

TLV support for BMP Route Monitoring and Peer Down Messages

`draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv`

Paolo Lucente, NTT

Yunan Gu, Huawei

30 Mar 2023

IETF GROW WG

draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv



- Problem statement:
 - Not all BMP message types support TLVs
- Ideas in the draft:
 - Support TLVs in Route Monitoring
 - Support TLVs in Peer Down
 - Bump version for backwards compatibility

Since IETF115 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-10

- Added wire format example (thanks Luuk!)
- Processed feedback
- Constellation of minor fixes

Status / open issues draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv

- ~~Move the BGP PDU into a TLV~~
- Stateless parsing TLVs:
 - Remove, ADD-PATH becomes a bit in Peers Flag
- Bump version to 4 or use a new Message Type:
 - Authors prefer to keep bumping version
 - WG Chairs? Any opinion?

Support for Enterprise-specific TLVs in the BGP Monitoring Protocol

`draft-lucente-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit`

Paolo Lucente, NTT

Yunan Gu, Huawei

30 Mar 2023

IETF GROW WG

Problem statement

“Vendors need the ability to define proprietary Information Elements, because, for example, they are delivering a pre-standards product, or the Information Element is in some way commercially sensitive”

Since IETF115 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-01

- Processed feedback

Status / open issues draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit

- 65531-65534 are for experimental use for Information TLVs
 - E-bit should be used for experimental use instead
- Should E-bit be applicable to other pieces too? Ie. Stats Types?
 - Authors believe so. Feedback?