

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: May 7, 2009

M. Petit-Huguenin  
8x8, Inc.  
November 3, 2008

**Path MTU Discovery Using Session Traversal Utilities for NAT (STUN)  
draft-petithuguenin-behave-stun-pmtud-02**

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

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>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 7, 2009.

Abstract

This document describes a Session Traversal Utilities for NAT (STUN) usages for discovering the path MTU between a client and a server.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Probing Mechanisms . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Simple Probing Mechanism . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Sending a Probe Request . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Receiving a Probe Request . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	Receiving a Probe Response . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Complete Probing Mechanism . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Sending the Probe Indications and Report Request . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Receiving an ICMP packet . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	Receiving a Probe Indication and Report Request . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	Receiving a Report Response . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.5.</a>	Using Checksum as Packet Identifiers . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.6.</a>	Using Sequential Numbers as Packet Identifiers . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Probe Support Discovery Mechanisms . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	Implicit Mechanism . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	Probe Support Discovery with TURN . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	Probe Support Discovery with ICE . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	New STUN Method . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	New STUN Attributes . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	IDENTIFIERS . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	PMTUD-SUPPORTED . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">12.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">12.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">12.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Release notes . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">A.1.</a>	Modifications between -02 and -01 . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">A.2.</a>	Modifications between -01 and -00 . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
	Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>



## **1. Introduction**

The Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery specification [[RFC4821](#)] describes a method to discover the path MTU but does not describe a practical protocol to do so with UDP.

This document only describe how probing mechanisms are implemented with STUN. The algorithm to find the path MTU is described in [[RFC4821](#)].

Two probing mechanisms are described, a simple probing mechanism and a more complete mechanism that can converge quicker.

The simple probing mechanism is implemented by sending a Probe Request with a PADDING [[I-D.ietf-behave-nat-behavior-discovery](#)] attribute and the DF bit set over UDP. A router on the path to the server can reject this request with an ICMP message or drop it. The client SHOULD cease retransmissions after 3 missing responses.

The complete probing mechanism is implemented by sending one or more Probe Indication with a PADDING attribute and the DF bit set over UDP then a Report Request to the same server. A router on the path to the server can reject this indication with an ICMP message or drop it. The server keeps a time ordered list of identifiers of all packets received (including retransmitted packets) and sends this list back to the client in the Report Response. The client analyzes this list to find which packets were not received. Because UDP packets does not contain an identifier, the complete probing mechanism needs a way to identify each packet received. As example, this document describes two different ways to identify a specific packet.

In the first packet identifier mechanism, the server computes a checksum over each packet received and sends back to the sender the ordered list of checksums. The client compares this list to its own list of checksums.

In the second packet identifier mechanism, the client adds a sequential number in front of each UDP packet sent. The server sends back the ordered list of sequential numbers received that the client compares to its own list

## **2. Terminology**

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 [[RFC2119](#)].



### **3. Probing Mechanisms**

A client MUST NOT send a probe if it does not have knowledge that the server supports this specification. This is done by an external mechanism specific to each UDP protocol. [Section 6](#) describes some of this mechanisms.

The probe mechanism is used to discover the path MTU in one direction only, from the client to the server.

### **4. Simple Probing Mechanism**

#### **4.1. Sending a Probe Request**

A client forms a Probe Request by following the rules in [Section 7.1 of \[RFC5389\]](#). No authentication method is used. The client adds a PADDING [[I-D.ietf-behave-nat-behavior-discovery](#)] attribute with a length that, when added to the IP and UDP headers and the other STUN components, is equal to the Selected Probe Size, as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.3](#). The client MUST add the FINGERPRINT attribute.

Then the client sends the Probe Request to the server over UDP with the DF bit set. The client SHOULD stop retransmitting after 3 missing responses.

#### **4.2. Receiving a Probe Request**

A server receiving a Probe Request MUST process it as specified in [\[RFC5389\]](#). The server MUST NOT challenge the client.

The server then creates a Probe Response. The server MUST add the FINGERPRINT attribute. The server then sends the response to the client.

