

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: #489  
NIC #15298

Jon Postel  
UCLA-NMC  
March 26, 1973

### Comment on Resynchronization of Connection Status Proposal

This is a comment on the proposal by Burchfiel and Tomlinson in RFC 467 for a procedure in the host-to host protocol for resynchronization of connection status. I endorse their proposal with the following trivial change. The commands proposed might be more appropriately be called "reset connection allocation sender" and "reset connection allocation receiver" since the only aspect of the connection which is reset is the allocation. I therefore use the names RAS and RAR respectively.

The table below shows in overly concise notation my interpretation of the resynchronizing procedure proposed by Burchfiel and Tomlinson, this presentation is not intended to supersede their document but to clarify the procedure. The sequence shown here can be initiated by either the sender or receiver either for internally generated reasons or upon the receipt of a RAS or RAR, if this latter is the case then sender step 5 or receiver step 4 is satisfied.

#### SENDER

1. Set state to "wait-for-RAR"
2. Wait till no RFNM outstanding
3. Send RAS
4. Process allocates until
5. RAR received then
6. Zero allocation quantities
7. Set state to "open"

#### RECEIVER

1. Set state to "wait-for RAS"
2. Send RAR
3. Process messages until
4. RAS received then
5. Zero allocation quantities
6. Set state to "open"
7. Send a new allocate

[ This RFC was put into machine readable form for entry ]  
[ into the online RFC archives by Alex McKenzie with ]  
[ support from GTE, formerly BBN Corp. 9/99 ]