

The telnet URI Scheme

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 (2005).

Abstract

This document specifies the telnet Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) scheme that was originally specified in RFC 1738. The purpose of this document is to allow RFC 1738 to be made obsolete while keeping the information about the scheme on standards track.

1. Introduction

URIs were previously defined in [RFC2396], which was updated by [RFC3986]. Those documents also specify how to define schemes for URIs.

The first definition for many URI schemes appeared in [RFC1738]. Because that document has been made obsolete, this document copies the telnet URI scheme from it to allow that material to remain on standards track.

2. Scheme Definition

The Telnet URL scheme is used to designate interactive services that may be accessed by the Telnet protocol [STD8].

A telnet URL takes the form:

```
telnet://<user>:<password>@<host>:<port>/
```

The final "/" character may be omitted. If :<port> is omitted, the port defaults to 23. The :<password> can be omitted, as well as the whole <user>:<password> part. Few implementations handle the user name and password very well, if at all.

This URL does not designate a data object, but rather an interactive service. Remote interactive services vary widely in the means by which they allow remote logins; in practice, the <user> and <password> supplied are advisory only: clients accessing a telnet URL merely advise the user of the suggested username and password.

Many RFCs have added various services to the Telnet protocol for better authentication, encryption of traffic, or both. Those RFCs have not specified new URI schemes for Telnet to invoke those services (along the lines of "https" being a different URI scheme from "http"). Some modern telnet clients attempt to invoke those more-secure versions of Telnet when resolving a "telnet" URL.

3. Security Considerations

There are many security considerations for URI schemes discussed in [RFC3986].

The Telnet protocol normally uses passwords in the clear for authentication, and normally offers no privacy. In normal telnet, both the user's identity and their password are exposed without any protection; after that, the contents of the entire Telnet session is exposed without any protection.

Many extensions have been made to Telnet to make it more secure in different ways. In particular, [RFC2941] gives a framework based on a telnet option that many other security extensions have leveraged off of. These extensions are certainly worthwhile methods for reducing the obvious problems with exposing the user's name, password, and plaintext of the session in the clear.

Although some modern telnet clients attempt to invoke those more-secure versions of Telnet when resolving a "telnet" URL, other telnet clients do not, so a user cannot rely on this type of security unless it is explicitly enabled and the results of the security negotiation are checked.

4. Normative References

[STD8] Postel, J. and J. Reynolds, "Telnet Protocol Specification", STD 8, RFC 854, May 1983.

5. Informative References

[RFC1738] Berners-Lee, T., Masinter, L., and M. McCahill, "Uniform Resource Locators (URL)", RFC 1738, December 1994.

[RFC2396] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax", RFC 2396, August 1998.

[RFC2941] Ts'o, T. and J. Altman, "Telnet Authentication Option", RFC 2941, September 2000.

[RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, RFC 3986, January 2005.

Author's Address

Paul Hoffman
VPN Consortium
127 Segre Place
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

E-Mail: paul.hoffman@vpnc.org

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

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.

