

Network Working Group	L. Eggert
Internet-Draft	Nokia
Updates: 4614 (if approved)	February 16, 2011
Obsoletes: 1072, 1106, 1110, 1145, 1146, 1263, 1379, 1644, 1693 (if approved)	
Intended status: Informational	
Expires: August 20, 2011	

Moving the Undeployed TCP Extensions RFC1072, RFC1106, RFC1110, RFC1145, RFC1146, RFC1263, RFC1379, RFC1644 and RFC1693 to Historic Status

draft-eggert-tcpm-historicize-01

Abstract

This document recommends that several TCP extensions that have never seen widespread use be moved to Historic status. The affected RFCs are RFC1072, RFC1106, RFC1110, RFC1145, RFC1146, RFC1263, RFC1379, RFC1644 and RFC1693.

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 August 20, 2011.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

1. Introduction

TCP has a long history, and several proposed TCP extensions have never seen widespread deployment. Section 5 of the TCP "roadmap" document [\[RFC4614\]](#) 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 5 of [\[RFC4614\]](#) for justification.

[\[RFC1263\]](#) ("TCP Extensions Considered Harmful") is somewhat of a special case. Unlike the other RFCs made Historic by this memo, it does not specify a TCP option that failed to see deployment, but argued for a way to evolve TCP forward (by not relying on TCP options) that the community did not choose to follow.

2. RFC Editor Considerations

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

- * [\[RFC1072\]](#) on "TCP Extensions for Long-Delay Paths"
- * [\[RFC1106\]](#) and [\[RFC1110\]](#) related to the "TCP Big Window and NAK Options"
- * [\[RFC1145\]](#) and [\[RFC1146\]](#) related to the "TCP Alternate Checksum Options"
- * [\[RFC1263\]](#) on "TCP Extensions Considered Harmful"
- * [\[RFC1379\]](#) and [\[RFC1644\]](#) on "TCP Extensions for Transactions"
- * [\[RFC1693\]](#) on "TCP Partial Order Service"

3. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to mark the TCP options 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 documented in [\[RFC1072\]](#), [\[RFC1146\]](#), [\[RFC1644\]](#) and [\[RFC1693\]](#) as "obsolete" in the TCP option numbers registry [\[TCPOPTREG\]](#), with a reference to this RFC.

(None of the other documents moved to Historic status had TCP options numbers assigned; no IANA action is therefore required for them.)

4. Security Considerations

This document has no known security implications.

[Note to the RFC Editor: Please remove this section upon publication.]

5. Acknowledgments

Lars Eggert is partly funded by [\[TRILOGY\]](#), a research project supported by the European Commission under its Seventh Framework Program.

6. References

6.1. Normative References

[RFC1072]	Jacobson, V. and R. Braden, " TCP extensions for long-delay paths ", RFC 1072, October 1988.
[RFC1106]	Fox, R. , " TCP big window and NAK options ", RFC 1106, June 1989.
[RFC1110]	McKenzie, A. , " Problem with the TCP big window option ", RFC 1110, August 1989.
[RFC1145]	Zweig, J. and C. Partridge , " TCP alternate checksum options ", RFC 1145, February 1990.
[RFC1146]	Zweig, J. and C. Partridge , " TCP alternate checksum options ", RFC 1146, March 1990.
[RFC1263]	O'Malley, S. and L.L. Peterson , " TCP Extensions Considered Harmful ", RFC 1263, October 1991.
[RFC1379]	Braden, B. , " Extending TCP for Transactions -- Concepts ", RFC 1379, November 1992.
[RFC1644]	Braden, B. , " T/TCP -- TCP Extensions for Transactions Functional Specification ", RFC 1644, July 1994.
[RFC1693]	Connolly, T. , Amer, P. and P. Conrad , " An Extension to TCP : Partial Order Service ", RFC 1693, November 1994.
[RFC4614]	Duke, M., Braden, R., Eddy, W. and E. Blanton, " A Roadmap for Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) Specification Documents ", RFC 4614, September 2006.

6.2. Informative References

, "

[RFC2026]	Bradner, S. , " The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3 ", BCP 9, RFC 2026, October 1996.
[TCPOPTREG]	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), , "TCP Option Kind Numbers", http://www.iana.org/assignments/tcp-parameters/tcp-parameters.xml , .
[TRILOGY]	Trilogy Project", http://www.trilogy-project.org/ , .

Author's Address

Lars Eggert
Eggert Nokia Research Center P.O. Box 407 Nokia
Group, 00045 Finland Phone: +358 50 48 24461 EMail:
lars.eggert@nokia.com URI: http://research.nokia.com/people/lars_eggert

Table of Contents

- *1. [Introduction](#)
- *2. [RFC Editor Considerations](#)
- *3. [IANA Considerations](#)
- *4. [Security Considerations](#)
- *5. [Acknowledgments](#)
- *6. [References](#)
 - *6.1. [Normative References](#)
 - *6.2. [Informative References](#)
- *[Author's Address](#)