

GROW  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [7854](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: June 17, 2019

J. Scudder  
Juniper Networks  
December 14, 2018

**BMP Peer Up Message Namespace**  
**draft-scudder-grow-bmp-peer-up-00.txt**

Abstract

[RFC 7854](#), BMP, uses different message types for different purposes. Most of these are Type, Length, Value (TLV) structured. One message type, the Peer Up message, lacks a set of TLVs defined for its use, instead sharing a namespace with the Initiation message. Subsequent experience has shown that this namespace sharing was a mistake, as it hampers the extension of the protocol.

This document updates [RFC 7854](#) by creating an independent namespace for the Peer Up message. The changes in this document are formal only, compliant implementations of [RFC 7854](#) also comply with this specification.

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 June 17, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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 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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	String Definition . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Changes to <a href="#">RFC 7854</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
3.1.	Revision to Information TLV, Renamed as Initiation Information TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Revision to Peer Up Notification . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Definition of Peer Up Information TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
	Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

[RFC7854] defines a number of different BMP message types. With the exception of the Route Monitoring message type, these messages are TLV-structured. Most message types have distinct namespaces and IANA registries. However, the namespace of the Peer Up message overlaps that of the Initiation message. As the BMP protocol has been extended, this oversight has become problematic. In this document, we create a distinct namespace for the Peer Up message to eliminate this overlap, and create the corresponding missing registry.

The changes in this document are formal only, compliant implementations of [\[RFC7854\]](#) also comply with this specification.

### [1.1.](#) 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](#) [\[RFC2119\]](#) [\[RFC8174\]](#) when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.



## **2. String Definition**

A string TLV is a free-form sequence of UTF-8 characters whose length is given by the TLV's Length field. There is no requirement to terminate the string with a null (or any other particular) character -- the Length field gives its termination.

## **3. Changes to [RFC 7854](#)**

We update [[RFC7854](#)] as follows:

- o The "Information TLV" of [section 4.4](#), that was shared between the Initiation and Peer Up message types, is renamed as the "Initiation Information TLV", and is only relevant to the Initiation message type.
- o A "Peer Up Information TLV" is defined, and is relevant to the Peer Up message type.
- o A "Peer Up TLVs" registry is created, seeded with the Peer Up Information TLV.

Other than as summarized above, and detailed below, there are no other changes.

### **[3.1.](#) Revision to Information TLV, Renamed as Initiation Information TLV**

The Information TLV defined in [section 4.4 of \[RFC7854\]](#) is renamed "Initiation Information TLV". It is used only by the Initiation message, not by the Peer Up message.

The definition of Type = 0 is revised to be:

- o Type = 0: String. The Information field contains a string ([Section 2](#)). The value is administratively assigned. If multiple strings are included, their ordering MUST be preserved when they are reported.

### **[3.2.](#) Revision to Peer Up Notification**

The final paragraph of [section 4.10 of \[RFC7854\]](#) references the Information TLV (which is revised above ([Section 3.1](#))). That paragraph is replaced by the following:

- o Information: Information about the peer, using the Peer Up Information TLV format defined below ([Section 3.3](#)). The String type may be repeated. Inclusion of the Information field is



OPTIONAL. Its presence or absence can be inferred by inspection of the Message Length in the common header.

### 3.3. Definition of Peer Up Information TLV

The Peer Up Information TLV is used by the Peer Up message.

```

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           Information Type           |           Information Length           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|           Information (variable)           |
~                                         ~
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

- o Information Type (2 bytes): Type of information provided. Defined types are:
  - \* Type = 0: String. The Information field contains a string ([Section 2](#)). The value is administratively assigned. If multiple strings are included, their ordering MUST be preserved when they are reported.
- o Information Length (2 bytes): The length of the following Information field, in bytes.
- o Information (variable): Information about the monitored router, according to the type.

## 4. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to create a registry within the BMP group, named "BMP Peer Up Message TLVs", reference this document.

Registration procedures for this registry are:

Range	Registration Procedures
0-32767	Standards Action
32768-65530	First Come, First Served
65531-65534	Experimental
65535	Reserved

Initial values for this registry are:



Type	Description	Reference
0	String	this document
65535	Reserved	this document

## 5. Security Considerations

This rearrangement of deck chairs does not change the underlying security issues inherent in the existing [RFC7854].

## 6. Acknowledgements

TBD

## 7. Normative References

- [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>>.
- [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>>.
- [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>>.

### Author's Address

John Scudder  
Juniper Networks  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
USA

Email: [jgs@juniper.net](mailto:jgs@juniper.net)



