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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...