

BMP in MRT

draft-petrie-grow-mrt-bmp

Colin Petrie, NTT

AKA: there is no spec for capturing/storing BMP messages

- Can we re-use?
- MRT (RFC6396) – existing standard for storing routing protocol transactions
 - Well supported, lots of BGP archive data (public and private)
- MRT supports Type codes, define new type codes for BMP?

Stateless parsing

- MRT files are usually stateless, and split into files per time-interval
 - E.g. start a new file every 5 mins
- This means each message must contain enough information about the encoding of the BGP update PDUs
- Examples:
 - AS4
 - Add-path

Which entity would be responsible for ensuring the messages can be independently parsed?

- The BMP sender?
 - Needs full TLV support - draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv
 - TLVs are currently still optional
 - Should they be mandatory in BMPv4?
 - Should this draft specify only for BMPv4?
 - Then the BMP receiver can just record the incoming message, MRT type is simple.
- The BMP monitoring station?
 - Needs to add additional MRT header information, for the MRT parser
 - MRT header needs extra encoding information

Existing MRT BGP4MP type example

- MRT Type: BGP4MP
- MRT Subtype:
 - Listing all permutations of encoding types
 - 2, 4, 8 (current number)
 - 16 bit subtype space
 - 12 more permutations left
 - GROW needs to play catch-up with IDR BGP capabilities that change the wire encoding

4	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_AS4	[RFC6396]
5	BGP4MP_STATE_CHANGE_AS4	[RFC6396]
6	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_LOCAL	[RFC6396]
7	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_AS4_LOCAL	[RFC6396]
8	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_ADDPATH	[RFC8050]
9	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_AS4_ADDPATH	[RFC8050]
10	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_LOCAL_ADDPATH	[RFC8050]
11	BGP4MP_MESSAGE_AS4_LOCAL_ADDPATH	[RFC8050]
12-65534	Unassigned	

New MRT type for BMP – BGP encoding options

- If information about BGP encoding needs to be in MRT:
 - do we use the same mechanism as BGP4MP and use subtypes permutations?
 - Ignore subtype field, add some new extra header fields in this type, to represent encoding methods or capabilities per-message?
 - Ideas? How would this look? Like BMP TLVs but in the MRT header?
- What if the encapsulated BMP message contains a TLV that doesn't match the MRT-indicated encoding? 😊

Thoughts/Ideas

- Trying to avoid potential future issues
- But we haven't run out of permutations yet (3 out of 15)
 - Stop trying to overengineer the problem?
- Define the entity with responsibility for ensuring correct encoding information
- Avoid altering received message where possible – capture as-is

Questions? Rotten Tomatoes?
Adopt? Co-authors?

draft-petrie-grow-mrt-bmp

colin@ntt.net