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This document reclassifies several TCP extensions that have either been superceded or never seen widespread use to Historic status.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.
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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 Some of these have become outdated or simply have never seen widespread deployment.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"
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.
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