# BMP Peer Up Message Namespace

draft-ietf-grow-bmp-peer-up

John Scudder, Juniper Paolo Lucente, NTT

06 Nov 2023 IETF GROW WG

### 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

(Status quo)

0	String	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
1	sysDescr	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
2	sysName	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
3	VRF/Table Name	[ <u>RFC9069</u> ]
4	Admin Label	[RFC8671]
5-65530	Unassigned	
65531-65534	Experimental	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
65535	Reserved	[RFC7854]

## **BMP Initiation Information TLV**

(this draft)

0	String	[RFC7854]
1	sysDescr	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
2	sysName	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
3	Reserved	
4	Reserved	
5-65530	Unassigned	
65531-65534	Experimental	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
65535	Reserved	[RFC7854]

## BMP Peer Up Information TLV

(this draft)

0	String	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
1	Reserved	
2	Reserved	
3	VRF/Table Name	[RFC9069]
4	Admin Label	[RFC8671]
5-65530	Unassigned	
65531-65534	Experimental	[ <u>RFC7854</u> ]
65535	Reserved	[RFC7854]

# BMP v4: TLV support for BMP Route Monitoring and Peer Down Messages

draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv

Paolo Lucente, NTT Yunan Gu, Huawei

06 Nov 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

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

- Move the BGP PDU into a TLV
- Justified Stateless parsing TLVs
  - Idea to make it one field (from Luuk)
- Bump version to 4
- Time to pause & re-implement the draft in software
  - (more on the next slide)

## Hackathon: Wireshark dissector for BMPv4

```
> Ethernet II, Src: be:f7:8f:70:36:33 (be:f7:8f:70:36:33), Dst: f6:a6:25:64:d0:e8 (f6:a6:25:64:d0:e8)
→ Internet Protocol Version 4, Src: 99.99.100.1, Dst: 99.99.100.99
> Transmission Control Protocol, Src Port: 50850, Dst Port: 1790, Seq: 688, Ack: 279, Len: 336

    BGP Monitoring Protocol, Type Route Monitoring

   Version: 4
   Length: 168
   Type: Route Monitoring (0)
 ▶ Per Peer Header
 ▼ BMPv4 TLV: BGP Message
     Type: 4
     Length: 74
     Index: 0
   ▼ Border Gateway Protocol - UPDATE Message
         Length: 74
         Type: UPDATE Message (2)
         Withdrawn Routes Length: 0
         Total Path Attribute Length: 43
       ▶ Path attributes
       ▶ Network Layer Reachability Information (NLRI)
 → BMPv4 TLV: Route VRF/Table Name
     Type: 3
     Length: 6
     Index: 0
     Value: global
 → BMPv4 TLV: BGP Add-Path Capability
 ▼ BMPv4 TLV: BGP Multi-Label Capability
     Type: 7
     Length: 1
     Index: 0
     Value: True

→ BMPv4 TLV: Group

     Type: 5
     Length: 8
     Index: 0
     Group ID: 69

→ Target Count: 3
       Index: 420
       Index: 69
       Index: 21
 DOD Manitarina Dustanal Tima Dauta Manitarina
```

#### Thank you Maxence!

# Support for Enterprise-specific TLVs in the BGP Monitoring Protocol

draft-lucente-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit

Paolo Lucente, NTT Yunan Gu, Huawei

06 Nov 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 IETF117 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-03

Added E-bit for Stats Types

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

- No open issues at the moment
- Some feedback to process
- Dependency on draft-ietf-grow-tlv for WGLC

# Logging of routing events in BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)

draft-lucente-grow-bmp-rel

Paolo Lucente, NTT Camilo Cardona, NTT

> 06 Nov 2023 IETF GROW WG

### 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 / open issues draft-lucente-grow-bmp-rel

- Timid attempt at defining the Policy Discard TLV
  - Currently just a string
  - o Goal: let's not F35 it
  - O What would YOU like to get here?
- Plenty of work to do, ie. detail all other TLVs
- Feedback to process
- WG Adoption call ongoing:
  - Show your interest by Nov 8<sup>th</sup>!