Network Working Group
Request for Comments: 5125
Obsoletes: 3525
Category: Informational

T. Taylor
Nortel

February 2008

Reclassification of RFC 3525 to Historic

Abstract

This document reclassifies RFC 3525, Gateway Control Protocol Version 1, to Historic Status. This memo also obsoletes RFC 3525.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to reclassify RFC 3525, Gateway Control Protocol Version 1, to Historic Status.

2. Reclassification of RFC 3525 to Historic

The protocol defined by RFC 3525 [RFC3525] was developed jointly by the IETF Megaco Working Group and ITU-T Study Group 16. The ITU-T published ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1 (originally H.248) with the same contents as RFC 3525. Since that initial development, the ITU-T has taken ownership of the protocol and has continued to work on it. The protocol as originally defined in RFC 3525 underwent a series of corrections and clarifications. H.248.1 version 1 [h248v1] was republished in March, 2002, incorporating all changes agreed upon up to that date. Since then, further corrections have been agreed upon. The accumulated set of corrections to H.248.1 (03/2002) is available in the Implementors' Guide for Recommendation H.248.1 Version 1 (03/2002) ("Media Gateway Control Protocol") [impgdv1], which is available at no charge on the ITU-T web site.

RFC 3525 has been rendered even more obsolete as a specification of the Megaco/H.248 protocol by the publication of further versions of ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1. Version 2 [h248v2] was published in May, 2002, and is the version most widely deployed at present. It is also the version that other standards bodies such as 3GPP are currently using as the basis for their own profile specifications. Version 3 [h248v3] was published more recently, in September, 2005.

In short, RFC 3525 may serve as an introduction to the Megaco/H.248 protocol, but it is misleading as a description of the protocol as currently standardized or deployed. It is appropriate to reclassify RFC 3525 to Historic status, as described in RFC 2026 [RFC2026].

3. Security Considerations

Reclassifying RFC 3525 has no security implications.

4. IANA Considerations

This document does not require any new actions by the IANA. The IANA registries established by RFC 3525 and extended by successive versions of ITU-T H.248.1 remain in force, along with the requirement for expert review by an IESG-designated expert.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

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

[RFC3525] Groves, C., Ed., Pantaleo, M., Ed., Anderson, T., Ed., and T. Taylor, Ed., "Gateway Control Protocol Version 1", RFC 3525, June 2003.

5.2. Informative References

[h248v1] International Telecommunication Union, "Gateway control protocol: Version 1", ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1, March 2002.

[h248v2] International Telecommunication Union, "Gateway control protocol: Version 2", ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1, May 2002.

[h248v3] International Telecommunication Union, "Gateway control protocol: Version 3", ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1, September 2005.

[impgdv1] International Telecommunication Union, "Implementors' Guide for Recommendation H.248.1 Version 1 (03/2002) ("Media Gateway Control Protocol")", ITU-T Recommendation H.248.1, April 2006.

Author's Address

Tom Taylor
Nortel
1852 Lorraine Ave
Ottawa, Ontario K1H 6Z8
Canada

EMail: taylor@nortel.com

Full Copyright Statement

Intellectual Property