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Abstract
IPv4 has been superseded by IPv6, and is therefore Historic.
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1. Introduction

According to [RFC2026], "The Internet Standards Process":

4.2.4 Historic

A specification that has been superseded by a more recent
specification or is for any other reason considered to be obsolete
is assigned to the "Historic" level.

Note: Standards track specifications normally must not depend on
other standards track specifications which are at a lower maturity
level or on non standards track specifications other than
referenced specifications from other standards bodies. (See
Section 7.)

IPv4 [RFC791] has been superseded by the more recent IPv6
specification [RFC2460bis]. The IPv6 document specifically says, "IP
version 6 (IPv6) is a new version of the Internet Protocol, designed
as the successor to IP version 4 (IPv4) [RFC791]."

RFC791 is therefore Historic.

IPv4 has inherent limitations which can not be mitigated; the IETF
has therefore developed a new protocol without these limitations.
Current and future work builds on IPv6, making it better for every
purpose than the old protocol.

The use of IPv4 is deprecated. The term "deprecated" is used to
indicate a feature, characteristic, or practice that should be
avoided, in this case because it is being superseded by a newer
protocol. The term does not indicate that the practice is harmful,
but that there will be no further development in IPv4, and therefore
those using the old version are advised to transition to the newer
version.
2. Implications

Moving an Internet Standard to the Historic maturity level does not mean that it cannot be used. It does mean that any Standards Track RFC with a Normative reference to RFC791 is Historic. This is appropriate: any RFC defining IPv4 options is Historic.

In addition, some RFCs that refer to RFC791, such as [RFC1035] "DOMAIN NAMES - IMPLEMENTATION AND SPECIFICATION" which defines A and IN-ADDR.ARPA, will be Updated By this document, but are not Historic. Other documents with incidental references to RFC791 should not be affected. Documents requiring updates are appropriate for [draft-ietf-sunset4-gapanalysis].

The IETF does not update Historic RFCs. Therefore, the IETF will no longer work on IPv4 technologies, including transition technologies.

The term "IP," without address family specified, is assumed to mean "IPv6."

3. Security Considerations

It is possible that bugs inherent to IPv4 will yet be discovered. Being Historic, the IETF will not further update IPv4. Therefore, for security reasons, the use of IPv6 exclusively is recommended.

4. IANA Considerations

This document does not direct IANA to alter its processes for allocating IPv4 addresses according to its processes. This is unlikely to be a significant activity for long.
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