

Workgroup: Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft:  
draft-ietf-grow-bmp-path-marking-tlv-00  
Published: 11 September 2023  
Intended Status: Standards Track  
Expires: 14 March 2024  
Authors: C. Cardona    P. Lucente    P. Francois    Y. Gu  
          NTT            NTT            INSA-Lyon     Huawei  
          T. Graf  
          Swisscom

## BMP Extension for Path Status TLV

### Abstract

The BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) provides an interface for obtaining BGP Path information. BGP Path Information is conveyed within BMP Route Monitoring (RM) messages. This document proposes an extension to BMP to convey the status of a path after being processed by the BGP process. This extension makes use of the TLV mechanisms described in [draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv](#) [[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv](#)] and [draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit](#) [[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit](#)].

### Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [RFC 8174](#) [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

### Status of This Memo

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

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 14 March 2024.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2023 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Path Status TLV](#)
  - [2.1. IANA-registered Path Status TLV](#)
  - [2.2. Enterprise-specific Path Status TLV](#)
- [3. Implementation notes](#)
  - [3.1. Configuration of BMP path marking](#)
  - [3.2. Paths with no markings](#)
  - [3.3. Significance of status and origin RIBs](#)
  - [3.4. Enterprise-specific status and reasons](#)
  - [3.5. Multiple TLVs assigned to the same route.](#)
- [4. Acknowledgments](#)
- [5. IANA Considerations](#)
- [6. Security Considerations](#)
- [7. Normative References](#)
- [Authors' Addresses](#)

### 1. Introduction

For a given prefix, multiple paths with different path status, e.g., the "best-path", "back-up path", "invalid", and so on, may co-exist in the BGP RIBs after being processed by the BGP decision process. The path status information is currently not carried in the BGP Update Message [RFC4271](#) [[RFC4271](#)] or in the BMP Update Message [RFC7854](#) [[RFC7854](#)].

External systems can use the path status for various applications. The path status is commonly checked by operators when performing troubleshooting. Having such status stored in a centralized system can enable the development of tools that facilitate this process. Optimisation systems can include the path status in their process, and also use the status as a validation source (since it can compare the calculated state to the actual outcome of the network, such as

primary and backup path). As a final example, path status information can complement other centralized sources of data, for example, flow collectors.

This document defines a so-called Path Status TLV to convey the BGP path status to the BMP server. The BMP Path Status TLV is carried in the BMP Route Monitoring (RM) Message.

## 2. Path Status TLV

This document defines two types of Path Status TLVs: one is the IANA-registered Path Status TLV, and the other is the Enterprise-specific Path Status TLV.

### 2.1. IANA-registered Path Status TLV




Figure 2: Encoding of IANA-Registered Path Status TLV

\*E bit: For an IANA-registered TLV, the E bit MUST be set to 0 [[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit](#)].

\*Type = TBD2 (15 Bits): indicates that it is the IANA-registered Path Status TLV.

\*Length (2 Octets): indicates the length of the value field of the Path Status TLV. The value field further consists of the Path-Status field and Reason Code field.

\*Index (2 Octets): indicates the prefix that this TLV is describing. Please see [[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv](#)] for details of the use of the index field to associate the path marking content with one or more NLRIs.

\*Path Status (4 Octets): indicates the path status of the BGP Update PDU encapsulated in the RM Message. Currently 10 types of path status are defined, as shown in Table 1. All zeros are reserved.

\*Reason Code (2 Octets, optional): indicates the reason of the path status indicated in the Path Status field. The reason code field is optional. If no reason code is carried, this field is empty. If a reason code is carried, the reason code is indicated by a 2-byte value, which is defined in Table 2.

Value	Path type
0x00000001	Invalid
0x00000002	Best
0x00000004	Non-selected
0x00000008	Primary
0x00000010	Backup
0x00000020	Non-installed
0x00000040	Best-external
0x00000080	Add-Path
0x00000100	Filtered in inbound policy
0x00000200	Filtered in outbound policy
0x00000400	Invalid ROV

Table 1: IANA-Registered Path Type

Figure 1

The Path Status field contains a bitmap where each bit encodes a specific role of the path. Multiple bits may be set when multiple path status apply to a path.

\*The best-path is defined in [RFC4271](#) [RFC4271] and the best-external path is defined in [draft-ietf-idr-best-external](#) [I-D.ietf-idr-best-external].

\*An invalid path is a route that does not enter the BGP decision process.

\*A non-selected path is a route that is not selected in the BGP decision process. Back-up routes are considered non-selected, while the best and ECMP routes are not considered as non-selected.

\*A primary path is a recursive or non-recursive path whose nexthop resolution ends with an adjacency [draft-ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic](#) [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic]. A prefix can have more than one primary path if multipath is configured [draft-lapukhov-bgp-ecmp-considerations](#) [I-D.lapukhov-bgp-ecmp-considerations]. A best-path is also considered as a primary path.

\*A backup path is also installed in the RIB, but it is not used until some or all primary paths become unreachable. Backup paths are used for fast convergence in the event of failures.

\*A non-installed path refers to the route that is not installed into the IP routing table.

\*For the advertisement of multiple paths for the same address prefix without the new paths implicitly replacing any previous ones, the add-path status is applied [[RFC7911](#)].

The path status TLV does not force a BMP client to send any of these paths. It just provides a method to mark the paths that are available with their status.

Value	Reason code
[0x0007]	invalid for AS loop
[0x0007]	invalid for unresolvable nexthop
[0x0016]	not preferred for Local preference
[0x0014]	not preferred for AS Path Length
[0x0013]	not preferred for origin
[0x0012]	not preferred for MED
[0x0011]	not preferred for peer type
[0x0010]	not preferred for IGP cost
[0x000E]	not preferred for router ID
[0x000D]	not preferred for peer address
[0x0020]	not preferred for AIGP

Table 2: IANA-Registered Reason Code

Figure 2



without necessarily incorporating any of the reason codes defined in table [Figure 2](#) or future extensions.

