

Requests For Comments Summary  
Notes: 800-899

Status of this Memo

This RFC is a slightly annotated list of the 100 RFCs from RFC 800 through RFC 899. This is a status report on these RFCs.

RFC ---	Author -----	Date ----	Title -----
899	Postel	Apr 84	Requests For Comments Summary
This memo.			
898	Hinden	Apr 84	Gateway Special Interest Group Meeting Notes

This memo is a report on the Gateway Special Interest Group Meeting that was held at ISI on 28 and 29 February 1984. Robert Hinden of BBNCC chaired, and Jon Postel of ISI hosted the meeting. Approximately 35 gateway designers and implementors attended. These notes are based on the recollections of Jon Postel and Mike Muuss. Under each topic area are Jon Postel's brief notes, and additional details from Mike Muuss. This memo is a report on a meeting. No conclusions, decisions, or policy statements are documented in this note.

897	Postel	Feb 84	Domain Name System Implementation Schedule
-----	--------	--------	--------------------------------------------

This memo is a policy statement on the implementation of the Domain Style Naming System in the Internet. This memo is a partial update of RFC 881. The intent of this memo is to detail the schedule for the implementation for the Domain Style Naming System. The names of hosts will be changed to domain style names. Hosts will begin to use domain style names on 14-Mar-84, and the use of old style names will be completely phased out before 2-May-84. This applies to both the ARPA research hosts and the DDN operational hosts. This is an official policy statement of the ICCB and the DARPA.

- 896 Nagle Jan 84 Congestion Control in IP/TCP  
Internetworks

This memo discusses some aspects of congestion control in IP/TCP Internetworks. It is intended to stimulate thought and further discussion of this topic. While some specific suggestions are made for improved congestion control implementation, this memo does not specify any standards.

- 895 Postel Apr 84 A Standard for the Transmission of  
IP Datagrams over Experimental Ethernet  
Networks

This RFC specifies a standard method of encapsulating Internet Protocol (IP) datagrams on an Experimental Ethernet. This RFC specifies a standard protocol for the ARPA Internet community.

- 894 Hornig Apr 84 A Standard for the Transmission of  
IP Datagrams over Ethernet Networks

This RFC specifies a standard method of encapsulating Internet Protocol (IP) datagrams on an Ethernet. This RFC specifies a standard protocol for the ARPA-Internet community.

- 893 Leffler Apr 84 Trailer Encapsulations

This RFC discusses the motivation for use of "trailer encapsulations" on local-area networks and describes the implementation of such an encapsulation on various media. This document is for information only. This is NOT an official protocol for the ARPA Internet community.

- 892 ISO Dec 83 ISO Transport Protocol Specification

This is a draft version of the transport protocol being standardized by the ISO. This version also appeared in the ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (V.12, N.3-4) July-October 1982. This version is now out of date.

- 891 Mills Dec 83 DCN Local-Network Protocols

This RFC provides a description of the DCN protocols for maintaining connectivity, routing, and clock information in a local network. These procedures may be of interest to the designers and implementers of other local networks.

890        Postel            Feb 84        Exterior Gateway Protocol  
                                         Implementation Schedule

This memo is a policy statement on the implementation of the Exterior Gateway Protocol in the Internet. This is an official policy statement of ICCB and DARPA. After 1-Aug-84 there shall be no dumb gateways in the Internet. Every gateway must be a member of some autonomous system. Some gateway of each autonomous system must exchange routing information with some gateway of the core autonomous system using the Exterior Gateway Protocol.

889        Mills            Dec 83        Internet Delay Experiments

This memo reports on some measurements of round-trip times in the Internet and suggests some possible improvements to the TCP retransmission timeout calculation. This memo is both a status report on the Internet and advice to TCP implementers.

888        Seamonson        Jan 84        "Stub" Exterior Gateway Protocol

This RFC describes the Exterior Gateway Protocol used to connect Stub Gateways to an Autonomous System of core Gateways. This document specifies the working protocol, and defines an ARPA official protocol. All implementers of Gateways should carefully review this document.

887        Accetta        Dec 83        Resource Location Protocol

This RFC specifies a draft standard for the ARPA Internet community. It describes a resource location protocol for use in the ARPA Internet. It is most useful on networks employing technologies which support some method of broadcast addressing, however it may also be used on other types of networks. For maximum benefit, all hosts which provide significant resources or services to other hosts on the Internet should implement this protocol. Hosts failing to implement the Resource Location Protocol risk being ignored by other hosts which are attempting to locate resources on the Internet.

