                        CIP Transport Protocols

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

   This document specifies three protocols for transporting CIP
   requests, responses and index objects, utilizing TCP, mail, and HTTP.
   The objects themselves are defined in [CIP-MIME] and the overall CIP
   architecture is defined in [CIP-ARCH].

1. Protocol

   In this section, the actual protocol for transmitting CIP index
   objects and maintaining the mesh is presented. While companion
   documents ([CIP-ARCH] and [CIP-MIME]) describe the concepts involved
   and the formats of the CIP MIME objects, this document is the
   authoritative definition of the message formats and transfer
   mechanisms of CIP used over TCP, HTTP and mail.

1.1 Philosophy

   The philosophy of the CIP protocol design is one of building-block
   design. Instead of relying on bulky protocol definition tools, or
   ad-hoc text encodings, CIP draws on existing, well understood
   Internet technologies like MIME, RFC-822, Whois++, FTP, and SMTP.
   Hopefully this will serve to ease implementation and consensus

building. It should also stand as an example of a simple way to
leverage existing Internet technologies to easily implement new
application-level services.

1.2 Conventions

The key words "MUST" and "MAY" in this document are to be interpreted
as described in "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement
Levels" [KEYWORDS].

Formal syntax is defined using ABNF [ABNF].

In examples octets sent by the sender-CIP are preceded by ">>> " and
those sent by the receiver-CIP by "<<< ".

2 MIME message exchange mechanisms

CIP relies on interchange of standard MIME messages for all requests
and replies. These messages are passed over a bidirectional, reliable
transport system. This document defines transport over reliable
network streams (via TCP), via HTTP, and via the Internet mail
infrastructure.

The CIP server which initiates the connection (conventionally
referred to as a client) will be referred to below as the sender-CIP.
The CIP server which accepts a sender-CIP's incoming connection and
responds to the sender-CIP's requests is called a receiver-CIP.

2.1 The Stream Transport

CIP messages are transmitted over bi-directional TCP connections via
a simple text protocol. The transaction can take place over any TCP
port, as specified by the mesh configuration. There is no "well known
port" for CIP transactions. All configuration information in the
system must include both a hostname and a port.

All sender-CIP actions (including requests, connection initiation,
and connection finalization) are acknowledged by the receiver-CIP
with a response code. See section 2.1.1 for the format of these
codes, a list of the responses a CIP server may generate, and the
expected sender-CIP action for each.

In order to maintain backwards compatibility with existing Whois++
servers, CIPv3 sender-CIPs MUST first verify that the newer protocol
is supported. They do this by sending the following illegal Whois++
system command: "# CIP-Version: 3<cr><lf>". On existing Whois++
servers implementing version 1 and 2 of CIP, this results in a 500-
series response code, and the server terminates the connection. If

the server implements CIPv3, it MUST instead respond with response
code 300. Future versions of CIP can be correctly negotiated using
this technique with a different string (i.e. "CIP-Version: 4"). An
example of this short interchange is given below.

Note: If a sender-CIP can safely assume that the server implements
CIPv3, it may choose to send the "# CIP-Version: 3" string and
immediately follow it with the CIPv3 request. This optimization,
useful only in known homogeneous CIPv3 meshes, avoids waiting for the
roundtrip inherent in the negotiation.

Once a sender-CIP has successfully verified that the server supports
CIPv3 requests, it can send the request, formatted as a MIME message
with Mime-Version and Content-Type headers (only), using the network
standard line ending: "<cr><lf>".

```
Cip-Req         = Req-Hdrs CRLF Req-Body

Req-Hdrs        = *( Version-Hdr | Req-Cntnt-Hdr )
Req-Body        = Body     ; format of request body as in [CIP-MIME]

Body            = Data CRLF "." CRLF
Data            =          ; data with CRLF "." CRLF replaced by
                           ; CRLF ".." CRLF

Version-Hdr     = "Mime-Version:" "1.0" CRLF
Req-Cntnt-Hdr   = "Content-Type:" Req-Content CRLF
Req-Content     =          ; format is specified in [CIP-MIME]

Cip-Rsp         = Rsp-Code CRLF [ Rsp-Hdrs CRLF Rsp-Body ]
                    [ Indx-Cntnt-Hdr CRLF Index-Body ]
Rsp-Code        = DIGIT DIGIT DIGIT Comment
Comment         =          ; any chars except CR and LF
Rsp-Hdrs        = *( Version-Hdr | Rsp-Cntnt-Hdr )
Rsp-Cntnt-Hdr   = "Content-Type:" Rsp-Content CRLF
Rsp-Content     =          ; format is specified in [CIP-MIME]
Rsp-Body        = Body     ; format of response body as in [CIP-MIME]

Indx-Cntnt-Hdr  = "Content-Type:" Indx-Obj-Type CRLF
Indx-Obj-Type   =          ; any registered index object's MIME-type
                           ; the format is specified in [RFC2045]
Index-Body      = Body     ; format defined in each index
                           ; specifications

CRLF            =  CR LF   ; Internet standard newline
CR              =  %x0D    ; carriage return
LF              =  %x0A    ; linefeed
DIGIT           =  %x30-39
```