#### **4.3. Receiving a Probe Response**

A client receiving a Probe Response MUST process it as specified in [\[RFC5389\]](#). If a response is received this is interpreted as a Probe Success as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.6.1](#). If an ICMP packet "Fragmentation needed" is received then this is interpreted as a Probe Failure as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.6.2](#). If the Probe transactions fails in timeout, then this is interpreted as a Probe Inconclusive as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.6.4](#).



## **5. Complete Probing Mechanism**

### **5.1. Sending the Probe Indications and Report Request**

A client forms a Probe Indication by following the rules in [\[RFC5389\] section 7.1](#). The client adds to the Probe Indication a PADDING attribute with a size that, when added to the IP and UDP headers and the other STUN components, is equal to the Selected Probe Size, as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.3](#). The client MUST add the FINGERPRINT attribute.

Then the client sends the Probe Indication to the server over UDP with the DF bit set.

Then the client forms a Report Request by following the rules in [\[RFC5389\] section 7.1](#). No authentication method is used. The client MUST add the FINGERPRINT attribute.

Then the client waits half the RTO if it is known or 50 milliseconds after sending the Probe Indication and sends the Report Request to the server over UDP.

### **5.2. Receiving an ICMP packet**

If an ICMP packet "Fragmentation needed" is received then this is interpreted as a Probe Failure as defined in [\[RFC4821\] section 7.5](#).

### **5.3. Receiving a Probe Indication and Report Request**

A server supporting this specification and knowing that the client also supports it will keep the identifiers of all packets received in a list ordered by receiving time. The same identifier can appear multiple times in the list because of retransmission. The maximum size of this list is calculated so that when the list is added to the Report Response, the total size of the packet does not exceed the unknown path MTU as defined in [\[RFC5389\] section 7.1](#). Older identifiers are removed when new identifiers are added to a list already full.

A server receiving a Report Request MUST process it as specified in [\[RFC5389\]](#). The server MUST NOT challenge the client.

The server creates a Report Response and adds an IDENTIFIERS attribute that contains the list of all identifiers received so far. The server MUST add the FINGERPRINT attribute. The server then sends the response to the client.





#### 5.4. Receiving a Report Response

A client receiving a Report Response processes it as specified in [RFC5389]. If the response IDENTIFIERS attribute contains the identifier of the Probe Indication, then this is interpreted as a Probe Success for this probe as defined in [RFC4821] Section 7.5. If the Probe Indication identifier cannot be found in the Report Response, this is interpreted as a Probe Failure as defined in [RFC4821] Section 7.5. If the Probe Indication identifier cannot be found in the Report Response but other packets identifier sent before or after the Probe Indication cannot also be found, this is interpreted as a Probe Inconclusive as defined in [RFC4821] Section 7.5. If the Report Transaction fails in timeout, this is interpreted as a Full-Stop Timeout as defined in [RFC4821] Section 3.

#### 5.5. Using Checksum as Packet Identifiers

When using checksum as packet identifiers, the client calculate the checksum for each packets sent over UDP and keep this checksum in an ordered list. The server does the same thing and send back this list in the Report Response.

It could have been possible to use the checksum generated in the UDP checksum for this, but this value is generally not accessible to applications. Also sometimes the checksum is not calculated or off-loaded to the network card.

