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If a route has a non-transitive extended community, then before advertising the route across the Autonomous System boundary the community SHOULD be removed from the route.

Section 6 of RFC4360
Why SHOULD?

- Some specific cases for which you’d like to transit non transitive communities...
What does that mean?

Should remove non transitive extended communities from the path.
Observed Behavior I

• “eBGP peers are not supposed to propagate them to me, so I strip them off from the received routes”
What does that mean?

enforces it...

should remove non transitive extended communities from the path
ASBR3 sets a non transitive extended community on the path
• “eBGP peers are not supposed to **propagate** them to me, so I strip them off”

• adding such communities in the outbound filter of the sender “does not work”
I should remove non transitive extended communities from the path, **but I don’t**
This is bad

- Looks like we’re not in synch
- Non transitive extended communities unusable across AS boundaries
Clarification B

• SHOULD NOT enforce removal on reception over eBGP

• MAY be configurable ?
Clarification A

• All routes **received** carrying an extended communities attribute containing a non-transitive community SHOULD have this(these) non-transitive community(ies) removed before advertising the route to another Autonomous System

• (in line with NO_EXPORT in RFC 1997)

• SHOULD NOT remove the ones added by its outbound filter

• MAY allow a config to disable this behavior
Use case
BGP G-Shut

- draft-ietf-grow-bgp-gshut-01
- FFFF0000 + configuration burden
- Would be simpler with a non-transitive extended community, provided that it
  - can be used over eBGP
  - is really non transitive
Next

- Do we agree on the suggested clarification?
- How do we proceed?