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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

(Status quo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RFC 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>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>
# BMP Initiation Information TLV

*(this draft)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sysDescr</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sysName</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-65530</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65531-65534</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65535</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>[RFC7854]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BMP Peer Up Information TLV

*(this draft)*

<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>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></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>
BMP v4: 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
• Justified Stateless parsing TLVs
  o Idea to make it one field (from Luuk)
• Bump version to 4
• Time to pause & re-implement the draft in software
  o (more on the next slide)
Hackathon: Wireshark dissector for BMPv4

Thank you Maxence!
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 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:
  o Alerting
  o Reporting
  o On-change analysis

• Complement to:
  o State Synchronization (Route Monitoring)
  o Debugging (Route Mirroring)
  o Session reporting (Peer Up, Peer Down)
  o Stats
Status / open issues draft-lucente-grow-bmp-rel

- Timid attempt at defining the Policy Discard TLV
  - Currently just a string
  - Goal: let’s not F35 it
  - 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 8th!