#### 5.6. Using Sequential Numbers as Packet Identifiers

When using sequential numbers, a small header similar to the TURN ChannelData header is added in front of all non-STUN packets. The sequential number is incremented for each packet sent. The server collects the sequence number of the packets sent.

```

      0              1              2              3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           Channel Number           |           Length           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           Sequence number           |                           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     |                           |
/                                     /                           /
/                                     /                           /
|                                     |                           |
|                                     |                           |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
|                                     |                           |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```



The Channel Number is always 0xFFFF.

## **6. Probe Support Discovery Mechanisms**

### **6.1. Implicit Mechanism**

An endpoint acting as a client for the STUN usage described in this specification MUST also act as a server for this STUN usage. This means that a server receiving a probe can assume that it can act as a client to discover the path MTU to the IP address and port from which it received the probe.

### **6.2. Probe Support Discovery with TURN**

A TURN client supporting this STUN usage will add a PMTUD-SUPPORTED attribute to the Allocate Request sent to the TURN server. The TURN server can immediately start to send probes to the TURN client on reception of an Allocation Request with a PMTUD-SUPPORTED attribute. The TURN client will then use the Implicit Mechanism described above to send probes.

### **6.3. Probe Support Discovery with ICE**

An ICE [[I-D.ietf-mmusic-ice](#)] client supporting this STUN usage will add a PMTUD-SUPPORTED attribute to the Binding Request sent during a connectivity check. The ICE server can immediately start to send probes to the ICE client on reception of a Binding Request with a PMTUD-SUPPORTED attribute. Local candidates receiving Binding Request with the PMTUD-SUPPORTED flag must not start PMTUD with the remote candidate if already done so. The ICE client will then use the Implicit Mechanism described above to send probes.

## **7. New STUN Method**

This specification defines the following new STUN methods:

0x801 : Probe  
0x802 : Report

## **8. New STUN Attributes**

This specification defines the following new STUN attributes:



0x4001 : IDENTIFIERS  
0xC001 : PMTUD-SUPPORTED

### **8.1. IDENTIFIERS**

The IDENTIFIERS attribute is used in Report Response. It contains a list of UDP packet identifiers.

### **8.2. PMTUD-SUPPORTED**

The PMTUD-SUPPORTED attribute is used in STUN usages and extensions to signal the support of this specification. This attribute has no content.

## **9. Security Considerations**

TBD

## **10. IANA Considerations**

TBD

## **11. Acknowledgements**

Thanks to Dan Wing and Eilon Yardeni for their comments, suggestions and questions that helped to improve this document.

This document was written with the xml2rfc tool described in [[RFC2629](#)].

## **12. References**

### **12.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4821] Mathis, M. and J. Heffner, "Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery", [RFC 4821](#), March 2007.
- [RFC5389] Rosenberg, J., Mahy, R., Matthews, P., and D. Wing, "Session Traversal Utilities for NAT (STUN)", [RFC 5389](#), October 2008.



[I-D.ietf-mmusic-ice]

Rosenberg, J., "Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE): A Protocol for Network Address Translator (NAT) Traversal for Offer/Answer Protocols",  
[draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-19](#) (work in progress), October 2007.

## **12.2. Informative References**

[RFC2629] Rose, M., "Writing I-Ds and RFCs using XML", [RFC 2629](#), June 1999.

[I-D.ietf-behave-nat-behavior-discovery]

MacDonald, D. and B. Lowekamp, "NAT Behavior Discovery Using STUN", [draft-ietf-behave-nat-behavior-discovery-05](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

## **Appendix A. Release notes**

This section must be removed before publication as an RFC.

### **A.1. Modifications between -02 and -01**

- o Replaced the transactions identifiers by packet identifiers
- o Defined checksum and sequential numbers as possible packet identifiers.
- o Updated the reference to [RFC 5389](#)
- o The FINGERPRINT attribute is now mandatory.
- o Changed the delay between Probe indication and Report request to be  $RT0/2$  or 50 milliseconds.
- o Added ICMP packet processing.
- o Added Full-Stop Timeout detection.
- o Stated that Binding request with PMTUD-SUPPORTED does not start the PMTUD process if already started.

### **A.2. Modifications between -01 and -00**

- o Removed the use of modified STUN transaction but shorten the retransmission for the simple probing mechanism.
- o Added a complete probing mechanism.
- o Removed the PADDING-RECEIVED attribute.
- o Added release notes.





Author's Address

Marc Petit-Huguenin  
8x8, Inc.  
3151 Jay Street  
Santa Clara, CA 95054  
US

Phone: +1 408 654 0875  
Email: marc@8x8.com

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM 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.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat 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 on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

