

DHC Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: October 12, 2013

Q. Sun  
Tsinghua University  
Y. Lee  
Comcast  
Q. Sun  
China Telecom  
G. Bajko  
Nokia  
M. Boucadair  
France Telecom  
April 10, 2013

**Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) Option for Port Set  
Assignment  
draft-sun-dhc-port-set-option-01**

Abstract

Because of the exhaustion of the IPv4 address space, several techniques have been proposed to share the same IPv4 address among several uses. As an alternative to introducing a level of NAT in the provider's core network, this document provides a mechanism to assign non-overlapping port set to users assigned with the same IPv4 address: Port Set DHCPv4 Option.

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 October 12, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 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 . . . . . [3](#)
- [2.](#) Requirements Language . . . . . [3](#)
- [3.](#) DHCPv4 Port Set Option . . . . . [3](#)
  - [3.1.](#) Port Set Option Format . . . . . [3](#)
  - [3.2.](#) Port Set Option Example . . . . . [5](#)
- [4.](#) Server Behavior . . . . . [5](#)
- [5.](#) Client Behavior . . . . . [6](#)
- [6.](#) DHCP Unicast Considerations . . . . . [6](#)
  - [6.1.](#) Server Behavior . . . . . [6](#)
  - [6.2.](#) Client Behavior . . . . . [6](#)
- [7.](#) Security Consideration . . . . . [7](#)
  - [7.1.](#) Denial-of-Service . . . . . [7](#)
  - [7.2.](#) Port Randomization . . . . . [7](#)
- [8.](#) IANA Consideration . . . . . [7](#)
- [9.](#) Contributors List . . . . . [7](#)
- [10.](#) References . . . . . [9](#)
  - [10.1.](#) Normative References . . . . . [9](#)
  - [10.2.](#) Informative References . . . . . [9](#)
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . [10](#)



## **1. Introduction**

Currently some large ISPs still have a large enough IPv4 address pool to be able to allocate public IPv4 addresses for their subscribers. However, due to the exhaustion of the global IPv4 address space, these ISP expect the situation is unsustainable and they will not be able anymore to assign to every requesting host a public IPv4 address.

Two solutions have been proposed so far: (1) Deploy Network Address Translation (NAT) or (2) Allocate the same public IPv4 address with non-overlapped port sets directly to multiple connected devices (which can be CPEs or end hosts). This document focuses on the second solution.

This document describes a new DHCPv4 option which allows the DHCPv4 server to assign a set of ports to a user device during the IPv4 address provisioning process. By assigning the same IPv4 address with non-overlapped port sets to multiple clients, the clients is enabled to share the IPv4 address and continue to deliver IPv4 services to subscribers.

The Port Set Option described in this document can be used in various deployment scenarios, some of which are described in [[RFC6346](#)]

## **2. Requirements Language**

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. DHCPv4 Port Set Option**

### **3.1. Port Set Option Format**

The format of Port Set Option is shown in Figure 1.






Figure 1 Port Set Option Format

- o option-code: OPTION\_PORT\_SET (TBD)
- o option-length: An 8-bit field indicating the length of the option excluding the 'Option Code' and the 'Option Length' fields. In this option, the option-length is 4 octets.
- o Port Set Index: Port Set Index identifies a set of ports assigned to a device. The first k bits on the left of the 2-octet field is the Port Set Index value, with the rest of the field right padding zeros.
- o Port Set Mask: Port Set Mask indicates the position of the bits used to build the mask. The first k bits on the left is padding ones while the remained (16-k) bits of the 2-octet field on the right is padding zeros.

In the context of Port Set Option, the port number should consist of port set prefix and port number suffix. The port set prefix can be got from Port Set Index and Port Set Mask, while port number suffix can change continuously. The format of port number is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2 Bit Representation of a port number

In order to exclude the system ports ([\[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-iana-ports\]](#)) or ports saved by SPS, the former port-sets that contains well-known ports SHOULD NOT be assigned.

For example: If k is 10 (the left 10 bits of Port Set Mask is '1'), the first 16 port sets is located in well-known port space, which



should not be allocated. Or,

For example: If  $k$  is 4 (the left 4 bits of Port Set Mask is '1'), the first port set (0 - 4095) contains the well-know port space. It should be perceived as well.

### **3.2. Port Set Option Example**

The Port Set Option is used to specify one contiguous port set pertaining to the given IP address.

Concretely, this option is used to notify a remote DHCP client about the port set prefix to be applied when selecting a port value as a source port. The Port Set Option is used to infer a set of allowed contiguous port values. Two port numbers are said to belong to the same Port Set if and only if, they have the same port set prefix.

