Network Working Group Request for Comments: 3818

BCP: 88

Category: Best Current Practice

V. Schryver Rhyolite Software June 2004

IANA Considerations for the Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP)

#### Status of this Memo

This document specifies an Internet Best Current Practices for the Internet Community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004).

### Abstract

The charter of the Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP) Extensions working group (pppext) includes the responsibility to "actively advance PPP's most useful extensions to full standard, while defending against further enhancements of questionable value." In support of that charter, the allocation of PPP protocol and other assigned numbers will no longer be "first come first served."

#### Introduction

The Point-to-Point protocol (PPP, RFC 1661 [1]) is a mature protocol with a large number of subprotocols, encapsulations and other extensions. The main protocol as well as its extensions involve many name spaces in which values must be assigned. http://www.iana.org/assignments/ppp-numbers contains a list of the address spaces and their current assignments.

Historically, initial values in new name spaces have often been chosen in the RFCs creating the name spaces. The IANA made subsequent assignments with a "First Come First Served" policy. This memo changes that policy for some PPP address spaces.

Most of the PPP names spaces are quiescent, but some continue to attract proposed extensions. Extensions of PPP have been defined in RFCs that are "Informational" and so are not subject to review. These extensions usually require values assigned in one or more of the PPP name spaces. Making these allocations require "IETF Consensus" will ensure that proposals are reviewed.

#### Terminology

The terms "name space", "assigned value", and "registration" are used here with the meanings defined in BCP 26 [2]. The policies "First Come First Served" and "IETF Consensus" used here also have the meanings defined in BCP 26.

# IANA Considerations for PPP

IETF Consensus, usually through the Point-to-Point Protocol Extensions working group (pppext), is required for assigning new values in the following address spaces:

- PPP DLL PROTOCOL NUMBERS
- PPP LCP AND IPCP CODES
- PPP LCP CONFIGURATION OPTION TYPES
- PPP CCP CONFIGURATION OPTION TYPES
- PPP CHAP AUTHENTICATION ALGORITHMS
- PPP LCP FCS-ALTERNATIVES
- PPP MULTILINK ENDPOINT DISCRIMINATOR CLASS
- PPP LCP CALLBACK OPERATION FIELDS
- PPP BRIDGING CONFIGURATION OPTION TYPES
- PPP BRIDGING MAC TYPES
- PPP BRIDGING SPANNING TREE
- PPP IPCP CONFIGURATION OPTION TYPES
- PPP IPV6CP CONFIGURATION OPTIONS
- PPP IP-Compression-Protocol Types

## Security Considerations

This memo deals with matters of process, not protocol.

## Normative References

- [1] Simpson, W., Ed., "The Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP)", STD 51, RFC 1661, July 1994.
- [2] Alvestrand, H. and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 2434, October 1998.

Author's Address

Vernon Schryver Rhyolite Software 2482 Lee Hill Drive Boulder, Colorado 80302

EMail: vjs@rhyolite.com

Schryver

Best Current Practice

[Page 3]

#### Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in BCP 78, and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

## Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

Schryver

Best Current Practice

[Page 4]