



# Recommendations for Transport Port Uses

---

**draft-ietf-tsvwg-port-use-00**  
**IETF 83**

**Joe Touch, USC/ISI**  
**As presented by Gorry Fairhurst**



**USC Viterbi**  
School of Engineering

# Purpose

---

- BCP advice to ***protocol designers***
  - Encourage port conservation
  - Encourage use of existing services
  - Discourage ‘reinventing the wheel’
  - Clarify how to describe a service in an application and/or ID
- **NOT**
  - Direction to the IESG or Expert Review team

# Current Status

---

- tsvwg-touch-port-use -> ietf-tsvwg-port-use
  - Accepted as WG item; resubmission as ietf- TBD
- Current doc:
  - Detailed history
  - Skeleton of issues
    - Many established conservation issues
    - Discuss TCP service with UDP discovery
    - Discuss multiple ports for insecure/secure
    - Discuss system/user boundary

# Current Open Issues

---

- System vs. User port space?
  - Is this still meaningful, or should users ask only for User numbers?
- Non-secure protocols?
  - Some protocols use different ports for secure and insecure variants of the same service.
    - Is this meaningful, e.g., for filtering?
    - Should users always include security support (thus they should never need an insecure port?)?

# Other Recommendations

---

- Seeking any suggestions on BCPs not already in the doc.
- Send to the mailing list...