

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: August 6, 2015

E. Jasinska
Netflix, Inc
February 2, 2015

**Internet Exchange Route Server - Implementation Report
draft-jasinska-ix-bgp-route-server-implementation-00**

Abstract

This document provides a survey of Internet Exchange Route Server implementations.

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 <http://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 August 6, 2015.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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 (<http://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 Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- [1.](#) Survey Summary [3](#)
- [2.](#) Survey Forms [3](#)
 - [2.1.](#) Cisco Systems [3](#)
 - [2.2.](#) BIRD [4](#)
 - [2.3.](#) Quagga [4](#)
- [3.](#) Security Considerations [4](#)
- [4.](#) References [5](#)
 - [4.1.](#) Normative References [5](#)
 - [4.2.](#) Informative References [5](#)
- Author's Address [5](#)

1. Survey Summary

This document provides a survey of Internet Exchange Route Server implementations [[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server](#)]. After a brief summary, each response is listed. The editor makes no claim as to the accuracy of the information provided.

The following organizations reported having implementations of Internet Exchange Route Server: Cisco Systems, BIRD and Quagga.

All Route Server implementations adhere to the specifications described in [[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server](#)]. All implementations provide the means for per-peer policy control.

Multiple test studies have been published on resource consumption of Route Server implementations of the various vendors, e.g.:

http://www.nanog.org/meetings/nanog48/presentations/Monday/Jasinska_RouteServer_N48.pdf

2. Survey Forms

2.1. Cisco Systems

Person filling out this form: Robert Raszuk <robert@raszuk.net>

Does your Route Server implementation do the following as defined in [[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server](#)]?

- o Accept, process and forward client UPDATE messages according to [Section 2.1](#)?

YES

- o Perform attribute transparency according to [Section 2.2](#)?

YES

- o Allow for per-client routing policy control without path hiding using one of the methods described in [Section 2.3.2](#)?

YES

2.2. BIRD

Person filling out this form: Ondrej Filip <feela@network.cz>

Does your Route Server implementation do the following as defined in [[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server](#)]?

- o Accept, process and forward client UPDATE messages according to [Section 2.1](#)?

YES

- o Perform attribute transparency according to [Section 2.2](#)?

YES

- o Allow for per-client routing policy control without path hiding using one of the methods described in [Section 2.3.2](#)?

YES

2.3. Quagga

Person filling out this form: David Lamparter <equinox@diac24.net>

Does your Route Server implementation do the following as defined in [[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server](#)]?

- o Accept, process and forward client UPDATE messages according to [Section 2.1](#)?

YES

- o Perform attribute transparency according to [Section 2.2](#)?

YES

- o Allow for per-client routing policy control without path hiding using one of the methods described in [Section 2.3.2](#)?

YES

3. Security Considerations

None.

4. References

4.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server]
Jasinska, E., Hilliard, N., Raszuk, R., and N. Bakker,
"Internet Exchange Route Server",
[draft-ietf-idr-ix-bgp-route-server-06](#) (work in progress),
December 2014.

4.2. Informative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

Author's Address

Elisa Jasinska
Netflix, Inc
100 Winchester Circle
Los Gatos, CA 95032
USA

Email: elisa@netflix.com

