

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: 3180  
Obsoletes: 2770  
BCP: 53  
Category: Best Current Practice

D. Meyer  
P. Lothberg  
Sprint  
September 2001

## GLOP Addressing in 233/8

### 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 (2001). All Rights Reserved.

### Abstract

This document defines the policy for the use of 233/8 for statically assigned multicast addresses.

### 1. Introduction

It is envisioned that the primary use of this space will be many-to-many applications. This allocation is in addition to those described on [IANA] (e.g., [RFC2365]). The IANA has allocated 223/8 as per RFC 2770 [RFC2770]. This document obsoletes RFC 2770.

### 2. Problem Statement

Multicast addresses have traditionally been allocated by a dynamic mechanism such as SDR [RFC2974]. However, many current multicast deployment models are not amenable to dynamic allocation. For example, many content aggregators require group addresses that are fixed on a time scale that is not amenable to allocation by a mechanism such as described in [RFC2974]. Perhaps more seriously, since there is not general consensus by providers, content aggregators, or application writers as to the allocation mechanism, the Internet is left without a coherent multicast address allocation scheme.

The MALLOC working group has created a specific strategy for global multicast address allocation [RFC2730, RFC2909]. However, this approach has not been widely implemented or deployed. This document proposes a solution for a subset of the problem, namely, those cases not covered by Source Specific Multicast.

### 3. Address Space

The IANA has allocated 233/8 as per RFC 2770 [RFC2770]. RFC 2770 describes the administration of the middle two octets of 233/8 in a manner similar to that described in RFC 1797:

```

  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
  +---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
  |           233           |           16 bits AS           | local bits |
  +---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

#### 3.1. Example

Consider, for example, AS 5662. Written in binary, left padded with 0s, we get 0001011000011110. Mapping the high order octet to the second octet of the address, and the low order octet to the third octet, we get 233.22.30/24.

### 4. Allocation

As mentioned above, the allocation proposed here follows the RFC 1797 (case 1) allocation scheme, modified as follows: the high-order octet has the value 233, and the next 16 bits are a previously assigned Autonomous System number (AS), as registered by a network registry and listed in the RWhois database system. This allows a single /24 per AS.

As was the case with RFC 1797, using the AS number in this way allows automatic assignment of a single /24 to each service provider and does not require an additional registration step.

#### 4.1. Private AS Space

The part of 233/8 that is mapped to the private AS space [RFC1930] is assigned to the IRRs [RFC3138].

### 5. Large AS Numbers

It is important to note that this approach will work only for two octet AS numbers. In particular, it does not work for any AS number extension scheme.

## 6. Security Considerations

The approach described here may have the effect of reduced exposure to denial-of-service attacks based on dynamic allocation. Further, since dynamic assignment does not cross domain boundaries, well-known intra-domain security techniques can be applied.

## 7. IANA Considerations

The IANA has assigned 233/8 for this purpose.

## 8. Acknowledgments

This proposal originated with Peter Lothberg's idea that we use the same allocation (AS based) as described in RFC 1797. Randy Bush and Mark Handley contributed many insightful comments, and Pete and Natalie Whiting contributed greatly to the readability of this document.

## 9. References

- [IANA] <http://www.iana.org/numbers.html>
- [RFC1797] IANA, "Class A Subnet Experiment", RFC 1797, April 1995.
- [RFC1930] Hawkinson, J. and T. Bates, "Guidelines for creation, selection, and registration of an Autonomous System (AS)", RFC 1930, March 1996.
- [RFC2365] Meyer, D., "Administratively Scoped IP Multicast", RFC 2365, July 1998.
- [RFC2374] Hinden, R., O'Dell, M. and S. Deering, "An IPv6 Aggregatable Global Unicast Address Format", RFC 2374, July 1998.
- [RFC2730] Hanna, S., Patel, B. and M. Shah, "Multicast Address Dynamic Client Allocation Protocol (MADCAP)", RFC 2730, December 1999.
- [RFC2770] Meyer, D. and P. Lothberg, "GLOP Addressing in 233/8", RFC 2770, February 2000.
- [RFC2909] Radoslavov, P., Estrin, D., Govindan, R., Handley, M., Kumar, S. and D. Thaler, "The Multicast Address-Set Claim (MASC) Protocol", RFC 2909, September 2000.

[RFC2974] Handley, M., Perkins, C. and E. Whelan, "Session Announcement Protocol", RFC 2974, October 2000.

[RFC3138] Meyer, D., "Extended Assignments in 233/8", RFC 3138, June 2001.

#### 10. Authors' Addresses

David Meyer  
Sprint  
VARESA0104  
12502 Sunrise Valley Drive  
Reston VA, 20196

EMail: dmm@sprint.net

Peter Lothberg  
Sprint  
VARESA0104  
12502 Sunrise Valley Drive  
Reston VA, 20196

EMail: roll@sprint.net

## 11. 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.