886        Rose            Dec 83        Proposed Standard for Message Header  
                                         Munging

This RFC specifies a draft standard for the ARPA Internet community. It describes the rules to be used when transforming mail from the conventions of one message system to those of another message system. In particular, the treatment of header fields, and recipient addresses is specified.

885        Postel            Dec 83        Telnet End of Record Option

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. It specifies a method for marking the end of records in data transmitted on Telnet connections.

884        Solomon         Dec 83        Telnet Terminal Type Option

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. It specifies a method for exchanging terminal type information in the Telnet protocol.

883        Mockapetris    Nov 83        Domain Names - Implementation and Specification

This RFC discusses the implementation of domain name servers and resolvers, specifies the format of transactions, and discusses the use of domain names in the context of existing mail systems and other network software.

882        Mockapetris    Nov 83        Domain Names - Concepts and Facilities

This RFC introduces domain style names, their use for ARPA Internet mail and host address support, and the protocol and servers used to implement domain name facilities.

881        Postel           Nov 83        The Domain Names Plan and Schedule

This RFC outlines a plan and schedule for the implementation of domain style names throughout the DDN/ARPA Internet community. The introduction of domain style names will impact all hosts on the DDN/ARPA Internet.

880        Reynolds        Oct 83        Official Protocols

This RFC identifies the documents specifying the official protocols used in the ARPA Internet. Annotations identify any revisions or changes planned. Obsoletes RFC 840.

879        Postel           Nov 83        The TCP Maximum Segment Size and Related Topics

This RFC discusses the TCP Maximum Segment Size Option and related topics. The purposes is to clarify some aspects of TCP and its interaction with IP. This memo is a clarification to the TCP specification, and contains information that may be considered as "advice to implementers".

878        Malis            Dec 83        The ARPANET 1822L Host Access Protocol

This RFC specifies the ARPANET 1822L Host Access Protocol, which is a successor to the existing 1822 Host Access Protocol. The 1822L procedure allows ARPANET hosts to use logical identifiers as well as 1822 physical interface identifiers to address each other.

877        Korb            Sep 83        A Standard for the Transmission of IP  
Datagrams Over Public Data Networks

This RFC specifies a standard adopted by CSNET, the VAN gateway, and other organizations for the transmission of IP datagrams over the X.25-based public data networks.

876        Smallberg      Sep 83        Survey of SMTP Implementations

This RFC is a survey of implementation status. It does not specify an official protocol, but rather notes the status of implementation of aspects of a protocol. It is expected that the status of the hosts reported on will change. This information must be treated as a snapshot of the state of these implemetations.

875        Padlipsky      Sep 82        Gateways, Architectures, and Heffalumps

This RFC is a discussion about the role of gateways in an internetwork, especially the problems of translating or mapping protocols between different protocol suites. The discussion notes possible functionality mis-matches, undesirable routing "singularity points", flow control issues, and high cost of translating gateways. Originally published as M82-51 by the MITRE Corporation, Bedford, Massachusetts.

874        Padlipsky      Sep 82        A Critique of X.25

This RFC is an analysis of X.25 pointing out some problems in the conceptual model, particularly the conflict between the interface aspects and the end-to-end aspects. The memo also touches on security, and implementation issues. Originally published as M82-50 by the MITRE Corporation, Bedford, Massachusetts.

873        Padlipsky      Sep 82        The Illusion of Vendor Support

This memo takes issue with the claim that international standards in computer protocols presently provide a basis for low cost vendor supported protocol implementations. Originally published as M82-49 by the MITRE Corporation, Bedford, Massachusetts.

872      Padlipsky      Sep 82      TCP-ON-A-LAN

This memo attacks the notion that TCP cannot be appropriate for use on a Local Area Network. Originally published as M82-48 by the MITRE Corporation, Bedford Massachusetts.

871      Padlipsky      Sep 82      A Perspective on the Arpanet Reference Model

This RFC is primarily intended as a perspective on the ARM and points out some of the differences between the ARM and the ISORM which were expressed by members in NWG general meetings, NWG protocol design committee meetings, the ARPA Internet Working Group, and private conversations over the intervening years. Originally published as M82-47 by the MITRE Corporation, Bedford, Massachusetts.