The message is terminated using SMTP-style message termination. The
data is sent octet-for-octet, except when the pattern
<cr><lf>1*["."]<cr><lf> is seen, in which case one more period is
added.

When the data is finished, the octet pattern "<cr><lf>.<cr><lf>" is
transmitted to the receiver-CIP.

On the receiver-CIP's side, the reverse transformation is applied,
and the message read consists of all bytes up to, but not including,
the terminating pattern.

In response to the request, the receiver-CIP sends a response code,
from either the 200, 400, or 500 series. The receiver-CIP then
processes the request and replies, if necessary, with a MIME message.
This reply is also delimited by an SMTP-style message terminator.

After responding with a response code, the receiver-CIP MUST prepare
to read another request message, resetting state to the point when
the sender-CIP has just verified the CIP version. If the sender-CIP
is finished making requests, it may close the connection. In response
the receiver-CIP MUST abort reading the message and prepare for a new
sender-CIP connection (resetting its state completely).

An example is given below. It is again worth reiterating that the
command format is defined in [CIP-MIME] whereas the message body is
defined in each index object definition. In this example the index
object definition in [CIP-TIO] will be used. Line endings are
explicitly shown in anglebrackets; newlines in this text are added
only for readability. Comments occur in curly-brackets.

```
    { sender-CIP connects to receiver-CIP }
<<< % 220 Example CIP server ready<cr><lf>
>>> # CIP-Version: 3<cr><lf>
<<< % 300 CIPv3 OK!<cr><lf>
>>> Mime-Version: 1.0<cr><lf>
>>> Content-type: application/index.cmd.datachanged; type=
>>> x-tagged-index-1; dsi=1.2.752.17.5.10<cr><lf>
>>> <cr><lf>
>>> updatetype: incremental tagbased<cr><lf>
>>> thisupdate: 855938804<cr><lf>
>>> lastupdate: 855940000<cr><lf>
>>> .<cr><lf>
<<< % 200 Good MIME message received
>>> MIME-Version: 1.0<cr><lf>
>>> Content-Type: application/index.obj.tagged;
>>> dsi=1.2.752.17.5.10;
>>> base-uri="ldap://ldap.umu.se/dc=umu,dc=se"<cr><lf>
```

```
   >>> <cr><lf>
   >>> version: x-tagged-index-1<cr><lf>
   >>> updatetype: incremental<cr><lf>
   >>> lastupdate: 855940000<cr><lf>
   >>> thisupdate: 855938804<cr><lf>
   >>> BEGIN IO-schema<cr><lf>
   >>> cn: TOKEN<cr><lf>
   >>> sn: FULL<cr><lf>
   >>> title: FULL<cr><lf>
   >>> END IO-Schema<cr><lf>
   >>> BEGIN Update Block<cr><lf>
   >>> BEGIN Old<cr><lf>
   >>> title: 3/testpilot<cr><lf>
   >>> END Old<cr><lf>
   >>> BEGIN New<cr><lf>
   >>> title: 3/chiefpilot<cr><lf>
   >>> END New<cr><lf>
   >>> END Update Block<cr><lf>
   >>> .<cr><lf>
   <<< % 200 Good MIME message received
      { Sender-CIP shuts down socket for writing }
   <<< % 222 Connection closing in response to sender-CIP shutdown
      { receiver-CIP closes its side, resets, and awaits a
        new sender-CIP }
```

   An example of an unsuccessful version negotiation looks like this:

```
      { sender-CIP connects to receiver-CIP }
   <<< % 220 Whois++ server ready<cr><lf>
   >>> # CIP-Version: 3<cr><lf>
   <<< % 500 Syntax error<cr><lf>
      { server closes connection }
```

   The sender-CIP may attempt to retry using version 1 or 2 protocol.
   Sender-CIP may cache results of this unsuccessful negotiation to
   avoid later attempts.

