IDR Working Group   Eric C. Rosen
Internet Draft   Keyur Patel
Intended Status: Standards Track   Cisco Systems, Inc.
Updates: 4684
Expires: December 16, 2014   Jeffrey Haas
                                              Juniper Networks, Inc.

                                                      Robert Raszuk

                                                      June 16, 2014

Route Target Constrained Distribution of Routes with no Route Targets

draft-rosen-idr-rtc-no-rt-00.txt

Abstract

   BGP routes sometimes carry an "Extended Communities" path attribute.
   An Extended Communities path attribute can contain one or more "Route
   Targets" (RTs). By means of a procedure known as "RT Constrained
   Distribution" (RTC), a BGP speaker can send BGP UPDATE messages that
   express its interest in a particular set of RTs. Generally, RTC has
   been applied only to address families whose routes always carry RTs.
   When RTC is applied to such an address family, a BGP speaker
   expressing its interest in a particular set of RTs is indicating that
   it wants to receive all and only the routes of that address family
   that have at least one of the RTs of interest. However, there are
   scenarios in which the originator of a route chooses not to include
   any RTs at all, assuming that the distribution of a route with no RTs
   at all will be unaffected by RTC. This has led to interoperability
   problems in the field, where the originator of a route assumes that
   RTC will not affect the distribution of the route, but intermediate
   BGP speakers refuse to distribute that route because it does not
   carry any RT of intrest. The purpose of this document is to clarify
   the effect of the RTC mechanism on routes that do not have any RTs.

Status of this Memo

   This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the
   provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

   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.

Copyright and License Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   A BGP route can carry a particular type of BGP path attribute known
   as an "Extended Communities Attribute" [RFC4360]. Each such
   attribute can contain a variable number of typed communities.
   Certain typed communities are known as "Route Targets" (RTs)
   ([RFC4360], [RFC4364]).

   [RFC4684] defines a procedure, known as "RT Constrained Distribution"
   (RTC) that allows a BGP speaker to advertise its interest in a
   particular set of RTs. It does so by advertising "RT membership
   information". (See [RFC4684] for details.) It may advertise RT
   membership for any number of RTs. By advertising membership for a
   particular RT, a BGP speaker declares that it is interested in
   receiving BGP routes that carry that RT.

   If RTC is enabled on a particular BGP session, the session must be
   provisioned with the set of "address family" and "subsequent address
   family" (AFI/SAFIs) values to which RTC is to be applied. In
   [RFC4684] it is implicitly assumed that RTC will only by applied to
   AFI/SAFIs where all the routes carry RTs. When this assumption is
   true, the RTC semantics are clear. A BGP speaker advertising its
   interest in RT1, RT2, ..., RTk is saying that, for the AFI/SAFIs to
   which RTC is being applied, it is interested in any route that
   carries at least one of those RTs, and it is not interested in any
   route that does not carry at least one of those RTs.

   However, [RFC4684] does not specify how the RTC procedures are to be
   applied to address families whose routes sometimes carry RTs and
   sometimes do not. Consider a BGP session between routers R1 and R2,
   where R1 has advertised its interest in RT1, RT2, ..., RTk, and RTC
   is being applied to a particular AFI/SAFI. Suppose R2 has a route of
   that AFI/SAFI, and that route carries no RTs. Should R2 advertise
   this route to R1 or not?

   There are two different answers to this question, each of which seems
   prima facie reasonable:

     - No, R2 should not advertise the route, because it belongs to an
       AFI/SAFI to which RTC is being applied, and the route does carry
       any of the RTs in which R1 is interested.

     - Yes, R2 should advertise the route; since the route carries no
       RTs, the intention of the route's originator is that the
       distribution of the route not be constrained by the RTC
       mechanism.

   As might be expected, "one size does not fit all", and the best

answer depends upon the particular deployment scenario, and upon the
particular AFI/SAFI to which RTC is being applied.

Section 3 defines a default behavior for each existing AFI/SAFI.
This default behavior will ensure proper operation of that AFI/SAFI
when RTC is applied. The default behavior may of course be
overridden by a local policy.

Section 3 also defines a default "default behavior" for new
AFI/SAFIs. When a new AFI/SAFI is defined, the specification
defining it may specify a different default behavior; otherwise the
default default behavior will apply.

2. Some Deployment Scenarios

   There are at least three deployment scenarios where lack of a clearly
   defined default behavior for RTC is problematic.