870      Reynolds      Oct 83      Assigned Numbers

This RFC documents the list of numbers assigned for networks, protocols, etc. Obsoletes RFCs 820, 790, 776, 770, 762, 758, 755, 750, 739, 604.

869      Hinden      Dec 83      A Host Monitoring Protocol

This RFC specifies the Host Monitoring Protocol used to collect information from various types of hosts in the Internet. Designers of Internet communications software are encouraged to consider this protocol as a means of monitoring the behavior of their creations.

868      Postel      May 83      Time Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Time Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. This protocol provides a site-independent, machine readable date and time. The Time service sends back to the originating source the time in seconds since midnight on January first 1900.

867      Postel      May 83      Daytime Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Daytime Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Daytime service simply sends the current date and time as a character string without regard to the input.

866        Postel            May 83        Active Users

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement an Active Users Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Active Users service simply sends a list of the currently active users on the host without regard to the input.

865        Postel            May 83        Quote of the Day Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Quote of the Day Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Quote of the Day service simply sends a short message without regard to the input.

864        Postel            May 83        Character Generator Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Character Generator Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Character Generator service simply sends data without regard to the input.

863        Postel            May 83        Discard Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Discard Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Discard service simply throws away any data it receives.

862        Postel            May 83        Echo Protocol

This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet that choose to implement a Echo Protocol are expected to adopt and implement this standard. The Echo service simply sends back to the originating source any data it receives.

861        Postel            May 83        Telnet Extended Options - List Option

This Telnet Option provides a mechanism for extending the set of possible options. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 16239.

## 860 Postel May 83 Telnet Timing Mark Option

This Telnet Option provides a way to check the roundtrip path between two Telnet modules. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 16238.

## 859 Postel May 83 Telnet Status Option

This Telnet Option provides a way to determine the other Telnet module's view of the status of options. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes RFC 651 (NIC 31154).

## 858 Postel May 83 Telnet Suppress Go Ahead Option

This Telnet Option disables the exchange of go-ahead signals between the Telnet modules. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 15392.

## 857 Postel May 83 Telnet Echo Option

This Telnet Option enables remote echoing by the other Telnet module. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 15390.

## 856 Postel May 83 Telnet Binary Transmission

This Telnet Option enables a binary data mode between the Telnet modules. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 15389.

## 855 Postel May 83 Telnet Option Specifications

This memo specifies the general form for Telnet options and the directions for their specification. This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes RFC 651, NIC 18640.



854        Postel            May 83            Telnet Protocol Specifications

This is the specification of the Telnet protocol used for remote terminal access in the ARPA Internet. The purpose of the TELNET Protocol is to provide a fairly general, bi-directional, eight-bit byte oriented communications facility. Its primary goal is to allow a standard method of interfacing terminal devices and terminal-oriented processes to each other. It is envisioned that the protocol may also be used for terminal-terminal communication ("linking") and process-process communication (distributed computation). This RFC specifies a standard for the ARPA Internet community. Hosts on the ARPA Internet are expected to adopt and implement this standard. Obsoletes NIC 18639.

853        Not issued yet.

852        Malis            Apr 83            The ARPANET Short Blocking Feature

This RFC specifies the ARPANET Short Blocking Feature, which will allow ARPANET hosts to optionally shorten the IMP's host blocking timer. This Feature is a replacement of the ARPANET non-blocking host interface, which was never implemented, and will be available to hosts using either the 1822 or 1822L Host Access Protocol. This RFC is also being presented as a solicitation of comments on the Short Blocking Feature, especially from host network software implementers and maintainers.

851        Malis            Apr 83            The ARPANET 1822L Host Access Protocol

This RFC specifies the ARPANET 1822L Host Access Protocol, which is a successor to the existing 1822 Host Access Protocol. 1822L allows ARPANET hosts to use logical names as well as 1822's physical port locations to address each other. This RFC is also being presented as a solicitation of comments on 1822L, especially from host network software implementers and maintainers. Obsoletes RFC 802.

850        Horton           Jun 83            Standard for Interchange of USENET Messages

This memo is distributed as an RFC only to make this information easily accessible to researchers in the ARPA community. It does not specify an Internet standard. This RFC defines the standard format for interchange of Network News articles among USENET sites. It describes the format for articles themselves, and gives partial standards for transmission of news. The news transmission is not entirely standardized in order to give a good deal of flexibility to the individual hosts to choose transmission hardware and software, whether to batch news and so on.