2.1.1   Transport specific response codes

   The following response codes are used with the stream transport:

   Code   Suggested description   Sender-CIP action
          text

   200   MIME request received   Expect no output, continue session
          and processed   (or close)

201	MIME request received and processed, output follows	Read a response, delimited by SMTP-style message delimiter.
220	Initial server banner message	Continue with Whois++ interaction, or attempt CIP version negotiation.
222	Connection closing (in response to sender-CIP close)	Done with transaction.
300	Requested CIP version accepted	Continue with CIP transaction, in the specified version.
400	Temporarily unable to process request	Retry at a later time. May be used to indicate that the server does not currently have the resources available to accept an index.
500	Bad MIME message format	Retry with correctly formatted MIME
501	Unknown or missing request in application/index.cmd	Retry with correct CIP command
502	Request is missing required CIP attributes	Retry with correct CIP attributes.
520	Aborting connection for some unexpected reason	Alert local administrator.
530	Request requires valid signature	Sign the request, if possible, and retry. Otherwise, report problem to the administrator.
531	Request has invalid signature	Report problem to the administrator.
532	Cannot check signature	Alert local administrator, who should cooperate with remote administrator tp diagnose and resolve the problem. (Probably missing a public key.)

2.2 Internet mail infrastructure as transport

   As an alternative to TCP streams, CIP transactions can take place
   over the existing Internet mail infrastructure. There are two
   motivations for this feature of CIP. First, it lowers the barriers to
   entry for leaf servers. When the need for a full TCP implementation
   is relaxed, leaf nodes (which, by definition, only send index
   objects) can consist of as little as a database and an indexing
   program (possibly written in a very high level language) to
   participate in the mesh.

   Second, it keeps with the philosophy of making use of existing
   Internet technology. The MIME messages used for requests and
   responses are, by definition of the MIME specification, suitable for
   transport via the Internet mail infrastructure. With a few simple
   rules, we open up an entirely different way to interact with CIP
   servers which choose to implement this transport. See Protocol
   Conformance, below, for details on what options server implementers
   have about supporting the various transports.

   The basic rhythm of request/response is maintained when using the
   mail transport. The following sections clarify some special cases
   which need to be considered for mail transport of CIP objects. In
   general, all mail protocols and mail format specifications
   (especially MIME Security Multiparts) can be used with the CIP mail
   transport.

2.2.1   CIP-Version negotiation

   Since no information on which CIP-version is in use is present in the
   MIME message, this information has to be carried in the mailheader.
   Therefore CIP requests sent using the mail transport MUST include a
   CIP-version headerline, to be registered according to [MHREG].
   The format of this line is:

   DIGIT   = %x30-39
   number   = 1*DIGIT
   cipversion = "CIP-Version:" <sp> number["." number]

2.2.2   Return path

   When CIP transactions take place over a bidirectional stream, the
   return path for errors and results is implicit. Using mail as a
   transport introduces difficulties to the recipient, because it's not
   always clear from the headers exactly where the reply should go,
   though in practice there are some heuristics used by MUA's.

CIP solves this problem by fiat. CIP requests sent using the mail
transport MUST include a Reply-To header as specified by RFC-822.
Any mail received for processing by a CIP server implementing the
mail transport without a Reply-To header MUST be ignored, and a
message should be logged for the local administrator. The receiver
MUST not attempt to reply with an error to any address derived from
the incoming mail.

If there are no circumstances under which a response is to be sent to
a CIP request, the sender should include a Reply-To header with the
address "<>" in it. Receivers MUST never attempt to send replies to
that address, as it is defined to be invalid (both here, and by the
BNF grammar in RFC-822). It should be noted that, in general, it is a
bad idea to turn off error reporting in this way. However, in the
simplest case of an index pushing program, this MAY be a desirable
simplification.