The following Port Set Index and Port Set Mask are conveyed using DHCP to assign a contiguous port set with excluding well-know ports (with Port Set Index not zero):

Port Set Index: 0001 0100 0000 0000 (5120)

Port Set Mask: 1111 1100 0000 0000 (64512)

The device will get a contiguous port set: 5120 - 6143

## **4. Server Behavior**

The server will not reply with the option until the client has explicitly listed the option code in the Parameter Request List (Option 55).

Server MUST reply with Port Set Option if the client requested `OPTION_PORT_SET` in its Parameter Request List. The server MUST run an address & port-set pool which plays the same role as address pool in regular DHCP server. The address and port-set pool MUST follow the Port-Mask-format port-set.

If the server receives a DHCPDISCOVER message containing a Port Set Option, this means the client is requesting a specific port set. The Port Set Mask field in the option indicates the size of port set that the client requests. The server MAY reply with a Port Set Option whose Port Set Mask is as requested, if the server has such one port set. Or the server can ignore the request and just assign a port set from the pool.



The port-set assignment SHOULD be coupled with the address assignment process. Therefore server SHOULD assign the address and port set in the same DHCP messages. And the lease information for the address is applicable to the port-set as well.

## **5. Client Behavior**

The DHCP client applying for the a port-set MUST include either the OPTION\_PORT\_SET code in the Parameter Request List (Option 55). The client will retrieve a Port Set Option and use the Port Set Index and Port Set Mask to perform the port mask algorithm to get the contiguous port set. The client renews or releases the DHCP lease with the port set.

The client MAY include a Port Set Option in the DHCPDISCOVER message, in which the Port Set Mask field indicates the requested size of a port set from the client.

## **6. DHCP Unicast Considerations**

DHCP messages could be unicasted over UDP port 67. In the context of address sharing, not all the ports are available to the clients. The server cannot use unicast to send the DHCP message to a client which originated the DHCP request. To mitigate this problem, we propose to use the broadcast address (0.0.0.0) when the server replies to the client. Broadcast address is special and won't be assigned to any client.

### **6.1. Server Behavior**

DHCP server MUST set broadcast bit of the 'flags' field in DHCP messages (Figure 2 of [[RFC2131](#)]) when allocating port sets. And DHCP server MUST NOT unicast responses to DHCP client. In order to identify the DHCP responses are sent to which client, client identifier [[I-D.ietf-dhc-client-id](#)] is used. DHCP server MUST return client identifier.

### **6.2. Client Behavior**

DHCP client MUST validate client identifier, as specified in [[I-D.ietf-dhc-client-id](#)]. DHCP client MUST NOT unicast requests to server: all requests are broadcast. This includes lease renewals. In the case of DHCP relay agent, it will broadcast the server responses to clients.

In some deployment scenarios, DHCP messages containing the proposed



DHCP option can be conveyed by other forwarding carrier than IPv4, saying IPv6 [[I-D.ietf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-ipv6](#)], [[I-D.scskf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-dhcpv6](#)], etc. The server has to manage to forward DHCP responses to right client.

## **7. Security Consideration**

### **7.1. Denial-of-Service**

The solution is generally vulnerable to DoS when used in shared medium or when access network authentication is not a prerequisite to IP address assignment. The solution SHOULD only be used on point-to-point links, tunnels, and/or in environments where authentication at link layer is performed before IP address assignment, and not shared medium.

### **7.2. Port Randomization**

Preserving port randomization [[RFC6056](#)] may be more or less difficult depending on the address sharing ratio (i.e., the size of the port space assigned to a CPE). The host can only randomize the ports inside a fixed port range [[RFC6269](#)].

More discussion to improve the robustness of TCP against Blind In-Window Attacks can be found at [[RFC5961](#)]. Other means than the (IPv4) source port randomization to provide protection against attacks should be used (e.g., use [[I-D.vixie-dnsextdns0x20](#)] to protect against DNS attacks, [[RFC5961](#)] to improve the robustness of TCP against Blind In-Window Attacks, use IPv6).

A proposal to preserve the entropy when selecting port is discussed in [[I-D.bajko-pripaddrassign](#)]

## **8. IANA Consideration**

IANA is kindly requested to allocate DHCP option code to the OPTION\_PORT\_SET. The code should be added to the DHCP option code space.