- 849        Crispin        May 83        Suggestions for Improved Host Table Distribution

This RFC actually is a request for comments. The issue dealt with is that of a naming registry update procedure, both as exists currently and what could exist in the future. None of the proposed solutions are intended as standards at this time; rather it is hoped that a general consensus will emerge as the appropriate solution, leaving eventually to the adoption of standards.

- 848        Smallberg     Mar 83        Who provides the "Little" TCP Services?

This RFC lists those hosts which provide any of these "little" TCP services: The list of hosts were taken from the NIC hostname table of 24-Feb-83. The tests were run on February 23 and 24, and March 3 and 5 from ISI-VAXA.ARPA.

- 847        Westine        Feb 83        Summary of Smallberg Surveys

This is a summary of the surveys of Telnet, FTP and Mail (SMTP) servers conducted by David Smallberg in December 1982, January and February 1983 as reported in RFC 832-843, 845-846. This memo extracts the number of hosts that accepted the connection to their server for each of Telnet, FTP, and SMTP, and compares it to the total host in the Internet (not counting TACs or ECHOS).

- 846        Smallberg     Feb 83        Who Talks TCP? -- Survey of 22 February 1983

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 18-Feb-83. The tests were run on 22-Feb-83 from ISI-VAXA.ARPA.

- 845        Smallberg     Feb 83        Who Talks TCP? -- Survey of 15 February 1983

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 3-Feb-83. The tests were run on 15-Feb-83 from ISI-VAXA.ARPA.

- |     |          |        |                      |              |
|-----|----------|--------|----------------------|--------------|
| 844 | Clements | Feb 83 | Who Talks ICMP, too? | Survey of 18 |
|     |          |        | February 1983        |              |

This survey determines how many hosts are able to respond to TELENET connections from a user at a class C site. This requires, in addition to IP and TCP, participation in gateway routing via ICMP and handling of Class C addresses. The list of hosts was taken from RFC 843, extracting only those hosts which are listed there as accepting TELNET connection. The tests were run on 18-Feb-83.

- 843 Smallberg Feb 83 Who Talks TCP? -- Survey of 8 February  
1983

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 3-Feb-83. The tests were run on 8-Feb-83 and on 9-Feb-83 from ISI-VAXA.ARPA.

- |     |           |        |                                             |
|-----|-----------|--------|---------------------------------------------|
| 842 | Smallberg | Feb 83 | Who Talks TCP? -- Survey of 1 February 1983 |
|-----|-----------|--------|---------------------------------------------|

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 28-Jan-83. The tests were run on 1-Feb-83 and on 2-Feb-83 ISI-VAXA.ARPA.

- |     |             |        |                                                                        |
|-----|-------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 841 | FIPS PUB 98 | Jan 83 | Specification for Message Format for<br>Computer Based Message Systems |
|-----|-------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|

This RFC is FIPS 98. The purpose of distributing this document as an RFC is to make it easily accessible to the ARPA research community. This RFC does not specify a standard for the ARPA Internet. Obsoletes RFC 806.

- 840 Postel Apr 83 Official Protocols

This RFC has been revised, see RFC 880.

- 839 Smallberg Jan 83 Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 31-Dec-82. The tests were run on 25-Jan-83.

838        Smallberg        Jan 83        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 31-Dec-82. The tests were run on 18-Jan-83.

837        Smallberg        Jan 83        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 31-Dec-82. The tests were run on 11-Jan-83.

836        Smallberg        Jan 83        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 20-Dec-82. The tests were run on 4-Jan-83 through 5-Jan-83.

835        Smallberg        Dec 82        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 2-Dec-82. The tests were run on 28-Dec-82 through 5-Jan-83.

834        Smallberg        Dec 82        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 2-Dec-82. The tests were run on 22-Dec-82.

833        Smallberg        Dec 82        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 2-Dec-82. The tests were run on 14-Dec-82.

832        Smallberg        Dec 82        Who Talks TCP?

This RFC is a survey of hosts to identify the implementation status of Telnet, FTP, and Mail on TCP. The list of hosts was taken from the NIC hostname table of 2-Dec-82. The tests were run on 7-Dec-82.

- 831 Braden Dec 82 Backup Access to the European Side of SATNET

The purpose of this RFC is to focus discussion on a particular Internet problem: a backup path for software maintenance of the European sector of the Internet, for use when SATNET is partitioned. We propose a mechanism, based upon the Source Routing option of IP, to reach European Internet sites via the VAN Gateway and UCL. This proposal is not intended as a standard at this time.