This document refrains from defining mechanisms for signaling the status or reason codes an implementation supports. This could be established through external means (e.g. documentation) or potentially addressed in a subsequent document.

The remainder of this section encompasses additional points related to the implementation of the BMP Path marking TLV.

### **3.1. Configuration of BMP path marking**

Implementations supporting the BMP path marking TLV SHOULD provide an option for enabling or disabling the Path Marking TLV over BMP sessions. Furthermore, the configuration options for this TLV SHOULD provide the means to enable and disable the transmission of reason codes, if the reason code are supported by the implementation.

### **3.2. Paths with no markings**

Some BGP routes might not require any type of status or reasons. For example, an unfiltered path obtained via the Adj-RIB-IN may fall under this category since there is really nothing to mark for that path. We suggest a couple of approaches for signaling that a path has no markings: (1) An implicit form of marking, achieved by abstaining from appending any BMP marking TLV pointing toward the route. (2) Alternatively, an explicit marking of the packet through a TLV containing no marked status and no associated reason code.

### **3.3. Significance of status and origin RIBs**

This document refrains from imposing any implementation to mark specific status from specific RIBs. We recognize the diversity among implementations; some might be able to mark some status over one RIB while other do it on others. For instance, some might be able to mark Adj-RIB-in filtered routes when obtained from the Adj-RIB-IN pre, while other could do it only from the Adj-RIB-IN post. To remove ambiguities in implementations, we recommend the meaning of status (and reason codes) to not depend on the origin RIB of a route.

### **3.4. Enterprise-specific status and reasons**

Implementations introducing their own status and reason codes are advised to adhere to [[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit](#)] and use ebit and vendor specific status and reasons. Additionally, we recommend all implementations to provide comprehensive documentation for these codes.

For scenarios where a path state combines a standard status with an enterprise-specific reason code (or vice versa), the following alternatives are presented:

\*Replication of the standard definitions within the enterprise-specific space, thus permitting direct marking within the same packet using the ebit.

\*Assigning two TLVs to the same path(s): one containing the standard part and another housing the vendor-specific part.

### **3.5. Multiple TLVs assigned to the same route.**

We advocate for the employment of TLV grouping wherever feasible. The inclusion of all marking information within a single message is recommended, except on the case described in section [Section 3.4](#). In situations where multiple TLVs are associated with a single route, all markings will be applicable to that route.

## **4. Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank Jeff Haas and Maxence Younsi for their valuable comments.

## **5. IANA Considerations**

This document requests that IANA assign the following new parameters to the BMP parameters name space.

Type = TBD1 (15 Bits): indicates that it is the IANA-registered Path Status TLV.

## **6. Security Considerations**

It is not believed that this document adds any additional security considerations.

## **7. Normative References**

[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv] Lucente, P. and Y. Gu, "TLV support for BMP Route Monitoring and Peer Down Messages", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-12, 27 March 2023, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-12>>.

[I-D.ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit] Lucente, P. and Y. Gu, "Support for Enterprise-specific TLVs in the BGP Monitoring Protocol", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-03, 24 July 2023, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-03>>.



**[I-D.ietf-idr-best-external]**

Marques, P., Fernando, R., Chen, E., Mohapatra, P., and H. Gredler, "Advertisement of the best external route in BGP", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-idr-best-external-05, 3 January 2012, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-idr-best-external-05>>.

**[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic]** Bashandy, A., Filsfils, C., and P.

Mohapatra, "BGP Prefix Independent Convergence", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic-19, 1 April 2023, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic-19>>.

**[I-D.lapukhov-bgp-ecmp-considerations]** Lapukhov, P. and J. Tantsura,

"Equal-Cost Multipath Considerations for BGP", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-lapukhov-bgp-ecmp-considerations-11, 26 June 2023, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-lapukhov-bgp-ecmp-considerations-11>>.

**[RFC2119]** Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

**[RFC4271]** Rekhter, Y., Ed., Li, T., Ed., and S. Hares, Ed., "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", RFC 4271, DOI 10.17487/RFC4271, January 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4271>>.

**[RFC7854]** Scudder, J., Ed., Fernando, R., and S. Stuart, "BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)", RFC 7854, DOI 10.17487/RFC7854, June 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7854>>.

**[RFC7911]** Walton, D., Retana, A., Chen, E., and J. Scudder, "Advertisement of Multiple Paths in BGP", RFC 7911, DOI 10.17487/RFC7911, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7911>>.

**[RFC8174]** Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

**Authors' Addresses**

Camilo Cardona  
NTT  
164-168, Carrer de Numancia

08029 Barcelona  
Spain

Email: [camilo@ntt.net](mailto:camilo@ntt.net)

Paolo Lucente  
NTT  
Siriusdreef 70-72  
2132 Hoofddorp  
Netherlands

Email: [paolo@ntt.net](mailto:paolo@ntt.net)

Pierre Francois  
INSA-Lyon  
Lyon  
France

Email: [Pierre.Francois@insa-lyon.fr](mailto:Pierre.Francois@insa-lyon.fr)

Yunan Gu  
Huawei  
Huawei Bld., No.156 Beiqing Rd.  
Beijing  
100095  
China

Email: [guyunan@huawei.com](mailto:guyunan@huawei.com)

Thomas Graf  
Swisscom  
Binzring 17  
CH-8045 Zurich  
Switzerland

Email: [thomas.graf@swisscom.com](mailto:thomas.graf@swisscom.com)