

Internet Engineering Task Force  
Internet-Draft  
Obsoletes: [1863](#) (if approved)  
Expires: November 15, 2004

P. Savola  
CSC/FUNET  
May 17, 2004

Request to Move [RFC 1863](#) to Historic  
draft-savola-idr-rfc1863-historic-00.txt

#### Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, I certify that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which I am aware have been disclosed, and any of which I become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3668](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on November 15, 2004.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). All Rights Reserved.

#### Abstract

This memo requests moving [RFC 1863](#), A BGP/IDRP Route Server alternative to a full mesh routing, to Historic status. This memo also Obsoletes [RFC 1863](#).

#### 1. Request to Move [RFC 1863](#) to Historic

[RFC 1863](#) [1] describes the use of route servers as an alternative to BGP/IDRP full mesh routing.

Internet-Draft

[RFC 1863](#) to Historic

May 2004

In the modern terminology, the term "route server" refers to a designated, normal BGP speaker set up for specific purposes such as data collection or retrieval; such route servers do not implement [RFC 1863](#). For clarity, in the context of this document the term "[RFC 1863](#) route server" is used to refer to a route server as specified in [RFC 1863](#).

Implementations of [RFC 1863](#) route servers do not exist, and are not used as an alternative to full mesh routing. Therefore the [RFC 1863](#) route server concept is considered extinct and [RFC 1863](#) is requested to be moved to Historic status.

The most common technique as an alternative to full mesh routing is to use BGP route reflectors [2]. Confederations [3] and/or dividing the autonomous system to multiple private AS numbers have also been used. IDRPs itself has never been standardized by the IETF and can be considered obsolete.

Other uses of (non-RFC1863) route servers, rather than as an alternative to full mesh routing as described by [RFC 1863](#), are expected to continue be used for multiple purposes, but are out of the scope of this memo.

## [2.](#) Acknowledgements

Jeffrey Haas, John Scudder, Paul Jakma, and Yakov Rekhter provided useful background information for the creation of this memo.

## [3.](#) Security Considerations

Reclassifying [RFC 1863](#) has no security considerations.

## [4.](#) References

### [4.1](#) Normative References

- [1] Haskin, D., "A BGP/IDRP Route Server alternative to a full mesh routing", [RFC 1863](#), October 1995.

### [4.2](#) Informative References

- [2] Bates, T., Chandra, R. and E. Chen, "BGP Route Reflection - An

Alternative to Full Mesh IBGP", [RFC 2796](#), April 2000.

- [3] Traina, P., McPherson, D. and J. Scudder, "Autonomous System Confederations for BGP", [RFC 3065](#), February 2001.

Savola

Expires November 15, 2004

[Page 2]

---

Internet-Draft

[RFC 1863](#) to Historic

May 2004

#### Author's Address

Pekka Savola  
CSC/FUNET

Espoo  
Finland

EMail: [psavola@funet.fi](mailto:psavola@funet.fi)

#### Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

#### Disclaimer of Validity

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an

"AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

#### Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.