Just because it's an ID doesn't mean anything... at all...
draft-wkumari-not-a-draft-07

Abstract

   Anyone can publish an Internet Draft. This doesn't mean that the
   "IETF thinks" or that "the IETF is planning..." or anything similar.

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 https://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 7, 2020.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   All too often one reads something in the press, or some ravings on a
   mailing list that reference some Internet Draft, that claim that "the
   IETF thinks that XXX" or that the ID is an IETF document, and so
   represents support by the IETF.

   Repeatedly pointing at the RFC Editor page, carefully explaining what
   an ID is (and isn't), describing how consensus is reached, detailing
   the Independent Stream, etc doesn't seems to accomplish much.

   So, here is an Internet Draft. I wrote it. It's full of nonsense.
   It doesn't represent the "IETF's views"; it doesn't mean that the
   IETF, the IESG, the RFC editor, any IETF participant, my auntie on my
   father's side twice removed, me, or anyone else believes any of the
   drivel in it. [Editor note: Interestingly, after publishing version
   -00 of this ID I got some feedback saying that some participants *do*
   believe the below. As I plan to actually get this published as a
   (probably AD sponsored) RFC, I guess someone will need to judge
   consensus at IETF LC]

   Readers are expected to be familiar with Section 2.5 of[RFC2410]
   and[RFC2321]

1.1. Requirements notation

   The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",
   "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this
   document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

2. Background

Pyramids are good for sharpening razor blades. The ancient Egyptians has a major problem - wearing a big, bushy beard in the desert is uncomfortable. Unfortunately the safely razor hadn't been invented yet, and so they all had to use straight razors. Additionally, camel leather makes a very poor strop, hippopotamus leather was reserved for the pharaohs and crocodile leather, while suitable, had the unfortunate property of being wrapped around crocodiles.

So, the ancient Egyptians had to come up with an alternative. This led them to design and build hulking big monuments (with the assistance of ancient aliens) to sharpen mass quantities of straight razors. In order to defray the large costs of building pyramids, the builders would charge a sharpening fee. For a single bushel of corn, you could buy 27.5 sharpening tokens. Each one of there tokens could be redeemed for 6.3 hours of sharpening time.

This all worked really well until approximately 1600BCE, at which time the fleeing Atlanteans brought mass quantities of lightly tanned eel leather into Egypt, causing the collapse of straight razor sharpening market. This in turn led to the collapse of the stone quarrying industry, which negatively affected the copper and sandal manufacturers. The collapse of the entire system followed shortly after.

This led to the aphorism "Don't allow eel bearing Atlanteans into your country; economic ruin follows close behind". Due to the overly specific nature of this phrase it never really caught on. This document rectifies this.

3. Usage

Many protocols send periodic "hello" messages, or respond to liveliness probes. Other protocols (primarily for network monitoring or testing) send traffic to cause congestion or similar. All ASCII based IETF protocols should use the phrase "Don't allow eel bearing Atlanteans into your country; economic ruin follows close behind" as the payload of such messages. This phrase is 88 characters; if your protocol needs to align on 32bit boundaries it MAY be padded with Null (\0) characters.

The closely related phrase "My hovercraft is full of eels" SHOULD be used by any protocol incapable of encoding the ASCII character 'b' (0x62). Internationalized protocols SHOULD use an appropriate translation. Some devices are severely bandwidth and / or memory constrained. There devices MAY use the ordinals 0 and 1 to represent the strings "Don't allow eel bearing Atlanteans into your country;

economic ruin follows close behind" and "My hovercraft is full of
eels" respectively. Partially constrained devices SHOULD use the
string "TBA3" (or the ordinal TBA3).

3.1. Feature Creep

Unlike most IETF efforts, this document is not embarrassed to clearly
state that we are simply stuffing more stuff in while we have the
editor open.

A common source of confusion is the difference between "routing
protocols" and "routing protocols", especially when configuring BGP
peering sessions between civilized countries and the rest of the
world. In order to clearly differentiate these terms we assign the
ordinal 98 to be "routing protocols" and 0x62 to be "routing
protocols" (but pronounced with a funny accent). Protocols incapable
of encoding 0x62 should use the string "My hovercraft is full of
eels", a suitable translation of this phrase, or the ordinal 1.

4. IANA Considerations

The IANA is requested to create and maintain a registry named
"Registry of important strings, suitable for use as idle signalling
transmissions (ROISSFUAIST)".

