

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Expiration Date: September 2004

T. Bates  
Cisco Systems  
R. Chandra  
E. Chen  
Redback Networks

BGP Route Reflection -  
An Alternative to Full Mesh IBGP

[draft-ietf-idr-rfc2796bis-00.txt](#)

## **1. Status of this Memo**

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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>.

## **2. Abstract**

The Border Gateway Protocol [[1](#)] is an inter-autonomous system routing protocol designed for TCP/IP internets. Currently in the Internet BGP deployments are configured such that that all BGP speakers within a single AS must be fully meshed so that any external routing information must be re-distributed to all other routers within that

AS. This represents a serious scaling problem that has been well documented with several alternatives proposed [[2](#),[3](#)].

This document describes the use and design of a method known as "Route Reflection" to alleviate the the need for "full mesh" IBGP.

### **3. Specification of Requirements**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [7].

### **4. Introduction**

Currently in the Internet, BGP deployments are configured such that that all BGP speakers within a single AS must be fully meshed and any external routing information must be re-distributed to all other routers within that AS. For  $n$  BGP speakers within an AS that requires to maintain  $n*(n-1)/2$  unique IBGP sessions. This "full mesh" requirement clearly does not scale when there are a large number of IBGP speakers each exchanging a large volume of routing information, as is common in many of today's internet networks.

This scaling problem has been well documented and a number of proposals have been made to alleviate this [2,3]. This document represents another alternative in alleviating the need for a "full mesh" and is known as "Route Reflection". This approach allows a BGP speaker (known as "Route Reflector") to advertise IBGP learned routes to certain IBGP peers. It represents a change in the commonly understood concept of IBGP, and the addition of two new optional non-transitive BGP attributes to prevent loops in routing updates.

### **5. Design Criteria**

Route Reflection was designed to satisfy the following criteria.

- o Simplicity

Any alternative must be both simple to configure as well as understand.

- o Easy Transition

It must be possible to transition from a full mesh configuration without the need to change either topology or AS. This is an unfortunate management overhead of the technique proposed in [\[3\]](#).

- o Compatibility

It must be possible for non compliant IBGP peers to continue be part of the original AS or domain without any loss of BGP

routing information.

These criteria were motivated by operational experiences of a very large and topology rich network with many external connections.

## 6. Route Reflection

The basic idea of Route Reflection is very simple. Let us consider the simple example depicted in Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: Full Mesh IBGP

In ASX there are three IBGP speakers (routers RTR-A, RTR-B and RTR-C). With the existing BGP model, if RTR-A receives an external route and it is selected as the best path it must advertise the external route to both RTR-B and RTR-C. RTR-B and RTR-C (as IBGP speakers) will not re-advertise these IBGP learned routes to other IBGP speakers.

If this rule is relaxed and RTR-C is allowed to advertise IBGP learned routes to IBGP peers, then it could re-advertise (or reflect) the IBGP routes learned from RTR-A to RTR-B and vice versa. This would eliminate the need for the IBGP session between RTR-A and RTR-B as shown in Figure 2 below.






Figure 2: Route Reflection IBGP

The Route Reflection scheme is based upon this basic principle.

## 7. Terminology and Concepts

We use the term "Route Reflection" to describe the operation of a BGP speaker advertising an IBGP learned route to another IBGP peer. Such a BGP speaker is said to be a "Route Reflector" (RR), and such a route is said to be a reflected route.

The internal peers of a RR are divided into two groups:

- 1) Client Peers
- 2) Non-Client Peers

A RR reflects routes between these groups, and may reflect routes among client peers. A RR along with its client peers form a Cluster. The Non-Client peer must be fully meshed but the Client peers need not be fully meshed. Figure 3 depicts a simple example outlining the basic RR components using the terminology noted above.








Figure 3: RR Components

## 8. Operation

When a RR receives a route from an IBGP peer, it selects the best path based on its path selection rule. After the best path is selected, it must do the following depending on the type of the peer it is receiving the best path from:

- 1) A Route from a Non-Client IBGP peer

Reflect to all the Clients.