2.3 HTTP transport

HTTP MAY also be used to transport CIP objects, since they are just
MIME objects. A transaction is performed by using the POST method to
send an application/index.cmd and returning an
application/index.response or an application/index.obj in the HTTP
reply. The URL that is the target of the post is a configuration
parameter of the CIP-sender to CIP-receiver relationship.

Example:

    { the client opens the connection and sends a POST }
>>> POST / HTTP/1.1<cr><lf>
>>> Host: cip.some.corp<cr><lf>
>>> Content-type: application/index.cmd.noop<cr><lf>
>>> Date: Thu, 6 Jun 1997 18:16:03 GMT<cr><lf>
>>> Content-Length: 2<cr><lf>
>>> Connection: close<cr><lf>
>>> <cr><lf>
    { the server processes the request }
<<< HTTP/1.1 204 No Content<cr><lf>
    { the server closes the connection }

In addition to leveraging the security capabilities that come with
HTTP, there are other HTTP features that MAY be useful in a CIP
context. A CIP client MAY use the Accept-Charset and Accept-Language
HTTP headers to express a desire to retrieve an index in a particular
character set or natural language. It MAY use the Accept-Encoding
header to (e.g.) indicate that it can handle compressed responses,
which the CIP server MAY send in conjunction with the Transfer-
Encoding header. It MAY use the If-Modified-Since header to prevent

wasted transmission of an index that has not changed since the last
poll. A CIP server can use the Retry-After header to request that the
client retry later when the server is less busy.

3.   Security Considerations

There are two levels at which the index information can be protected;
the first is by use of the technology available for securing MIME
[MIME-SEC] objects, and secondly by using the technology available
for securing the transport.

When it comes to transport the stream transport can be protected by
the use of TLS [TLS] . For HTTP the Security is handled by using HTTP
Basic Authentication [RFC 2616], HTTP Message Digest Authentication
[RFC2617] or SSL/TLS. Extra protection for the SMTP exchange can be
achieve by the use of Secure SMTP over TLS [SMTPTLS].

4.   References

   [RFC 2045] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail
              Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message
              Bodies", RFC 2045, November 1996.

   [RFC 2616] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., Frystyk, H.,
              Masinter, L., Leach, P. and T. Berners-Lee, "Hypertext
              Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", RFC 2616, June 1999.

   [RFC 2617] Franks, J., Hallam-Baker, P., Hostetler, J., Lawrence, S.,
              Leach, P., Luotonen, A. and L. Stewart, "HTTP
              Authentication: Basic and Digest Access Authentication",
              RFC 2617, June 1999.

   [CIP-ARCH] Allen, J. and M. Mealling, "The Architecture of the Common
              Indexing Protocol (CIP)", RFC 2651, August 1999.

   [CIP-MIME] Allen, J. and M. Mealling, "MIME Object Definitions for
              the Common Indexing Protocol (CIP)", RFC 2652, August
              1999.

   [ABNF]   Crocker, D. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax
              Specifications: ABNF", RFC 2234, November 1997.

   [CIP-TIO] Hedberg, R., Greenblatt, B., Moats, R. and M. Wahl, "A
              Tagged Index Object for use in the Common Indexing
              Protocol", RFC 2654, August 1999.

   [KEYWORDS] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
              Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

   [MIME-SEC] Galvin, J., Murphy, S., Crocker, S. and N. Freed,
              "Security Multiparts for MIME: Multipart/Signed and
              Multipart/Encrypted", RFC 1847, October 1995.

   [TLS]   Dierks, T. and C. Allen, "The TLS Protocol Version 1.0",
              RFC 2246, January 1999.

   [SMTPTLS] Hoffman, P., "SMTP Service Extension for Secure SMTP over
              TLS", RFC 2487, January 1999.

   [MHREG]   Jacob, P., "Mail and Netnews Header Registration
              Procedure", Work in Progress.

5.   Authors' Addresses

   Jeff R. Allen
   246 Hawthorne St.
   Palo Alto, CA 94301

   EMail: jeff.allen@acm.org

   Paul J. Leach
   Microsoft
   1 Microsoft Way
   Redmond, WA 98052

   EMail: paulle@microsoft.com

   Roland Hedberg
   Catalogix
   Dalsveien 53
   0775 Oslo
   Norway

   EMail: roland@catalogix.ac.se

6. Full Copyright Statement

Acknowledgement