

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Updates: [5492](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: January 3, 2016

J. Scudder
Juniper Networks
July 2, 2015

**Revision to Capability Codes Registration Procedures
draft-scudder-idr-capabilities-registry-change-00.txt**

Abstract

This document updates [RFC 5492](#) by making a change to the registration procedures for BGP Capability Codes. Specifically, the range formerly designated "Reserved for Private Use" is divided into three new ranges, respectively designated as "Standards Action", "Experimental" and "Reserved".

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 January 3, 2016.

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 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	2
2.	Discussion	2
3.	IANA Considerations	3
4.	Security Considerations	3
5.	Acknowledgements	3
6.	References	3
6.1.	Normative References	3
6.2.	Informative References	3
	Author's Address	4

[1.](#) Introduction

[RFC5492] designates the range of Capability Codes 128-255 as "Reserved for Private Use". Subsequent experience has shown this to be not only useless, but actively confusing to implementors. BGP Capability Codes do not meet the criteria for "Reserved for Private Use" described in [\[RFC5226\]](#) S. 4.1. An example of a legitimate "private use" code point might be a BGP community [\[RFC1997\]](#) value assigned for use within a given AS, but no analogous use of Capabilities exists.

Accordingly, this document revises the registration procedures for the range 128-255, as follows, using the terminology defined in [\[RFC5226\]](#):

128-250: Standards Action

251-254: Experimental Use

255: Reserved

The procedures for the ranges 1-63 and 64-127 are unchanged, remaining "IETF Review" and "First Come First Served" respectively.

[2.](#) Discussion

The reason for choosing Standards Action and not some other policy is that it provides opportunity for working group oversight of the space, when and if it becomes depleted. At time of writing there is ample space available in both the IETF Review and First Come First Served portions of the 1-127 range. Note that any unallocated space in this range can be reclassified with some other allocation policy in the future, if needed.

The reason for providing an Experimental Use range is to preserve a range for use during early development. Although there are few practical differences between Experimental and Private Use, the change both makes it clear that code points from this space should not be used long-term or in shipping products, and reduces the consumption of the scarce Capability Code space expended for this purpose. Once classified as Experimental, it should be considered difficult to reclassify the space for some other purpose in the future.

The reason for reserving the maximum value is that it may be useful in the future if extension of the number space is needed.

3. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to revise the "Capability Codes" registry as described in [Section 1](#).

4. Security Considerations

This revision to registration procedures does not change the underlying security issues inherent in the existing [[RFC5492](#)] and [[RFC4271](#)].

5. Acknowledgements

Thanks to Alia Atlas, Jeff Haas and Sue Hares for review and comments.

6. References

6.1. Normative References

- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008.
- [RFC5492] Scudder, J. and R. Chandra, "Capabilities Advertisement with BGP-4", [RFC 5492](#), February 2009.

6.2. Informative References

- [RFC1997] Chandrasekeran, R., Traina, P., and T. Li, "BGP Communities Attribute", [RFC 1997](#), August 1996.
- [RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Li, T., and S. Hares, "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", [RFC 4271](#), January 2006.

Author's Address

John Scudder
Juniper Networks
1194 N. Mathilda Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
USA

Email: jgs@juniper.net