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Abstract

This document collects some ideas for a next generation of the Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) for further discussion. It is a result of lessons learned from more than one decade of SCTP deployment.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Abbreviations

   o SCTP: Stream Control Transmission Protocol

1.2. Stream Control Transmission Protocol

   The Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) has been defined as
   RFCs in [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [10], [11], [12],
   [13], [14], [15]. There is also a detailed introduction provided by
   [22] as well as lots of further information material on [19]. SCTP
   is therefore not introduced in more detail here.

1.3. Scope

   The scope of this document is to collect some ideas of what to
   update/change for a next generation of the SCTP protocol. It is a
   result of lessons learned from more than one decade of SCTP
   deployment (see also [22]) as well as ongoing discussions on applying
   SCTP for WebRTC Data Channels (as introduced in more detail in [18]).

2. What to Change in the Next Generation of SCTP?

   o Make useful extensions part of the next generation core protocol
     itself (that is, make their implementation a MUST):

     * Partial Reliability ([4])

     * Chunk Authentication ([6])
* Partial Reliability ([8])
* Stream Reconfiguration ([13])
* SACK Immediately ([15])

- Consider additional features as part of the next generation core protocol:
  * Non-Renegable Selective Acknowledgments (NR-SACK) ([24])
  * Concurrent Multi-Path Transfer for SCTP (CMT-SCTP) ([16])

- Chunk Authentication provides integrity but not confidentiality. There could be a feature for encryption as well, for example like [17]. Having encryption directly included inside the core transport protocol may make it easier to use (less error-prone work for application developers).

- SCTP assigns a fixed TSN per DATA chunk. The TSN cannot be changed any more. That is, it is not possible for a middlebox to split chunks into smaller pieces (for example, for hardware offloading). For further discussion: may it be useful to consider a different behavior?

- Definition of path: For SCTP, a path is defined by a remote destination address. [20], [21] shows that CMT-SCTP performance also depends on the local endpoint’s outgoing links. Considering each pair of local outgoing and remote incoming address as different path may lead to improved performance in many Internet scenarios.

2.1. Security Considerations

Security considerations for SCTP can be found in [9].

2.2. IANA Considerations

This document introduces no additional considerations for IANA.

3. Experimental Implementations

An Open Source simulation model for SCTP is available for OMNeT++ within the INET Framework. See [23] for the Git repository. For documentation on the model, see [25] and [22]. This model can be used to evaluate future ideas for SCTP.
4. Testbed Platform

NorNet is a large-scale and realistic Internet testbed platform with support for multi-homing. A description of and introduction to NorNet is provided in [26], [27], [28], [29]. Further information can be found on the project website [30] at https://www.nntb.no.
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