

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: 4223  
Obsoletes: 1863  
Category: Informational

P. Savola  
CSC/FUNET  
October 2005

## Reclassification of RFC 1863 to Historic

### Status of This Memo

This memo provides information for the Internet community. It does not specify an Internet standard of any kind. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

### Abstract

This memo reclassifies RFC 1863, A BGP/IDRP Route Server alternative to a full mesh routing, to Historic status. This memo also obsoletes RFC 1863.

### 1. Reclassification of RFC 1863 to Historic

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

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. Other uses of the term "route server" are outside the scope of this document.

Implementations of RFC 1863 route servers do not exist and are not used as an alternative to full mesh routing. Therefore, RFC 1863 is reclassified to Historic status.

Current techniques that serve as an alternative to full mesh routing include BGP Route Reflectors [2], BGP Confederations [3], and the use of private AS numbers. IDRP for IP 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 to 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. Scott Bradner, Jeffrey Haas, and Yakov Rekhter provided substantial feedback during the WG last call.

## 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

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

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.

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.

## Intellectual Property

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).

## Acknowledgement

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