     - [RFC6037] describes a deployed Multicast VPN (MVPN) solution. It
       defines a BGP address family known as "MDT-SAFI". Routes of this
       address family may carry RTs, but are not required to do so. In
       order for the RFC6037 procedures to work properly, if an MDT-SAFI
       route does not carry any RTs, the distribution of that route must
       not be constrained by RTC. However, if an MDT-SAFI route does
       carry one or more RTs, its distribution may be constrained by
       RTC.

     - [GTM] specifies a way to provide "global table" (as opposed to
       VPN) multicast, using procedures that are very similar to those
       described in [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] for MVPN. In particular, it
       uses routes of the MCAST-VPN address family that is defined in
       [RFC6514]. When used for MVPN, each MCAST-VPN route carries at
       least one RT. However, when used for global table multicast, it
       is optional for certain MCAST-VPN route types to carry RTs. In
       order for the procedures of [GTM] to work properly, if an MCAST-
       VPN route does not carry any RTs, the distribution of that route
       must not be constrained by RTC.

     - Typically, Route Targets have been carried only by routes that
       are distributed as part of a VPN service. However, it may be
       desirable to be able to place RTs on non-VPN routes (e.g., on
       unicast IPv4 or IPv6 routes) and then to use RTC to constrain the
       delivery of the non-VPN routes. For example, if a BGP speaker
       desires to receive only a small set of IPv4 unicast routes, and
       the desired routes carry one or more RTs, the BGP speaker could
       use RTC to advertise its interest in one or more of those RTs.
       In this application, the intention would be that any IPv4 unicast

route not carrying an RT would be filtered. Note that this is
the opposite of the behavior needed for the other use cases
discussed in this section.

3. Default Behavior

In order to handle the use cases discussed in Section 3, this
document specifies a default behavior for the case where RTC is
applied to a particular address family (AFI/SAFI), and some (or all)
routes of that address family do not carry any RTs.

When RTC is applied, on a particular BGP session, to routes of the
MDT-SAFI address family (SAFI=66), the default behavior is that
routes that do not carry any RTs are distributed on that session.

When RTC is applied, on a particular BGP session, to routes of the
MCAST-VPN address family (SAFI=5), the default behavior is that
routes that do not carry any RTs are distributed on that session.

When RTC is applied, on a particular BGP session, to routes of other
address families, the default behavior is that routes without any RTs
are not distributed on that session. This default "default behavior"
applies to all AFI/SAFIs for which a different default behavior has
not been defined.

A BGP speaker may be provisioned to apply a non-default behavior to a
given AFI/SAFI. This is a matter of local policy.

4. IANA Considerations

This document contains no actions for IANA.

5. Security Considerations

No security considerations are raised by this document beyond those
already discussed in [RFC4684].

6. Authors' Addresses

Eric C. Rosen
Cisco Systems, Inc.
1414 Massachusetts Avenue
Boxborough, MA, 01719
Email: erosen@cisco.com

Keyur Patel
Cisco Systems, Inc.
170 Tasman Drive
San Jose, CA, 95134
Email: keyupate@cisco.com

Jeffrey Haas
Juniper Networks
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA   94089
USA
Email: jhaas@juniper.net

Robert Raszuk
Email: robert@raszuk.net

7. Normative References

[RFC4360] "BGP Extended Communities Attribute", Sangli, Tappan,
Rekhter, RFC 4360, February 2006

[RFC4684] "Constrained Route Distribution for Border Gateway
Protocol/MultiProtocol Label Switching (BGP/MPLS) Internet Protocol
(IP) Virtual Private Networks (VPNs)", Marques, Bonica, Fang,
Martini, Raszuk, Patel, Guichard, RFC 4684, November 2006

8. Informational References

   [RFC6513] "Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs", E. Rosen and R. Aggarwal,
   editors, RFC 6513, February 2012

   [RFC6514] "BGP Encodings and Procedures for Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP
   VPNs", R. Aggarwal, E. Rosen, T. Morin, Y. Rekhter, RFC 6514,
   February 2012

   [GTM] "Global Table Multicast with BGP-MVPN Procedures", Zhang,
   Giuliano, Rosen, Subramanian, Pacella, Schiller, draft-zzhang-l3vpn-
   mvpn-global-table-mcast-04.txt, May 2014

   [RFC4364] "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private networks", Rosen, Rekhter, RFC
   4364, February 2006

   [RFC6037], "Cisco Systems' Solution for Multicast in BGP/MPLS IP
   VPNs", Rosen, Cai, Wijnands, RFC 6037, October 2010