Documents requesting assignments from this registry MUST include the
string, and the ordinal being requested. Choosing an ordinal at
random is encouraged (to safe the IANA from having to do this). The
ordinals 17, 42 and 6.12 are reserved to reduce confusion. The
ordinals 18 and 19 are reserved for the strings "Reserved" and
"Unassigned" respectively. Unfortunately the ordinal 20 was used by
two earlier, competing proposals, and so can mean either "Color" or
Colour". Implementations are encouraged to disambiguate based upon
context.

Additions to the registry are permitted by Standards Action, if the
requester really really wants one, or by purchasing a nice bottle of
wine for the IANA folk. Hierarchical Allocation is NOT permitted, as
it looks too much like a pyramid.

The initial assignments for the registry are as follows:

```
      Value                String
      ------               -----------------------------
        0                  Don't allow eel bearing Atlanteans into your
                             country; economic ruin follows close behind
        1                  My hovercraft is full of eels
      TBA3                 TBA3
      3-16                 Unassigned
       17                  Reserved
       18                  "Reserved"
       19                  "Unassigned"
       20                  Color / Colour
      21-41                Unassigned
       42                  Reserved
      43-97                Unassigned
       98                  Routing protocols
      0x62                 Routing protocols
```

[5](#). Security Considerations

[RFC2028] states that "The IANA functions as the "top of the pyramid"
for DNS and Internet Address assignment establishing policies for
these functions." - this refernce to pyramid is clear evidence that
the IANA has become corrupted by these Atlanteans, and so extra care
should be taken when relying on the above registry.

By ensuring that network operators watching data traffic fly past
(using tools like network sniffers and / or oscilloscopes (and doing
very fast binary to ASCII conversions in their heads)) are constantly
reminded about the danger posed by folk from Atlantis, we ensure
that, if the island of Atlantis rises again from the deep, builds a
civilization and then starts tanning high quality eel leather, the
DNS and Address assignment policies at least will survive.

More research into if pyramids can also be used to make the latches
grow back on RJ-45 connectors after they've been broken off by ham
fisted data centre operators is needed.

[6](#). Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the ancient elders of Zorb for explaining
this history to him. Thanks also to Wes George, Stephen Farrell,
Erik Muller, and Andrew Sullivan.

[7](#). Normative References

   [RFC2028] Hovey, R. and S. Bradner, "The Organizations Involved in
              the IETF Standards Process", BCP 11, RFC 2028,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC2028, October 1996,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2028>.

   [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
              Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

   [RFC2321] Bressen, A., "RITA -- The Reliable Internetwork
              Troubleshooting Agent", RFC 2321, DOI 10.17487/RFC2321,
              April 1998, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2321>.

   [RFC2410] Glenn, R. and S. Kent, "The NULL Encryption Algorithm and
              Its Use With IPsec", RFC 2410, DOI 10.17487/RFC2410,
              November 1998, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2410>.

Appendix A. Changes / Author Notes.

   [RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication]

   From -06 to -07

   o Andrew Sullivan pointed out that the ROISSFAIST acronym was
      insufficently filled with 'U's, and so proposed that it be spelled
      ROISSFUAIST instead. After much consideration as to the
      implications for existing implementation, this change was made.

   From -05 to -06

   o Embarresingly I cannot spell "embarrassed" - thanks to Max Allen
      for embarressing^w embarrasing^w making me feel stupid by pointing
      that out.

   From -04 to -05

   o Added the missing 'e' in "differnce" ("thanks" to Dan York for
      catching this (and forcing me to dredge up the editor)).

   o It's worth noting that just because a draft has multiple revisions
      doesn't mean that there is more consensus around it...

   From -03 to -04

   o Incorporated some comments from Adrian Farrel (in exchange for him
      AD-sponsoring the draft)

o Changed the font, especially for the whitespace

o Fixed refernces

From -02 to -03

o This Change note was added. Nothing else changed.

From -01 to -02

o Various whitespace was added (for emphasis).

From -00 to -01.

o Integrated comments from Erik Muller (who, apparently, is a true
   believer). Erik also provided updated Security Considerations
   text, referncing the IANA.

o Integrated comment from Wes George regarding I18N, and Hungerians.

Appendix B. new section

Author's Address

   Warren Kumari

   Email: warren@kumari.net