## **9. Contributors List**

Many thanks for valuable comments and great efforts from the following contributors:



Peng Wu  
Tsinghua University  
[peng-wu@foxmail.com](mailto:peng-wu@foxmail.com)

Teemu Savolainen  
Nokia  
[teemu.savolainen@nokia.com](mailto:teemu.savolainen@nokia.com)

Ted Lemon  
Nominum, Inc.  
[mellon@nominum.com](mailto:mellon@nominum.com)

Tina Tsou  
Huawei Technologies  
[tena@huawei.com](mailto:tena@huawei.com)

Pierre Levis  
France Telecom  
Email: [pierre.levis@orange.com](mailto:pierre.levis@orange.com)

Cong Liu  
Tsinghua University  
Email: [gnocuil@gmail.com](mailto:gnocuil@gmail.com)

## **10. References**



### **10.1. Normative References**

- [RFC1918] Rekhter, Y., Moskowitz, R., Karrenberg, D., Groot, G., and E. Lear, "Address Allocation for Private Internets", [BCP 5](#), [RFC 1918](#), February 1996.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2131] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3046] Patrick, M., "DHCP Relay Agent Information Option", [RFC 3046](#), January 2001.
- [RFC3527] Kinnear, K., Stapp, M., Johnson, R., and J. Kumarasamy, "Link Selection sub-option for the Relay Agent Information Option for DHCPv4", [RFC 3527](#), April 2003.
- [RFC4925] Li, X., Dawkins, S., Ward, D., and A. Durand, "Softwire Problem Statement", [RFC 4925](#), July 2007.
- [RFC5961] Ramaiah, A., Stewart, R., and M. Dalal, "Improving TCP's Robustness to Blind In-Window Attacks", [RFC 5961](#), August 2010.
- [RFC6056] Larsen, M. and F. Gont, "Recommendations for Transport-Protocol Port Randomization", [BCP 156](#), [RFC 6056](#), January 2011.
- [RFC6269] Ford, M., Boucadair, M., Durand, A., Levis, P., and P. Roberts, "Issues with IP Address Sharing", [RFC 6269](#), June 2011.
- [RFC6346] Bush, R., "The Address plus Port (A+P) Approach to the IPv4 Address Shortage", [RFC 6346](#), August 2011.

### **10.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.bajko-pripaddrassign]  
Bajko, G., Savolainen, T., Boucadair, M., and P. Levis, "Port Restricted IP Address Assignment", [draft-bajko-pripaddrassign-04](#) (work in progress), April 2012.
- [I-D.ietf-dhc-client-id]  
Swamy, N., Halwasia, G., and S. Unit, "Client Identifier Option in DHCP Server Replies",



[draft-ietf-dhc-client-id-07](#) (work in progress),  
November 2012.

[I-D.ietf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-ipv6]

Cui, Y., Wu, P., Wu, J., and T. Lemon, "DHCPv4 over IPv6 Transport", [draft-ietf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-ipv6-06](#) (work in progress), March 2013.

[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-iana-ports]

Cotton, M., Eggert, L., Touch, J., Westerlund, M., and S. Cheshire, "Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Procedures for the Management of the Service Name and Transport Protocol Port Number Registry", [draft-ietf-tsvwg-iana-ports-10](#) (work in progress), February 2011.

[I-D.scskf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-dhcpv6]

Sun, Q., Cui, Y., Siodelski, M., Krishnan, S., and I. Farrer, "DHCPv4 over DHCPv6 Transport", [draft-scskf-dhc-dhcpv4-over-dhcpv6-01](#) (work in progress), April 2013.

[I-D.vixie-dnsextd-dns0x20]

Vixie, P. and D. Dagon, "Use of Bit 0x20 in DNS Labels to Improve Transaction Identity", [draft-vixie-dnsextd-dns0x20-00](#) (work in progress), March 2008.

#### Authors' Addresses

Qi Sun  
Tsinghua University  
Department of Computer Science, Tsinghua University  
Beijing 100084  
P.R.China

Phone: +86-10-6278-5822

Email: sunqi@csnet1.cs.tsinghua.edu.cn



Yiu L. Lee  
Comcast  
One Comcast Center  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
USA

Phone:  
Email: [yiul\\_lee@cable.comcast.com](mailto:yiul_lee@cable.comcast.com)

Qiong Sun  
China Telecom  
Room 708, No.118, Xizhimennei Street  
Beijing 100035  
P.R.China

Phone: +86-10-58552936  
Email: [sunqiong@ctbri.com.cn](mailto:sunqiong@ctbri.com.cn)

Gabor Bajko  
Nokia

Phone:  
Email: [gabor.Bajko@nokia.com](mailto:gabor.Bajko@nokia.com)

Mohamed Boucadair  
France Telecom  
2330 Central Expressway  
Rennes 35000  
France

Phone:  
Email: [mohamed.boucadair@orange.com](mailto:mohamed.boucadair@orange.com)

