TCP Maintenance and Minor Extensions (TCPM) WG
Internet-Draft
Obsoletes: 675 761 721 813 816 879 896 6013 (if approved)
Updates: 4614bis (if approved)
Intended status: Informational
Expires: January 3, 2015

A. Zimmermann
NetApp, Inc.
W. Eddy
MTI Systems
L. Eggert
NetApp, Inc.

July 2, 2014

Moving Undeployed TCP Extensions to Historic and Informational Status -- An addition to RFC 6247 draft-zimmermann-tcpm-undeployed-00

Abstract

This document reclassifies several TCP extensions that have either been superceded or never seen widespread use to Historic status. The affected RFCs are RFC 675, RFC 761, RFC 721, RFC 813, RFC 816, RFC 879, RFC 896, RFC 6013. Additionally, it reclassifies RFC 814, RFC 817, RFC 872, RFC 964, RFC 1078 to Informational status.

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 January 3, 2015.

Copyright Notice

1. Introduction

TCP has a long history. Over time, many RFCs accumulated that described aspects of the TCP protocol, implementation, and extensions. Some of these have become outdated or simply have never seen widespread deployment. Section 6 and 7.1 of the TCP Roadmap document [I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-rfc4614bis] already classifies a number of TCP extensions as "historic" and describes the reasons for doing so, but it does not instruct the RFC Editor and IANA to change the status of these RFCs in the RFC database and the relevant IANA registries. The sole purpose of this document is to do just that. Please refer to Section 6 and 7.1 of [I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-rfc4614bis] for justification.

2. RFC Editor Considerations

The RFC Editor is requested to change the status of the following RFCs to Historic [RFC2026]:

- [RFC0675] on "Specification of Internet Transmission Control Program"
- [RFC0761] on "DoD standard Transmission Control Protocol"
- [RFC0721] on "Out-of-Band Control Signals in a Host-to-Host Protocol"
- [RFC0813] on "Window and Acknowledgement Strategy in TCP"
- [RFC0816] on "Fault Isolation and Recovery
- [RFC0879] on "TCP Maximum Segment Size and Related Topics"
- [RFC6013] on "TCP Cookie Transactions"

The RFC Editor is requested to change the status of the following RFCs to Informational [RFC2026]:

- [RFC0814] on "Name, addresses, ports, and routes"

- [RFC0817] on "Modularity and efficiency in protocol implementation"
- [RFC0872] on "TCP-on-a-LAN"
- [RFC0964] on "Some problems with the specification of the Military Standard Transmission Control Protocol"
- [RFC1078] on "TCP port service Multiplexer (TCPMUX)"

3. Open Questions for TCPM Working Group

- How should [RFC0896] be handled? (Nagle algorithm and discussion) Informational?
- Should TCPMUX be Historic? It is easy to find on systems, but does anyone actually use it anymore, or is it even desirable?

4. Security Considerations

This document introduces no new security considerations. Each RFC listed in this document attempts to address the security considerations of the specification it contains.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

[RFC0675] Cerf, V., Dalal, Y., and C. Sunshine, "Specification of Internet Transmission Control Program", RFC 675, December 1974.

[RFC0721] Garlick, L., "Out-of-Band Control Signals in a Host-to-Host Protocol", RFC 721, September 1976.

[RFC0761] Postel, J., "DoD standard Transmission Control Protocol", RFC 761, January 1980.

[RFC0813] Clark, D., "Window and Acknowledgement Strategy in TCP", RFC 813, July 1982.

[RFC0814] Clark, D., "Name, addresses, ports, and routes", RFC 814, July 1982.

[RFC0816] Clark, D., "Fault isolation and recovery", RFC 816,

July 1982.

[RFC0817] Clark, D., "Modularity and efficiency in protocol implementation", RFC 817, July 1982.

[RFC0872] Padlipsky, M., "TCP-on-a-LAN", RFC 872, September 1982.

[RFC0879] Postel, J., "TCP maximum segment size and related topics", RFC 879, November 1983.

[RFC0896] Nagle, J., "Congestion control in IP/TCP internetworks", RFC 896, January 1984.

[RFC0964] Sidhu, D. and T. Blumer, "Some problems with the specification of the Military Standard Transmission Control Protocol", RFC 964, November 1985.

[RFC1078] Lottor, M., "TCP port service Multiplexer (TCPMUX)", RFC 1078, November 1988.

[RFC6013] Simpson, W., "TCP Cookie Transactions (TCPCT)", RFC 6013, January 2011.

5.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-rfc4614bis]
Duke, M., Braden, R., Eddy, W., Blanton, E., and A. Zimmermann, "A Roadmap for Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) Specification Documents", draft-ietf-tcpm-tcp-rfc4614bis-05 (work in progress), April 2014.

[RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, October 1996.

Authors' Addresses

Alexander Zimmermann
NetApp, Inc.
Sonnenallee 1
Kirchheim 85551
Germany

Phone: +49 89 900594712
Email: alexander.zimmermann@netapp.com

Wesley M. Eddy
MTI Systems
3000 Aerospace Parkway
Cleveland, OH 44135

Phone: 216-433-6682
Email: wes@mti-systems.com

Lars Eggert
NetApp, Inc.
Sonnenallee 1
Kirchheim 85551
Germany

Phone: +49 89 900594306
Email: lars@netapp.com