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Problem statement

“One message type, the Peer Up message, lacks a set of TLVs defined for its use, instead sharing a namespace with the Initiation message. This document updates RFC 7854 by creating an independent namespace for the Peer Up message.”
## BMP Initiation and Peer Up Information TLVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sysDescr</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sysName</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VRF/Table Name</td>
<td>[RFC9069]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Admin Label</td>
<td>[RFC8671]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-65530</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65531-65534</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65535</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Idea: BMP Initiation Information TLV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sysDescr</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sysName</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-65530</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65531-65534</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65535</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Idea: BMP Peer Up Information TLV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decimal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VRF/Table Name</td>
<td>[RFC9069]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Admin Label</td>
<td>[RFC8671]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-65530</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65531-65534</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65535</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Enterprise-specific TLVs in the BGP Monitoring Protocol
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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 IETF116 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-02

- 65531-65534 are for experimental use for Information TLVs:
  - E-bit should be used for experimental use instead
Status / open issues draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit

- Should E-bit be applicable to Stats Types?
  - Authors believe so. Feedback?
TLV support for BMP Route Monitoring and Peer Down Messages
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- 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
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?

Becomes a separate draft

Feedback appreciated
Logging of routing events in BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)
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Intuition

- Add an event-driven message type to BMP:
  - Alerting
  - Reporting
  - On-change analysis

- Complement to:
  - State Synchronization (Route Monitoring)
  - Debugging (Route Mirroring)
  - Session reporting (Peer Up, Peer Down)
  - Stats
Status: use cases better defined

- Ease differential analysis among BMP vantage points, ie.:
  - NLRIs filtered
- Report outcome of validation processes, ie.:
  - RPKI
  - RTBH
- Report malformed BGP packets
Throw a tomato to show interest