- 2) A Route from a Client peer

Reflect to all the Non-Client peers and also to the Client peers. (Hence the Client peers are not required to be fully meshed.)

An Autonomous System could have many RRs. A RR treats other RRs just like any other internal BGP speakers. A RR could be configured to have other RRs in a Client group or Non-client group.

In a simple configuration the backbone could be divided into many clusters. Each RR would be configured with other RRs as Non-Client peers (thus all the RRs will be fully meshed.). The Clients will be configured to maintain IBGP session only with the RR in their cluster. Due to route reflection, all the IBGP speakers will receive reflected routing information.

It is possible in a Autonomous System to have BGP speakers that do not understand the concept of Route-Reflectors (let us call them conventional BGP speakers). The Route-Reflector Scheme allows such conventional BGP speakers to co-exist. Conventional BGP speakers could be either members of a Non-Client group or a Client group. This allows for an easy and gradual migration from the current IBGP model to the Route Reflection model. One could start creating clusters by configuring a single router as the designated RR and configuring other RRs and their clients as normal IBGP peers. Additional clusters can be created gradually.

## **9. Redundant RRs**

Usually a cluster of clients will have a single RR. In that case, the cluster will be identified by the ROUTER\_ID of the RR. However, this represents a single point of failure so to make it possible to have multiple RRs in the same cluster, all RRs in the same cluster can be configured with a 4-byte CLUSTER\_ID so that an RR can discard routes from other RRs in the same cluster.

## **10. Avoiding Routing Information Loops**

When a route is reflected, it is possible through mis-configuration to form route re-distribution loops. The Route Reflection method defines the following attributes to detect and avoid routing information loops:

ORIGINATOR\_ID

ORIGINATOR\_ID is a new optional, non-transitive BGP attribute of Type code 9. This attribute is 4 bytes long and it will be created by a RR in reflecting a route. This attribute will carry the ROUTER\_ID of

the originator of the route in the local AS. A BGP speaker SHOULD NOT create an ORIGINATOR\_ID attribute if one already exists. A router which recognizes the ORIGINATOR\_ID attribute SHOULD ignore a route received with its ROUTER\_ID as the ORIGINATOR\_ID.

CLUSTER\_LIST

CLUSTER\_LIST is a new optional, non-transitive BGP attribute of Type code 10. It is a sequence of CLUSTER\_ID values representing the reflection path that the route has passed.

When a RR reflects a route, it MUST prepend the local CLUSTER\_ID to the CLUSTER\_LIST. If the CLUSTER\_LIST is empty, it MUST create a new one. Using this attribute an RR can identify if the routing information is looped back to the same cluster due to mis-configuration. If the local CLUSTER\_ID is found in the CLUSTER\_LIST, the advertisement received SHOULD be ignored.

## **11. Impact on Path Selection**

The ORIGINATOR\_ID (when present) of a path SHOULD be treated as the BGP Identifier of the path in the route selection as described in [\[1\]](#).

If the BGP Identifiers of two paths are equal when compared in the route selection, then the path with the shorter CLUSTER\_LIST length SHOULD be preferred. The CLUSTER\_LIST length SHOULD be considered as zero for a path that has no CLUSTER\_LIST attribute.

## **12. Implementation Considerations**

Care should be taken to make sure that none of the BGP path attributes defined above can be modified through configuration when exchanging internal routing information between RRs and Clients and Non-Clients. Their modification could potential result in routing loops.

In addition, when a RR reflects a route, it SHOULD NOT modify the following path attributes: NEXT\_HOP, AS\_PATH, LOCAL\_PREF, and MED. Their modification could potential result in routing loops.



### **13. Configuration and Deployment Considerations**

The BGP protocol provides no way for a Client to identify itself dynamically as a Client of an RR. The simplest way to achieve this is by manual configuration.

One of the key component of the route reflection approach in addressing the scaling issue is that the RR summarizes routing information and only reflects its best path.

