

Short term NAT requirements for UDP based  
peer-to-peer applications

Status of this memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

This document is an Internet-Draft. Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

Abstract

During the next few years, as the IPv4 address space moves toward exhaustion, it is likely that the deployment of NAT will accelerate. This draft presents the requirements that NAT devices must meet in order to enable use of UDP by peer-to-peer applications. The requirement can be summed up by the need to avoid gratuitous filtering and too short timers.

## **1 Introduction**

During the next few years, as the IPv4 address space moves toward exhaustion, it is likely that the deployment of NAT will accelerate. By 2005, millions of NAT devices will likely be deployed on the Internet, both within enterprises and consumer households.

This draft presents the requirements that NAT devices must meet in order to enable UDP based peer-to-peer applications during the transition to IPv6. Rather than specifying every aspect of a NAT's operation in detail, our focus is solely on identifying those requirements that are absolutely essential to ensure compatibility with what we believe will be the most popular IPv6 transition mechanisms.

## **1.1 Requirements language**

Huitema.

[Page 1]

In this document, the key words "MAY", "MUST", "MUST NOT", "optional", "recommended", "SHOULD", and "SHOULD NOT", are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

## [1.2](#) The case for IPv6 transition

As described in [NAT Complications] today's NAT devices are relatively successful at supporting TCP/UDP "client" applications which represented the bulk of Internet usage during the 1990s. These applications include Web browsing with HTTP and SSL, FTP, email and DNS. The current generation of NAT products has some unfortunate consequences on the users ability to deploy new applications, many of which follow a "peer-to-peer" model, and expect all "clients" to be also able to behave as "servers." Napster is a typical example of one such popular application: the peer-to-peer exchanges of music files cannot take place if both peers are located behind a NAT. With peer-to-peer applications such as NAPSTER now comprising more than **[75 percent of Internet traffic in some locations, it has become](#)** clear that NAT devices are in danger of retarding the evolution of the Internet.

We believe that the proper solution to the NAT problem is to move towards IPv6. We realize that IPv6 cannot be turned on instantly, and that during this deployment even the IPv6 enabled hosts will have to continue using IPv4 to reach those hosts that are not yet IPv6 enabled. We believe that very simple restrictions on the way NAT perform mappings for UDP applications can greatly ease the deployment of those peer-to-peer applications that rely on UDP.

## [2](#) Definitions

### [2.1](#) NAT

As defined in [[RFC2663](#)], Network Address Translation is a method by which IP addresses are mapped from one realm to another, in an attempt to provide transparent routing to hosts. Traditionally, NAT devices are used to connect an isolated address realm with private unregistered addresses to an external realm with globally unique registered addresses.

### [2.2](#) Global IPv4 Internet

We use the term "global IPv4 Internet" to designate the fraction of the Internet that uses globally unique IP addresses, and where connectivity to all globally unique addresses is expected.

### [2.3](#) Private network

We use the term "private network" to designate a network that uses

private addresses as defined in [[RFC1918](#)], and that usually connects

Huitema.

[Page 2]

to the global IPv4 Internet through a NAT device.

### **3      Model, requirements**

Experience shows that the implementers of NAT products can adopt widely different treatments of UDP packets:

\*      Some implement the simplest solution, which is to map an internal UDP port, defined by an internal address and a port number on the corresponding host, to an external port, defined by a global address managed by the NAT and a port number valid for that address. In this simple case, the mapping is retained as long as the port is active, and is removed after an inactivity timer. As long as the mapping is retained, any packet received by the NAT for the external port is relayed to the internal address and port.

\*      Some implement a more complex solution, in which the NAT device not only establishes a mapping for the UDP port, but also maintain a list of external hosts to which traffic has been sent from that port. The packets originating from third party hosts to which the local host has not yet sent traffic are rejected.

\*      Instead of keeping just a list of authorized hosts, some NAT devices keep a list of authorized host and port pairs. UDP packets coming from remote addresses are rejected if the internal host has not yet sent traffic to the outside host and port pair.

\*      Finally, some NAT device map the same internal address and port pair to different external address and port pair, depending on the address of the remote host.

