

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: 4794  
Obsoletes: 1264  
Category: Informational

B. Fenner  
AT&T Labs - Research  
December 2006

## RFC 1264 Is Obsolete

### 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 IETF Trust (2006).

### Abstract

RFC 1264 was written during what was effectively a completely different time in the life of the Internet. It prescribed rules to protect the Internet against new routing protocols that may have various undesirable properties. In today's Internet, there are so many other pressures against deploying unreasonable protocols that we believe that existing controls suffice, and the RFC 1264 rules just get in the way.

## 1. Introduction

RFC 1264 [RFC1264] describes various rules to be applied when publishing routing protocols on the IETF Standards Track, including requirements for implementation, MIBs, security, etc. These rules were written in an attempt to protect the Internet from incomplete or unscalable new protocols.

Today, one of the big problems the IETF faces is timeliness. Applying additional rules to a certain class of protocols hurts the IETF's ability to publish specifications in a timely manner.

The current standards process [RFC2026] already permits the IESG to require additional implementation experience when it appears to be needed. We do not need any more rules than that. RFC 2026 says:

Usually, neither implementation nor operational experience is required for the designation of a specification as a Proposed Standard. However, such experience is highly desirable, and will usually represent a strong argument in favor of a Proposed Standard designation.

The IESG may require implementation and/or operational experience prior to granting Proposed Standard status to a specification that materially affects the core Internet protocols or that specifies behavior that may have significant operational impact on the Internet.

## 2. RFC 1264 Is Obsolete

Therefore, this document reclassifies RFC 1264 as historic. While that does not prohibit the Routing Area Directors from requiring implementation and/or operational experience under the RFC 2026 rules, it removes the broad, general requirement from all routing documents.

## 3. Working Group Procedures

Some working groups within the Routing Area have developed procedures, based on RFC 1264, to require implementations before forwarding a document to the IESG. This action does not prevent those working groups from continuing with these procedures if the working group prefers to work this way. We encourage working groups to put measures in place to improve the quality of their output.

RFC 1264 required a MIB module to be in development for a protocol; this is still encouraged in a broad sense. This is not meant to be limiting, however; protocol management and manageability should be

considered in the context of current IETF management protocols. In addition, [RTG-REQS] contains a description of a "Manageability Requirements" section; this is not currently a requirement but should be considered.

#### 4. Security Considerations

While RFC 1264's rules placed additional constraints on the security-related contents of an RFC, current policies (e.g., the requirement for a Security Considerations section) suffice.

#### 5. Acknowledgements

Alex Zinin and Bill Fenner spent a great deal of time trying to produce an updated version of the RFC 1264 rules that would apply to today's Internet. This work was eventually abandoned when it was realized (after much public discussion at Routing Area meetings, Internet Area meetings, and on the Routing Area mailing list) that there was just no way to write the rules in a way that advanced the goals of the IETF.

#### 6. References

##### 6.1. Normative References

- [RFC1264] Hinden, R., "Internet Engineering Task Force Internet Routing Protocol Standardization Criteria", RFC 1264, October 1991.
- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, October 1996.

##### 6.2. Informative References

- [RTG-REQS] Farrel, A., Andersson, L., and A. Doria, "Requirements for Manageability Sections in Routing Area Drafts", Work in Progress, October 2005.

#### Author's Address

Bill Fenner  
AT&T Labs - Research  
1 River Oaks Place  
San Jose, CA 95134-1918  
USA

Phone: +1 408 493-8505  
EMail: fenner@research.att.com

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2006).

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, THE IETF TRUST, 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.

