

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: 5245 (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: July 15, 2011

M. Westerlund  
Ericsson  
C. Perkins  
University of Glasgow  
January 11, 2011

IANA Registry for Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE) Options  
draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-options-registry-00

## Abstract

It has been identified that Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE) is missing a registry for ICE options. This document defines this missing IANA registry.

## Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 15, 2011.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction . . . . . 3
- 2. Requirements Language . . . . . 3
- 3. IANA Considerations . . . . . 3
  - 3.1. ICE Options . . . . . 3
- 4. Security Considerations . . . . . 4
- 5. Acknowledgements . . . . . 4
- 6. References . . . . . 4
  - 6.1. Normative References . . . . . 4
  - 6.2. Informative References . . . . . 5
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . 5

## 1. Introduction

"Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE): A Protocol for Network Address Translator (NAT) Traversal for Offer/Answer" [RFC5245] defines a concept of ICE Options. However, the ICE RFC fails to create an IANA registry for ICE options. As there has come into existence at least one ICE option, there is need to create the registry.

RFC 5245 says: "ICE provides for extensibility by allowing an offer or answer to contain a series of tokens that identify the ICE extensions used by that agent. If an agent supports an ICE extension, it MUST include the token defined for that extension in the ice-options attribute."

Thus, as future extensions are defined, these ICE options needs to be registered with IANA to ensure non-conflicting identification. The ICE options identifiers are used in signalling between the ICE endpoints to negotiate extension support. RFC 5245 defines one method of signaling these ICE options, using SDP with Offer/Answer [RFC3264].

## 2. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

## 3. IANA Considerations

This document defines a registry for ICE options that can be used in SDP "ice-options" attribute or other signalling parameters carrying the ICE options.

### 3.1. ICE Options

An ICE option identifier MUST fulfill the ABNF [RFC5234] syntax for "ice-option-tag" as specified in [RFC5245]. This syntax is reproduce here for simplicity, but the authoritative definition is in the ICE RFC:

```
ice-option-tag      = 1*ice-char
ice-char            = ALPHA / DIGIT / "+" / "/"
```

ICE options are of unlimited length by the syntax, however they are recommended to be no longer than 20 characters. This is to reduce message sizes and allow for efficient parsing.

Registration of an ICE option is done using the Specification Required policy as defined in "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs" [RFC5226].

A registration request MUST include the following information:

- o Name of contact person for the registration
- o Email and Address of the Contact person
- o Organization or individuals having the change control
- o The ICE option identifier
- o Short description of the ICE extension
- o Reference(s) to the specification defining the ICE option and the related extensions

#### 4. Security Considerations

As this document defines an IANA registry for an already existing concept there are no new security considerations.

#### 5. Acknowledgements

#### 6. References

##### 6.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 5226, May 2008.
- [RFC5234] Crocker, D. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, RFC 5234, January 2008.
- [RFC5245] Rosenberg, J., "Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE): A Protocol for Network Address Translator (NAT) Traversal for Offer/Answer Protocols", RFC 5245, April 2010.

## 6.2. Informative References

- [RFC3264] Rosenberg, J. and H. Schulzrinne, "An Offer/Answer Model with Session Description Protocol (SDP)", RFC 3264, June 2002.

### Authors' Addresses

Magnus Westerlund  
Ericsson  
Farogatan 6  
SE-164 80 Kista  
Sweden

Phone: +46 10 714 82 87  
Email: magnus.westerlund@ericsson.com

Colin Perkins  
University of Glasgow  
School of Computing Science  
Glasgow G12 8QQ  
United Kingdom

Email: csp@csperkins.org

