### Port Control Protocol

### draft-ietf-pcp-base-13

### Dan Wing, Stuart Cheshire, Mohamed Boucadair, Reinaldo Penno, Paul Selkirk

Dan Wing dwing@cisco.com

#### IETF81 July, 2011

draft-ietf-pcp-base - IETF81

## WGLC Summary

- MAP and PEER remain separate OpCodes
- Report public address without creating mapping
- Client MUST have exclusive use of port before using MAP
- Implicit mapping cannot be shorted
- PREFER\_FAILURE implied by PEER
- Clarify: MAP is EIM & EIF, PEER is impl. dep.
- Clarify: Implicit/Explicit/Static

## MAP and PEER remain separate OpCodes

- Different semantics
- Some options are implied, others are only valid for certain OpCode
- s/PEER/MAP, with the remote-ip-address field set to zero/ creates more complexity

• Packet layout will be made similar

# Report public address without creating mapping

- Helps UPnP IGD and NAT-PMP interworking
- Would create state in NAT (e.g., address pool)

• Resolution: leave as-is

## Client MUST have exclusive use of port before using MAP

- New requirement
- MAP is subset of implicit mapping

   Per Stuart's slides at IETF80
- Re-enforces existing pseudocode:
  - 1. client does MAP
  - 2. establishes outbound connection
- PCP doesn't care how the client meets this requirement

### PREFER\_FAILURE is implied by PEER

- PEER can create new mapping
   To restore old TCP connection
- If NAT cannot create mapping, return error
- On error, PCP client will start fresh TCP connection

## Clarify: MAP is EIM & EIF, PEER is impl. dep.

- Request: PEER can request EIF or EDF
- Resolution: EIF or EDF should remain implementation dependent
- MAP:
  - endpoint independent mapping
  - Endpoint independent filtering
- PEER:
  - Implementation dependent

# Clarify: Implicit/Explicit/Static

- Implicit mapping cannot be shortened by MAP or PEER
- MAP can learn of static mappings (read only)
- PEER can't reduce lifetime of implicit mapping
- Static > MAP > PEER > implicit