

Moving Undeployed TCP Extensions to Historic and Informational

`draft-zimmermann-tcpm-undeployed-00`

Alexander Zimmermann <alexander.zimmermann@netapp.com>

Wesley M. Eddy <wes@mti-systems.com>

Lars Eggert <lars@netapp.com>

Motivation (1/2)

- **TCP Roadmap 2.0 classifies several TCP extensions as "historic" and describes the reason for doing so**
- **No instruction to RFC Editor to change the RFC status**
- **Reclassification of outdated TCP extensions**
 - Reclassifies TCP extensions that have either been superseded or never seen widespread use to Historic status
 - RFC 675: Specification of Internet Transmission Control Program
 - RFC 761: DoD standard Transmission Control Protocol
 - RFC 721: Out-of-Band Control Signals in a Host-to-Host Protocol
 - RFC 813: Window and Acknowledgement Strategy in TCP
 - RFC 816: Fault Isolation and Recovery
 - RFC 879: TCP Maximum Segment Size and Related Topics
 - RFC 6013: TCP Cookie Transactions

Motivation (2/2) & Question

- Reclassifies RFC 814, RFC 817, RFC 872, and RFC 964 to Informational status
 - RFC 814: Name, addresses, ports, and routes
 - RFC 817: Modularity and efficiency in protocol implementation
 - RFC 872: TCP-on-a-LAN
 - RFC 964: Some problems with the specification of the Military Standard Transmission Control Protocol

■ Open Questions for TCPM Working Group

- How should RFC 896 “Congestion Control in IP/TCP Internetworks” be handled? Informational?
- Should TCPMUX (RFC 1078) be Historic? Easy to find on systems, but does anyone use it? Is it even desirable?