                 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/1id-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.

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.

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]. Conferedations [3] and/or dividing
the autonomous system to multiple private AS numbers have also been
used. IDRP 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.

Author's Address

    Pekka Savola
    CSC/FUNET

    Espoo
    Finland

    EMail: 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.

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.