The most complex implementations break many application scenarios that use "triangular routing": a Host A sends a packet to a server B; the server B forwards the query to a secondary server C; C responds directly to A. Such scenarios are quite common in real-time communication applications.

The goal of this document is to enable easy deployment of UDP-based peer-to-peer applications in private networks that are connected to the "global IPv4 Internet" through a NAT device.

### **4      Description of the solution**

The following requirements apply to NAT devices establishing mappings of private hosts addresses and UDP ports to global host addresses and ports:

1)      The NAT MUST maintain UDP mappings for at least MIN\_INTERVAL minutes. By default, MIN\_INTERVAL = 3.

2) The NAT SHOULD use the same external address and external port for all current UDP session involving a given internal address

Huitema.

[Page 3]

and a given port, regardless of the third party address and port involved in the session,

- 3)      The NAT MUST NOT filter incoming traffic on the basis of the third party address and port.

The intent of these requirements is for a NAT to only implement the simple mapping of an internal address and port pair to a corresponding external address and port pair. The NAT SHOULD retain that mapping as long as the port is active; an inactivity timer of at least INACTIVITY\_MIN minutes is required, where by default INACTIVITY\_MIN = 2. NATs SHOULD NOT filter UDP traffic based on its external origin, and SHOULD use the same mapping for all external destinations. These rules have the following results:

- 1)      If an internal host A sends UDP packets from its internal address and port AI:PA to an external host B through a NAT N, the packets will appear to B to originate from the address and port NA:PNA, i.e. the address and port chosen by N for this session.
- 2)      If A sends UDP packets from the same address and port AI:PA to another host C, the packets will appear to C to come from the same address and port, NA:PNA.
- 3)      If an external D sends a packet to the address and port pair NA:PNA before the mappings have expired, the packets will be forwarded by N to the internal address and port AI:PA.

A discussion of the rationale for this choice is provided in the next section.

## **5      Discussion of the solution**

The rationale for the complex filtering is that by being as restrictive as possible into what the NAT will accept, they offer maximum protection to the internal host against external attacks. However, the protection value is somewhat limited, since port mappings are chosen at random and are hard to guess by third parties. If these parties can observe the port number by getting a copy of a packet, they can also get the address of the authorized peer, and spoof that address in their attacks. Indeed, the port could also be found through a port scan, but there should be other ways to protect against port scans than disabling peer-to-peer applications. In any case, the attacks that can be exercised through access to a single application port should be minimal, if the application is well programmed.

While the complex options may provide some limited additional security, they also disable many application scenarios, which is not a good trade-off. On balance it is better to be less restrictive.

## **6 Future Work**

Huitema.

[Page 4]



In order to enable hosts in private domains to receive TCP connections, we must provide a well adopted standard. This work is undertaken by the MIDCOM working group.

## **7      Security Considerations**

Making UDP ports available is arguably more risky than restricted mappings. The trade-off between security and connectivity is discussed in [section 5](#).

## **8      IANA Considerations**

None.

## **9      Copyright**

The following copyright notice is copied from [RFC 2026](#) [Bradner, 1996], [Section 10.4](#), and describes the applicable copyright for this document.

Copyright (C) The Internet Society XXX 0, 0000. All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## **10      Intellectual Property**

The following notice is copied from [RFC 2026](#) [Bradner, 1996], [Section 10.4](#), and describes the position of the IETF concerning

intellectual property claims made against this document.

Huitema.

[Page 5]

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of other technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

## [11](#)      **References**

[RFC2663] P. Srisuresh, M. Holdrege. IP Network Address Translator (NAT) Terminology and Considerations. [RFC 2663](#), August 1999.

[RFC1918] Y. Rekhter, B. Moskowitz, D. Karrenberg, G. J. de Groot & **E. Lear. Address Allocation for Private Internets.** [RFC 1918](#), February 1996.

[NAT Complications] M. Holdrege, P. Srisuresh. Protocol Complications with the IP Network Address Translator. Work in Progress.

## [12](#)      **Authors' Addresses**

Christian Huitema  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

Email: [huitema@microsoft.com](mailto:huitema@microsoft.com)

