

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: 3097  
Updates: 2747  
Category: Standards Track

R. Braden  
ISI  
L. Zhang  
UCLA  
April 2001

## RSVP Cryptographic Authentication -- Updated Message Type Value

### Status of this Memo

This document specifies an Internet standards track protocol for the Internet community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Please refer to the current edition of the "Internet Official Protocol Standards" (STD 1) for the standardization state and status of this protocol. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2001). All Rights Reserved.

### Abstract

This memo resolves a duplication in the assignment of RSVP Message Types, by changing the Message Types assigned by RFC 2747 to Challenge and Integrity Response messages.

### 1. Introduction

RFC 2747 ("RSVP Cryptographic Authentication") [RFC2747] assigns RSVP Message Type 12 to an Integrity Response message, while RFC 2961 ("RSVP Refresh Overhead Reduction Extensions") [RFC2961] assigns the same value to a Bundle message. This memo resolves the conflict over RSVP Message Type 12 by assigning a different value to the Message Type of the Integrity Response Message in RFC 2747. It is believed that the protocol defined by RFC 2961 entered use in the field before the RFC's publication and before the conflicting Message Type was noticed, and that it may be easier to install new software in environments that have deployed the Integrity object than in those that have deployed the refresh reduction extension.

To simplify possible interoperability problems caused by this change, we also assign a new value to the Message Type of RFC 2747's Challenge message, to which the Integrity Response message is a reply.

## 2. Modification

Message Types defined in the RSVP Integrity extension [RFC 2747] shall be changed as follows:

- o Challenge message has Message Type 25.
- o Integrity Response message has Message Type 25+1.

## 3. Compatibility

Two communicating nodes whose Integrity implementations are conformant with this modification will interoperate, using Message Type 12 for Bundle messages and Message Types 25 and 26 for the Integrity handshake. A non-conformant implementation of the Integrity extension will not interoperate with a conformant implementation (though two non-conformant implementations can interoperate as before).

There is no possibility of an Integrity handshake succeeding accidentally due to this change, since both sides of the handshake use the new numbers or the old numbers. Furthermore, the Integrity Response message includes a 32-bit cookie that must match a cookie in the Challenge message, else the challenge will fail. Finally, a non-conformant implementation should never receive a Bundle message that it interprets as an Integrity Response message, since RFC 2961 requires that Bundle messages be sent only to a Bundle-capable node.

## 4. References

- [RFC2747] Baker, F., Lindell, R. and M. Talwar, "RSVP Cryptographic Authentication", RFC 2747, January 2000.
- [RFC2961] Berger, L., Gan, D., Swallow, G., Pan, P., Tommasi, F. and S. Molendini, "RSVP Refresh Overhead Reduction Extensions", RFC 2961, April 2001.

## Security Considerations

No new security considerations are introduced beyond RFC 2747 itself and the compatibility issues above.

## Authors' Addresses

Bob Braden  
USC Information Sciences Institute  
4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Phone: (310) 822-1511  
EMail: Braden@ISI.EDU

Lixia Zhang  
UCLA Computer Science Department  
4531G Boelter Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1596 USA

Phone: 310-825-2695  
EMail: lixia@cs.ucla.edu

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2001). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS 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.

## Acknowledgement

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

