [RFC6130]

		registry	
		[OTHER_NEIGHB TLV	
		Values]	
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for	<a href="#">[RFC6130]</a>
		Experimental Use	

Table 11: Type 4 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "ICV Address TLV Type Extensions" is renamed as "ICV Address Block TLV Type Extensions" but is otherwise unchanged.

The IANA Registry "TIMESTAMP Address TLV Type Extensions" is renamed as "ICV Address Block TLV Type Extensions" but is otherwise unchanged.

The IANA Registry "LINK\_METRIC Address Block TLV Type Extensions" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "MPR Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 8 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 12.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	MPR	This value is to be interpreted according to the registry [MPR TLV Bit Values]	<a href="#">[RFC7188]</a> [RFC7181]
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	This Document

Table 12: Type 8 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "NBR\_ADDR\_TYPE Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 9 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 13.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	NBR_ADDR_TYPE	This value is to be interpreted according to the registry [NBR_ADDR_TYPE Address Block TLV Bit Values]	<a href="#">[RFC7188]</a> [RFC7181]
1-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	This Document

Table 13: Type 9 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "GATEWAY Address Block Type Extensions" is renamed as "Type 10 Address Block TLV Type Extensions" and changed to Table 14.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	GATEWAY	Specifies that a given network address is reached via a gateway on the originating router, with value equal to the number of hops	<a href="#">[RFC7188]</a> [RFC7181]
1-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	This Document

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

#### Table 14: Type 10 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

The IANA Registry "HELLO Message-Type-specific Address Block TLV Types" is unchanged.

The IANA Registry "TC Message-Type-specific Address Block TLV Types" is unchanged.

Note: This document adds reservations for experimental use, omitted in [[RFC7181](#)], to the last three tables.

#### [4.](#) Security Considerations

As this document is concerned only with how entities are named, those names being used only in documents such as this and IANA registries, this document has no security considerations.

#### [5.](#) Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Adrian Farrel for pointing out the need to reorganize and rationalize the naming of the TLVs defined by [[RFC5444](#)], and Tom Taylor for pointing out some omissions and errors.

#### [6.](#) Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

[RFC5444] Clausen, T., Dearlove, C., Dean, J., and C. Adjih, "Generalized MANET Packet/Message Format", [RFC 5444](#), February 2009.

[RFC5497] Clausen, T. and C. Dearlove, "Representing Multi-Value Time in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (MANETs)", [RFC 5497](#),

March 2009.

- [RFC6130] Clausen, T., Dean, J., and C. Dearlove, "Mobile Ad Hoc Network (MANET) Neighborhood Discovery Protocol (NHDP)", [RFC 6130](#), April 2011.
- [RFC6621] Macker, J., "Simplified Multicast Forwarding", [RFC 6621](#), May 2012.
- [RFC7181] Clausen, T., Dearlove, C., Jacquet, P., and U. Herberg, "The Optimized Link State Routing Protocol version 2", [RFC 7181](#), April 2014.
- [RFC7182] Herberg, U., Clausen, T., and C. Dearlove, "Integrity Check Value and Timestamp TLV Definitions for Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (MANETs)", [RFC 7182](#), April 2014.
- [RFC7188] Dearlove, C. and T. Clausen, "Optimized Link State Routing Protocol version 2 (OLSRv2) and MANET Neighborhood Discovery Protocol (NHDP) Extension TLVs", [RFC 7188](#), April 2014.

#### Authors' Addresses

Christopher Dearlove  
BAE Systems Advanced Technology Centre  
West Hanningfield Road  
Great Baddow, Chelmsford  
United Kingdom

Phone: +44 1245 242194  
Email: [chris.dearlove@baesystems.com](mailto:chris.dearlove@baesystems.com)  
URI: <http://www.baesystems.com/>

Thomas Heide Clausen  
LIX, Ecole Polytechnique

Phone: +33 6 6058 9349



Email: T.Clausen@computer.org

URI: <http://www.ThomasClausen.org/>