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Procedures are Crufty!

- The notion of a well known port is antiquated.
- The range is less magical than it was.
- Very few protocol developers can predict in advance whether their port needs to be "well known".
The TCP/UDP registry is crufty!

- Lots of entries by people and organizations that we have lost track of
- (some no longer exist)
Goals

- We want port usage documented, in terms of what is running on that port
- We want broadly deployed protocols that use ports to get a central allocation still to avoid conflicts
- We should encourage protocol developers to consider SRV records
SRV Records

- RFC 2782:
- `_Service._Proto.Name` TTL Class SRV Priority Weight Port Target
- Similar to MX records but with specific weight for load balancing targets with the same priority
SRV good

- No IANA port allocation required
- Not that we’re running short now, but good to conserve even so
- SRV records allow for prioritized and load balanced services
SRV bad

- DNS dependency (and attendant issues)
- Potential additional service delay
So...

- SRV records may be useful
- But not for everybody
Service Documentation

- RFCs are a great way to document services (either standards or other)
- Publication by academic journals and other standards organizations is good to
- Not having a service documented does pose a long term resource issue
- RFC 3205 is still valid. Better to use port numbers than to use HTTP inappropriately
More information

* draft-lear-iana-no-more-well-known-ports-02.txt

* Comments welcome

* (now or later)