Both MEDs and IGP metrics may impact the BGP route selection. Because MEDs are not always comparable and the IGP metric may differ for each router, with certain route reflection topologies the route reflection approach may not yield the same route selection result as that of the full IBGP mesh approach. A way to make route selection the same as it would be with the full IBGP mesh approach is to make sure that route reflectors are never forced to perform the BGP route selection based on IGP metrics which are significantly different from the IGP metrics of their clients, or based on incomparable MEDs. The former can be achieved by configuring the intra-cluster IGP metrics to be better than the inter-cluster IGP metrics, and maintaining full mesh within the cluster. The latter can be achieved by:

- o setting the local preference of a route at the border router to reflect the MED values.
- o or by making sure the AS-path lengths from different ASs are different when the AS-path length is used as a route selection criteria.
- o or by configuring community based policies using which the reflector can decide on the best route.

One could argue though that the latter requirement is overly restrictive, and perhaps impractical in some cases. One could further argue that as long as there are no routing loops, there are no compelling reasons to force route selection with route reflectors to be the same as it would be with the full IBGP mesh approach.

To prevent routing loops and maintain consistent routing view, it is

essential that the network topology be carefully considered in designing a route reflection topology. In general, the route reflection topology should congruent with the network topology when there exist multiple paths for a prefix. One commonly used approach is the POP-based reflection, in which each POP maintains its own route reflectors serving clients in the POP, and all route reflectors are fully meshed. In addition, clients of the reflectors in each POP are often fully meshed for the purpose of optimal intra-POP routing,



and the intra-POP IGP metrics are configured to be better than the inter-POP IGP metrics.

#### **14. Security Considerations**

This extension to BGP does not change the underlying security issues inherent in the existing IBGP [5].

#### **15. Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank Dennis Ferguson, John Scudder, Paul Traina and Tony Li for the many discussions resulting in this work. This idea was developed from an earlier discussion between Tony Li and Dimitri Haskin.

In addition, the authors would like to acknowledge valuable review and suggestions from Yakov Rekhter on this document, and helpful comments from Tony Li, Rohit Dube, John Scudder and Bruce Cole.

#### **16. Normative References**

- [1] Rekhter, Y. and T. Li, "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", [RFC 1771](#), March 1995.
- [2] Haskin, D., "A BGP/IDRP Route Server alternative to a full mesh routing", [RFC 1863](#), October 1995.
- [3] Traina, P., "Limited Autonomous System Confederations for BGP", [RFC 1965](#), June 1996.
- [4] Bates, T. and R. Chandra, "BGP Route Reflection An alternative to full mesh IBGP", [RFC 1966](#), June 1996.
- [5] Heffernan, A., "Protection of BGP Sessions via the TCP MD5 Signature Option", [RFC 2385](#), August 1998.

- [6] Bates, T., R. Chandra and E. Chen "BGP Route Reflection - An Alternative to Full Mesh IBGP", [RFC 2796](#), April 2000.
  
- [7] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

## **17. Authors' Addresses**

Tony Bates  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134

EMail: [tbates@cisco.com](mailto:tbates@cisco.com)

Ravi Chandra  
Redback Networks Inc.  
300 Holger Way.  
San Jose, CA 95134

EMail: [rchandra@redback.com](mailto:rchandra@redback.com)

Enke Chen  
Redback Networks Inc.  
300 Holger Way.  
San Jose, CA 95134

EMail: [enke@redback.com](mailto:enke@redback.com)

## **18. Appendix A Comparison with RFC 2796**

The impact on route selection is added.

## **19. Appendix B Comparison with RFC 1966**

Several terminologies related to route reflection are clarified, and the reference to EBGp routes/peers are removed.

The handling of a routing information loop (due to route reflection) by a receiver is clarified and made more consistent.

The addition of a CLUSTER\_ID to the CLUSTER\_LIST has been changed from "append" to "prepend" to reflect the deployed code.

The section on "Configuration and Deployment Considerations" has been expanded to address several operational issues.

## **20. Full Copyright Statement**

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2000). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS 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.

## **21. Acknowledgement**

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



----- End of Forwarded Message