- 830 Zaw-Sing Su Oct 82 A Distributed System for Internet Name Service

This RFC proposes a distributed name service for DARPA Internet. Its purpose is to focus discussion on the subject. It is hoped that a general consensus will emerge leading eventually to the adoption of standards.

- 829 Cerf Oct 82 Packet Satellite Technology Reference Sources

This RFC describes briefly the packet satellite technology developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and several other participating organizations in the U.K. and Norway and provides a bibliography of relevant papers for researchers interested in experimental and operational experience with this dynamic satellite-sharing technique.

- 828 Owen Aug 82 Data Communications: IFIP's International "Network" of Experts

This RFC is distributed to inform the ARPA Internet community of the activities of the IFIP technical committee on Data Communications, and to encourage participation in those activities.

- 827 Rosen Oct 82 Exterior Gateway Protocol (EGP)

This RFC is proposed to establish a standard for Gateway to Gateway procedures that allow the Gateways to be mutually suspicious. This document is a DRAFT for that standard. Your comments are strongly encouraged.

- 826 Plummer Nov 82 An Ethernet Address Resolution Protocol

The purpose of this RFC is to present a method of Converting Protocol Addresses (e.g., IP addresses) to Local Network Addresses (e.g., Ethernet addresses). This is an issue of general concern in the ARPA Internet Community at this time. The method proposed here is presented for your consideration and comment. This is not the specification of an Internet Standard.

- |     |        |        |                                                  |
|-----|--------|--------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 825 | Postel | Nov 82 | Request for Comments on Requests for<br>Comments |
|-----|--------|--------|--------------------------------------------------|

This RFC is intended to clarify the status of RFCs and to provide some guidance for the authors of RFCs in the future. It is in a sense a specification for RFCs.

- 824 MacGregor Aug 82 The Cronus Virtual Local Network

The purpose of this note is to describe the CRONUS Virtual Local Network, especially the addressing related features. These features include a method for mapping between Internet Addresses and Local Network addresses. This is a topic of current concern in the ARPA Internet community. This note is intended to stimulate discussion. This is not a specification of an Internet Standard.

- 823          Hinden                  Sep 82                  The DARPA Internet Gateway

This RFC is a status report on the Internet Gateway developed by BBN. It describes the Internet Gateway as of September 1982. This memo presents detailed descriptions of message formats and gateway procedures, however, this is not an implementation specification, and such details are subject to change.

- 822 Crocker Aug 82 Standard for the Format of ARPA  
Internet Text Messages

This document revises the specifications in RFC 733, in order to serve the needs of the larger and more complex ARPA Internet. Some of RFC 733's features failed to gain adequate acceptance. In order to simplify the standard and the software that follows it, these features have been removed. A different addressing scheme is used, to handle the case of internetwork mail; and the concept of re-transmission has been introduced. Obsoletes RFC 733, NIC 41952.

- 821 Postel Aug 82 Simple Mail Transfer Protocol

The objective of Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) is to transfer mail reliably and efficiently. SMTP is independent of the particular transmission subsystem and requires only a reliable ordered data stream channel. Obsoletes RFC 788, 780, and 772.

- |     |        |        |                  |
|-----|--------|--------|------------------|
| 820 | Postel | Jan 82 | Assigned Numbers |
|-----|--------|--------|------------------|

This RFC is an old version, see RFC 870.

- 819       Zaw-Sing Su   Aug 82       The Domain Naming Convention for  
Internet User Applications

This RFC is an attempt to clarify the generalization of the Domain Naming Convention, the Internet Naming Convention, and to explore the implications of its adoption for Internet name service and user applications.

- 818       Postel       Nov 82       The Remote User Telnet Service

This RFC is the specification of an application protocol. Any host that implements this application level service must follow this protocol.

- 817       Clark       Jul 82       Modularity and Efficiency in Protocol  
Implementation

This RFC will discuss some of the commonly encountered reasons why protocol implementations seem to run slowly.

- 816       Clark       Jul 82       Fault Isolation and Recovery

This RFC describes the portion of fault isolation and recovery which is the responsibility of the host.

- 815       Clark       Jul 82       IP Datagram Reassembly Algorithms

This RFC describes an alternate approach of dealing with reassembly which reduces the bookkeeping problem to a minimum, and requires only one buffer for storage equal in size to the final datagram being reassembled, which can reassemble a datagram from any number of fragments arriving in any order with any possible pattern of overlap and duplication, and which is appropriate for almost any sort of operating system.

- 814       Clark       Jul 82       Name, Addresses, Ports, and Routes

This RFC gives suggestions and guidance for the design of the tables and algorithms necessary to keep track of these various sorts of identifiers inside a host implementation of TCP/IP.

- 813       Clark       Jul 82       Window and Acknowledgement Strategy in  
TCP

This RFC describes implementation strategies to deal with two mechanisms in TCP, the window and the acknowledgement. It also presents a particular set of algorithms which have received testing in the field, and which appear to work properly with each other. With more experience, these algorithms may become part of the formal specification, until such time their use is recommended.

812        Harrenstien    Mar 82        NICNAME/WHOIS

This RFC gives a description of what the NICNAME/WHOIS Server is and how to access it. This server together with the corresponding Identification Data Base provides online directory look-up equivalent to the ARPANET Directory.

811        Harrenstien    Mar 82        Hostnames Server

This RFC gives a description of what the Hostnames Server is and how to access it. The function of this particular server is to deliver machine-readable name/address information describing networks, gateways, hosts, and eventually domains, within the internet environment.

810        Feinler        Mar 82        DoD Internet Host Table Specification

This RFC specifies a new host table format applicable to both ARPANET and Internet needs. In addition to host name to host address translation and selected protocol information, we have also included network and gateway name to address correspondence, and host operating system information. This RFC obsoletes the host table described in RFC 608.

809        Chang         Feb 82        UCL Facsimile System

This RFC describes the features of the computerised facsimile system developed in the Department of Computer Science at UCL. First its functions are considered and the related experimental work are reported. Then the disciplines for system design are discussed. Finally, the implementation of the system are described, while detailed description are given as appendices.

808        Postel        Mar 82        Summary of Computer Mail Services  
Meeting Held at BBN on 10 January 1979

This RFC is a very belated attempt to document a meeting that was held three years earlier to discuss the state of computer mail in the ARPA community and to reach some conclusions to guide the further development of computer mail systems such that a coherent total mail service would continue to be provided.

807        Postel        Feb 82        Multimedia Mail Meeting Notes

This RFC consists of notes from a meeting held at USC Information Sciences Institute on the 12th of January to discuss common interests in multimedia computer mail issues and to agree on some specific initial experiments.



- 806        NBS                Sep 81        Specification for Message Format for  
                                         Computer Based Message Systems

This RFC deals with Computer Based Message systems which provides a basis for interaction between different CBMS by defining the format of messages passed between them. This RFC is replaced by RFC 841.

- 805        Postel            Feb 82        Computer Mail Meeting Notes

This RFC consists of notes from a meeting that was held at USC Information Sciences Institute on 11 January 1982, to discuss addressing issues in computer mail. The major conclusion reached at the meeting is to extend the "username@hostname" mailbox format to "username@host.domain", where the domain itself can be further structured.

- 804        CCITT            Jan 82        CCITT Draft Recommendation T.4

This is the CCITT standard for group 3 facsimile encoding. This is useful for data compression of bit map data.

- 803        Agarwal          Nov 81        Dacom 450/500 Facsimile Data  
                                         Transcoding

The first part of this RFC describes in detail the Dacom 450 data compression algorithms and is an update and correction to an earlier memorandum. The second part of this RFC describes briefly the Dacom 500 data compression algorithm as used by the INTELPOST electronic-mail network under development by the US Postal Service and several foreign administrators.

- 802        Malis            Nov 81        The ARPANET 1822L Host Access Protocol

This document proposed two major changes to the current ARPANET host access protocol. The first change will allow hosts to use logical addressing (i.e., host addresses that are independent of their physical location on the ARPANET) to communicate with each other, and the second will allow a host to shorten the amount of time that it may be blocked by its IMP after it presents a message to the network (currently, the IMP can block further input from a host for up to 15 seconds). See RFCs 852 and 851.

- 801        Postel            Nov 81        NCP/TCP Transition Plan

This RFC discusses the conversion of hosts from NCP to TCP. And making available the principle services: Telnet, File Transfer, and Mail. These protocols allow all hosts in the ARPA community to share a common interprocess communication environment.

800 Postel Nov 82 Requests for Comments Summary

This RFC is a slightly annotated list of the 100 RFCs from RFC 700 through RFC 799. This is a status report on these RFCs.

